

Error exponents of quantum state discrimination with composite correlated hypotheses

Kun Fang ^{*1} and Masahito Hayashi ^{†1,2,3}

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

²International Quantum Academy, Futian District, Shenzhen 518048, China

³Graduate School of Mathematics, Nagoya University, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya 464–8602, Japan

November 11, 2025

Abstract

We study the error exponents in quantum hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states, extending the analysis beyond the independent and identically distributed case to encompass composite correlated hypotheses. In particular, we introduce and compare two natural extensions of the quantum Hoeffding divergence and anti-divergence to sets of quantum states, establishing their equivalence or quantitative relations. In the error exponent regime, we generalize the quantum Hoeffding bound to stable sequences of convex, compact sets of quantum states, demonstrating that the optimal Type-I error exponent, under an exponential constraint on the Type-II error, is precisely characterized by the regularized quantum Hoeffding divergence between the sets. In the strong converse exponent regime, we provide a general lower bound on the exponent in terms of the regularized quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence and a matching upper bound when the null hypothesis is a singleton. The generality of these results enables applications in various contexts, including (i) refining the generalized quantum Stein’s lemma by [Fang, Fawzi & Fawzi, 2024]; (ii) exhibiting counterexamples to the continuity of the regularized Petz Rényi divergence and Hoeffding divergence; (iii) obtaining error exponents for adversarial channel discrimination and resource detection problems.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Quantum hypothesis testing between two quantum states	2
1.2	Quantum hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states	4
1.3	Summary of main results	5
1.4	Organization of the paper	7
2	Preliminaries	7
2.1	Notations	7
2.2	Quantum divergences	8
3	Hoeffding divergence and anti-divergence for sets of states	9
3.1	Quantum Hoeffding divergence	9
3.2	Quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence	12

^{*}kunfang@cuhk.edu.cn

[†]hmasahito@cuhk.edu.cn

4 Hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states	15
4.1 Composite correlated hypotheses	15
4.2 Optimal Type-I error probability	15
5 Quantum Hoeffding bound for composite correlated hypotheses	16
5.1 Proof of the lower bound	17
5.2 Proof of the upper bound	18
6 Strong converse exponent for composite correlated hypotheses	23
6.1 Proof of the lower bound	24
6.2 Proof of the upper bound	25
7 Applications	28
7.1 Refining quantum Stein’s lemma between two sets of quantum states	28
7.2 Counterexamples for the continuity of $D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \mathcal{B})$ at $\alpha = 1$	30
7.3 Error exponents in adversarial quantum channel discrimination	38
7.4 Error exponents in quantum resource detection	42
8 Discussion	43
A Useful lemmas	47
B Mathematical properties of $\phi(s)$	49

1 Introduction

1.1 Quantum hypothesis testing between two quantum states

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

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

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

A natural question is whether the above result generalizes to the quantum case. Substantial efforts have been made to answer this fundamental question in quantum information community (see, e.g., [HP91, ON00, Hay02, ANSV08, Hay07, BP10, CMW16, MO15a, WW19a, WW19b, FFF25, FFF24, HI25]). Consider the problem of distinguishing between two quantum hypotheses: the system is prepared either in state ρ_n (the null hypothesis) or in state σ_n (the alternative hypothesis). Operationally, the discrimination is carried out using a two-outcome positive

operator-valued measure (POVM) $\{M_n, I - M_n\}$, with $0 \leq M_n \leq I$. With this choice of test, the Type-I and Type-II errors are, respectively, given by

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

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




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

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

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

The quantum version of the Chernoff-Stein's Lemma (also known as quantum Stein's lemma) states that the optimal Type-II error decays exponentially with the number of copies n of the states when the Type-I error is restricted below a constant threshold and the optimal exponent is given by the quantum relative entropy $D(\rho \| \sigma) := \text{Tr}[\rho(\log \rho - \log \sigma)]$ [HP91, ON00],

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

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

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

with a constant $r > 0$. When $r < D(\rho\|\sigma)$, the optimal Type-I error $\alpha_{n,r}(\rho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n})$, also decays with an exponential speed, as was shown in [OH04]. The exact decay rate is determined by the quantum Hoeffding bound [Hay07, Nag06, ANSV08] as

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

where the quantum Hoeffding divergence is defined as

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

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

Strong converse exponent. On the other hand, when $r > D(\rho\|\sigma)$, the optimal Type-I error $\alpha_{n,r}(\rho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n})$ goes to 1 exponentially fast [ON00]. The rate of this convergence is [MO15a],

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

where the Hoeffding anti-divergence is defined as

$$H_r^*(\rho\|\sigma) := \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (r - D_{S,\alpha}(\rho\|\sigma)), \quad (9)$$

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

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

1.2 Quantum hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states

While much of the existing literature has focused on i.i.d. sources, practical scenarios often involve quantum states that are not fully specified (i.e., *composite hypotheses* [BP10, BBH21, MSW22, HI25, HT16, DWH25]) such as in adversarial or black-box settings [FFF25, WT24] and exhibit correlations that preclude a simple tensor product structure (i.e., *correlated hypotheses* [HMO07, HMO08, MO15b, HI25]). In this context, the task is to discriminate between two *sets of correlated quantum states* (see Figure 2). That is, a tester receives samples prepared according to either the set $\mathcal{A}_n$ or $\mathcal{B}_n$, and determines, via a quantum measurement $\{M_n, I - M_n\}$, from which set the samples originate.




Figure 2: Quantum hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states $\mathcal{A}_n$ and $\mathcal{B}_n$.

As in standard hypothesis testing, two types of errors can occur: a Type-I error, where a sample from $\mathcal{A}_n$ is incorrectly classified as coming from $\mathcal{B}_n$, and a Type-II error, where a sample from $\mathcal{B}_n$ is incorrectly classified as coming from $\mathcal{A}_n$. Since we aim to control the errors for any state within the given sets, regardless of which one is drawn, the (worst-case) Type-I error is defined by

$$\alpha(\mathcal{A}_n, M_n) := \sup_{\rho_n \in \mathcal{A}_n} \text{Tr}[\rho_n(I - M_n)], \quad (10)$$

and the (worst-case) Type-II error is defined by

$$\beta(\mathcal{B}_n, M_n) := \sup_{\sigma_n \in \mathcal{B}_n} \text{Tr}[\sigma_n M_n]. \quad (11)$$

A few variants of quantum Stein's lemma has been shown in this worst-case setting under some structural assumptions on the sets $\mathcal{A}_n$ and $\mathcal{B}_n$ [FFF24, HY25, Lam25]. Particularly, the Stein's lemma in [FFF24] shows that

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

where

$$\beta_\varepsilon(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) := \min_{0 \leq M_n \leq I} \{ \beta(\mathcal{B}_n, M_n) : \alpha(\mathcal{A}_n, M_n) \leq \varepsilon \}, \quad (13)$$

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

1.3 Summary of main results

In this work, we refine the analysis of asymmetric hypothesis testing for composite correlated hypotheses, as developed in [HY25, Lam25, FFF24], by extending it to the error exponent and strong converse exponent regimes. Specifically, we consider the optimal Type-I error¹:

$$\alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) := \min_{0 \leq M_n \leq I} \{ \alpha(\mathcal{A}_n, M_n) : \beta(\mathcal{B}_n, M_n) \leq 2^{-nr} \}, \quad (14)$$

and seek to determine the following asymptotic exponents:

$$\text{(Error exponent)} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) = ? \quad (15)$$

$$\text{(Strong converse exponent)} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)) = ? \quad (16)$$

Due to the uncertainty and correlation inherent in composite correlated hypotheses, several significant challenges arise when obtaining precise characterizations. First, discrimination strategies must be state-agnostic, ensuring that error probabilities are universally controlled for every state within the respective sets, regardless of which specific state is encountered. Second, the optimization problem exhibits a minimax structure, forming a competing scenario that requires simultaneous maximization over all possible states in the sets and minimization over all possible quantum measurements. Third, the non-i.i.d. structure significantly complicates the asymptotic analysis, as standard techniques relying on tensor product structures no longer directly apply. Fourth, it becomes necessary to define suitable extensions of the quantum Hoeffding divergence and anti-divergence to sets of quantum states that both recover existing results for i.i.d. sources and precisely capture the essential features of the general composite correlated setting.

Error exponent. For the error exponent regime, we explore two natural approaches to extending the quantum Hoeffding divergence (see Figure 3). The first treats the Hoeffding divergence as a quantum divergence and considers the minimal divergence between the sets, denoted as $H_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)$. The second approach uses the explicit formula for the Hoeffding divergence in terms of the Petz Rényi divergences: we first extend the Rényi divergences to sets of quantum states, $D_{P,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)$, and then define the Hoeffding divergence accordingly, denoted as $\mathfrak{H}_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)$. We show that these two extensions are equivalent for finite n in general, and further show the inequality $H_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) \geq \mathfrak{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})$ for their regularizations. As a main result, we

¹Such version of definition is similarly used in [CMW16, HT16, WBHK20].

prove that the error exponent is completely characterized by the regularized quantum Hoeffding divergence defined via the first approach.




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

Strong converse exponent. In the strong converse regime, we likewise investigate two natural extensions of the quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence (see Figure 4). The first approach considers the maximal anti-divergence between the sets, denoted $H_{n,r}^*(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n)$. The second approach leverages the explicit formula for the anti-divergence in terms of the sandwiched Rényi divergences: we first extend the sandwiched Rényi divergences to sets, $D_{S,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n)$, and then define the anti-divergence as $\mathfrak{H}_{n,r}^*(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n)$. We establish that these two approaches are equivalent for both finite n and in the asymptotic setting. As a main result, we prove that the strong converse exponent is lower bounded by the regularized quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence in general, and we provide a matching upper bound when the null hypothesis is a singleton.




Figure 4: Summary of results in the strong converse exponent regime. Quantitative relationships between the various quantities are indicated by black arrows: the quantity at the tail of an arrow is always greater than or equal to the one at the head. A double arrow indicates an equality. A dashed arrow indicates partial progress when $\mathcal{A}_n$ is a singleton.

Applications. As the error exponent and strong converse exponent regimes provide a finer characterization of the trade-off between Type-I and Type-II errors than the Stein regime, we apply the results above to refine and extend several existing studies. In particular, we recover the quantum Stein’s lemma for composite correlated hypotheses as established in [FFF24], and further strengthen it by providing explicit convergence rates for the Type-I error. Note that the Stein exponent only indicates whether the Type-I error decays, but does not quantify how fast it decays. Specifically, under the same assumptions as in [FFF24], we establish the following refined asymptotic trade-off between Type-I and Type-II errors:

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \geq \mathfrak{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) > 0, \quad \forall 0 < r < D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}), \quad (17)$$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)) \geq \mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) > 0, \quad \forall r > D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}), \quad (18)$$

where $D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})$ is the regularized relative entropy between the sets. These indicate that any Type-II error exponent r below $D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})$ is achievable, with the corresponding Type-I error decaying exponentially at a rate at least $\mathfrak{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})$. Conversely, if the Type-II error exponent r exceeds $D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})$, the Type-I error inevitably converges to one exponentially fast, with a rate at least $\mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})$. Thus, the regularized quantum relative entropy delineates a sharp threshold for the asymptotic trade-off in hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states.

Besides this, we also provide a few more explicit applications, including: (i) finding counterexamples to the continuity of the regularized Petz Rényi divergence and Hoeffding divergence; (ii) deriving error exponents for adversarial quantum channel discrimination; and (iii) obtaining error exponents for resource detection problems in coherence theory and entanglement theory.

1.4 Organization of the paper

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the notation and review a few quantum divergences, together with their extensions to sets of states. In Section 3 we introduce two natural extensions of the Hoeffding divergence and anti-divergence to sets and proves their equivalence or quantitative relation. In Section 4 we formulate asymmetric hypothesis testing for composite correlated hypotheses and show how the worst-case problem reduces to pairwise optimizations. Section 5 establishes the quantum Hoeffding bound for composite correlated hypotheses, while Section 6 studies the strong converse exponent. Section 7 discusses applications and implications of our results. In Section 8 we conclude the paper and discuss a few open questions for future exploration. Some technical lemmas are delegated to the appendices.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notations

Throughout this work, we adopt the following notational conventions. Finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces are denoted by $\mathcal{H}$, with $|\mathcal{H}|$ indicating their dimension. The set of all linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$, while $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{H}_+(\mathcal{H})$ denote the sets of Hermitian and positive semidefinite operators on $\mathcal{H}$, respectively. The set of density operators (i.e., positive semidefinite operators with unit trace) on $\mathcal{H}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$. Calligraphic letters such as $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$, and $\mathcal{C}$ are used to represent sets of linear operators. Unless otherwise specified, all logarithms are taken to base two and denoted by $\log(x)$. The positive semidefinite ordering is written as $X \geq Y$ if and only if $X - Y \geq 0$. The absolute value of an operator X is defined as $|X| := (X^\dagger X)^{1/2}$. For a Hermitian operator X with spectral decomposition $X = \sum_i x_i E_i$, the projection onto the non-negative eigenspaces is denoted by $\{X \geq 0\} := \sum_{x_i \geq 0} E_i$. Similarly, $\{X > 0\} := \sum_{x_i > 0} E_i$.

2.2 Quantum divergences

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

Definition 2.1 (Umegaki relative entropy [Ume54].) *For any $\rho \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{H}_+$, the Umegaki relative entropy is defined by*

$$D(\rho \parallel \sigma) := \text{Tr}[\rho(\log \rho - \log \sigma)], \quad (19)$$

if $\text{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \text{supp}(\sigma)$ and ∞ otherwise.

Definition 2.2 (Petz Rényi divergence [Pet86].) *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$. For any $\rho \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{H}_+$, the Petz Rényi divergence is defined by*

$$D_{\text{P},\alpha}(\rho \parallel \sigma) := \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log Q_\alpha(\rho \parallel \sigma) \quad \text{with} \quad Q_\alpha(\rho \parallel \sigma) := \text{Tr}[\rho^\alpha \sigma^{1-\alpha}], \quad (20)$$

if $\text{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \text{supp}(\sigma)$, and ∞ otherwise.

Definition 2.3 (Sandwiched Rényi divergence [MLDS⁺13, WWY14].) *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$. For any $\rho \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{H}_+$, the sandwiched Rényi divergence is defined by*

$$D_{\text{S},\alpha}(\rho \parallel \sigma) := \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \text{Tr} \left[\sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \rho \sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \right]^\alpha, \quad (21)$$

if $\text{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \text{supp}(\sigma)$, and ∞ otherwise.

Definition 2.4 (Quantum divergence between two sets of states.) *Let $\mathbb{D}$ be a quantum divergence between two quantum states. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. Then for any sets $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$, the quantum divergence between these two sets is defined by*

$$\mathbb{D}(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) := \inf_{\substack{\rho \in \mathcal{A} \\ \sigma \in \mathcal{B}}} \mathbb{D}(\rho \parallel \sigma). \quad (22)$$

Let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be two sequences of sets of quantum states², where each $\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$. the regularized divergence between these sequences is defined by

$$\underline{\mathbb{D}}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n), \quad (23)$$

$$\overline{\mathbb{D}}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n). \quad (24)$$

If the limit exists, we define the regularized divergence as

$$\mathbb{D}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n). \quad (25)$$

Remark 2.1 *Note that if $\mathbb{D}$ is lower semicontinuous (which is true for most quantum divergences of interest), and $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are compact sets, the infimum in the above expression is always attained and can thus be replaced by a minimization [KZ05, Theorem 7.3.1].*

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

²We abuse the notation $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$ to refer both to sets of states and to sequences of such sets, depending on the context.

Definition 2.5 (Stable sequence.) Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_+(\mathcal{H}_1)$, $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_+(\mathcal{H}_2)$, and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_+(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2)$. We say that $\{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}\}$ is stable under tensor product if, for any $X_1 \in \mathcal{A}$ and $X_2 \in \mathcal{B}$, it holds that $X_1 \otimes X_2 \in \mathcal{C}$. In short, we write $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. A sequence of sets $\{\mathcal{C}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\mathcal{C}_n \subseteq \mathcal{H}_+(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ is called stable under tensor product if $\mathcal{C}_n \otimes \mathcal{C}_m \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{n+m}$ for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Remark 2.2 If the divergence $\mathbb{D}$ is subadditive under tensor product states, then its extension to sets of states is also subadditive for stable sequences of sets [FFF24, Lemma 26]. This implies the existence of the regularized divergence by Fekete's lemma,

$$\mathbb{D}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = \underline{\mathbb{D}}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = \overline{\mathbb{D}}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n). \quad (26)$$

3 Hoeffding divergence and anti-divergence for sets of states

In this section, we develop extensions of the quantum Hoeffding divergence and anti-divergence to sets of quantum states. Two natural approaches arise for this purpose. The first approach treats the Hoeffding divergence as a quantum divergence and extends it to sets via Definition 2.4. The second approach leverages the explicit formula for the Hoeffding divergence in terms of the Petz Rényi divergences. Analogous constructions apply to the Hoeffding anti-divergence.

3.1 Quantum Hoeffding divergence

Definition 3.1 Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, $r > 0$ be a real number, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\rho_n, \sigma_n \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ be two quantum states. The quantum Hoeffding divergence is defined as

$$H_{n,r}(\rho_n \parallel \sigma_n) := \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (nr - D_{\text{P},\alpha}(\rho_n \parallel \sigma_n)). \quad (27)$$

Lemma 3.1 (Subadditivity.) For any $\rho_m, \sigma_m \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m})$ and $\rho_n, \sigma_n \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$, it holds that

$$H_{(m+n),r}(\rho_m \otimes \rho_n \parallel \sigma_m \otimes \sigma_n) \leq H_{m,r}(\rho_m \parallel \sigma_m) + H_{n,r}(\rho_n \parallel \sigma_n). \quad (28)$$

Proof. This can be seen as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & H_{(m+n),r}(\rho_m \otimes \rho_n \parallel \sigma_m \otimes \sigma_n) \\ &= \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} ((m+n)r - D_{\text{P},\alpha}(\rho_m \otimes \rho_n \parallel \sigma_m \otimes \sigma_n)) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

$$= \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} ((m+n)r - D_{\text{P},\alpha}(\rho_m \parallel \sigma_m) - D_{\text{P},\alpha}(\rho_n \parallel \sigma_n)) \quad (30)$$

$$\leq \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (mr - D_{\text{P},\alpha}(\rho_m \parallel \sigma_m)) + \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (nr - D_{\text{P},\alpha}(\rho_n \parallel \sigma_n)) \quad (31)$$

$$= H_{m,r}(\rho_m \parallel \sigma_m) + H_{n,r}(\rho_n \parallel \sigma_n), \quad (32)$$

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

Definition 3.2 (Quantum Hoeffding divergence between sets of states.) Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and $r > 0$ be a real number, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ be two sets of quantum

states. Two variants of the quantum Hoeffding divergence between these sets are defined as

$$H_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) := \inf_{\substack{\rho_n \in \mathcal{A}_n \\ \sigma_n \in \mathcal{B}_n}} H_{n,r}(\rho_n \| \sigma_n), \quad (33)$$

$$\mathfrak{H}_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) := \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (nr - D_{P,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)), \quad (34)$$

where $D_{P,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)$ is defined as in Definition 2.4. Moreover, let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be two sequences of sets of quantum states, where each $\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$. The regularized quantum Hoeffding divergences between these sequences are defined as

$$\underline{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n), \quad (35)$$

$$\overline{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n), \quad (36)$$

$$\underline{\mathfrak{H}}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) := \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (r - \underline{D}_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})), \quad (37)$$

$$\overline{\mathfrak{H}}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) := \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (r - \overline{D}_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})), \quad (38)$$

where $\underline{D}_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})$ and $\overline{D}_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})$ are defined as in Definition 2.4. If the limits exist, we define the regularized quantum Hoeffding divergence as

$$H_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n), \quad (39)$$

$$\mathfrak{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) := \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (r - D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})), \quad (40)$$

where $D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})$ is defined as in Definition 2.4.

Remark 3.1 (Attainment.) Since $D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_n \| \sigma_n)$ is lower semicontinuous in (ρ_n, σ_n) for any fixed α [MH23, Proposition III.11], it follows from Lemma A.3 that $H_{n,r}(\rho_n \| \sigma_n)$ is also lower semicontinuous in (ρ_n, σ_n) . Consequently, if $\mathcal{A}_n$ and $\mathcal{B}_n$ are compact sets, we know from Lemma A.2 that the infimum in the definition of $H_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)$ is attained.

Remark 3.2 (Limit existence.) The quantum Hoeffding divergence is subadditive under tensor product by Lemma 3.1. So this property extends to stable sequences of sets by Remark 2.2,

$$H_{(m+n),r}(\mathcal{A}_{m+n} \| \mathcal{B}_{m+n}) \leq H_{m,r}(\mathcal{A}_m \| \mathcal{B}_m) + H_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n). \quad (41)$$

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

$$H_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) = \overline{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) = \underline{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) = \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n). \quad (42)$$

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

$$\mathfrak{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) = \overline{\mathfrak{H}}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) = \underline{\mathfrak{H}}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}). \quad (43)$$

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

Lemma 3.2 (Finite equivalence.) *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and $r > 0$ be a real number, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ be two convex compact sets of quantum states. Then*

$$H_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) = \mathfrak{H}_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n). \quad (44)$$

Proof. This result was previously established in [MSW22, Lemma II.8]. $\square$

Remark 3.3 (Computability.) *For any fixed $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the function $Q_\alpha(\rho_n \| \sigma_n)$ is jointly concave in (ρ_n, σ_n) . Consequently, the quasi-divergence $Q_\alpha(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)$ can be efficiently computed using the QICS package [HSF24], provided that $\mathcal{A}_n$ and $\mathcal{B}_n$ admit semidefinite representations. If the sets $\mathcal{A}_n$ and $\mathcal{B}_n$ exhibit additional symmetries, the computational complexity can be further reduced. With this, $\mathfrak{H}_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)$ can be efficiently evaluated by scanning over $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.*

Remark 3.4 (Alternative expression.) *By the duality relation of the Petz Rényi divergences, we have the following alternative expression for the Hoeffding divergence:*

$$H_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) = \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (nr - D_{P,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)) \quad (45)$$

$$= \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \left(nr + \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} D_{P,1-\alpha}(\mathcal{B}_n \| \mathcal{A}_n) \right) \quad (46)$$

$$= \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} nr + D_{P,1-\alpha}(\mathcal{B}_n \| \mathcal{A}_n) \right) \quad (47)$$

$$= \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \left(-\frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} nr + D_{P,\alpha}(\mathcal{B}_n \| \mathcal{A}_n) \right), \quad (48)$$

where we replace α by $1 - \alpha$ in the penultimate equality. This alternative formulation is particularly useful when analyzing the Stein's exponent by taking the limit $r \rightarrow 0$.

Lemma 3.3 (Asymptotic relation.) *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and $r > 0$ be a real number. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be two stable sequences of convex compact sets of quantum states, where each $\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$. Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that*

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathfrak{H}_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \geq H_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) \geq \mathfrak{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}). \quad (49)$$

Proof. The existence of the regularizations is ensured by Remark 3.2. Then we have the following chain of inequalities:

$$H_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) = \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \quad (50)$$

$$= \inf_{n \geq 1} \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \left(r - \frac{1}{n} D_{P,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \right) \quad (51)$$

$$\geq \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \left(r - \frac{1}{n} D_{P,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \right) \quad (52)$$

$$= \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \left(r - \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} D_{P,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \right) \quad (53)$$

$$= \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (r - D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})) \quad (54)$$

$$= \mathfrak{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}), \quad (55)$$

where the first equality follows from Remark 3.2, the second equality follows from Lemma 3.2, the inequality follows by minimax inequality, the fourth equality follows from Remark 3.2, and the last equality follows by definition. Moreover, we have

$$H_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) \leq \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) = \frac{1}{n} \mathfrak{H}_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n). \quad (56)$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Remark 3.5 *If the minimax equality in the above proof can be established, then we would have $H_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = \mathfrak{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})$. However, this appears to be challenging, as existing minimax theorems typically require at least one of the spaces to be compact—a condition that is not directly satisfied here. Moreover, as we show later that the Petz Rényi divergence and the Hoeffding divergence between two sets can be nonadditive in general (see Section 7.3), which further complicates the situation. Nevertheless, in the special case where the Petz Rényi divergence is additive for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, i.e., $\frac{1}{n} D_{P,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) = D_{P,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_1 \parallel \mathcal{B}_1)$, we have that*

$$H_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = \mathfrak{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = H_{1,r}(\mathcal{A}_1 \parallel \mathcal{B}_1) = \mathfrak{H}_{1,r}(\mathcal{A}_1 \parallel \mathcal{B}_1). \quad (57)$$

3.2 Quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence

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

Definition 3.3 *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, $r > 0$ be a real number, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\rho_n, \sigma_n \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ be two quantum states. The quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence is defined as*

$$H_{n,r}^*(\rho_n \parallel \sigma_n) := \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (nr - D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_n \parallel \sigma_n)). \quad (58)$$

Lemma 3.4 (Subadditivity.) *For any $\rho_m, \sigma_m \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m})$ and $\rho_n, \sigma_n \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$, it holds that*

$$H_{(m+n),r}^*(\rho_m \otimes \rho_n \parallel \sigma_m \otimes \sigma_n) \leq H_{m,r}^*(\rho_m \parallel \sigma_m) + H_{n,r}^*(\rho_n \parallel \sigma_n). \quad (59)$$

Proof. This can be seen as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & H_{(m+n),r}^*(\rho_m \otimes \rho_n \parallel \sigma_m \otimes \sigma_n) \\ &= \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} ((m+n)r - D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_m \otimes \rho_n \parallel \sigma_m \otimes \sigma_n)) \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

$$= \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} ((m+n)r - D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_m \parallel \sigma_m) - D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_n \parallel \sigma_n)) \quad (61)$$

$$\leq \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (mr - D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_m \parallel \sigma_m)) + \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (nr - D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_n \parallel \sigma_n)) \quad (62)$$

$$= H_{m,r}^*(\rho_m \parallel \sigma_m) + H_{n,r}^*(\rho_n \parallel \sigma_n), \quad (63)$$

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

Definition 3.4 (Quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence between sets of states.) *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and $r > 0$ be a real number, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ be two*

sets of quantum states. Two variants of the quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence between these sets are defined as ³

$$H_{n,r}^*(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) := \sup_{\substack{\rho_n \in \mathcal{A}_n \\ \sigma_n \in \mathcal{B}_n}} H_{n,r}^*(\rho_n \| \sigma_n), \quad (64)$$

$$\mathfrak{H}_{n,r}^*(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) := \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (nr - D_{s,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)), \quad (65)$$

where $D_{s,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)$ is defined as in Definition 2.4. Moreover, let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be two sequences of sets of quantum states, where each $\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$. The regularized quantum Hoeffding anti-divergences between these sequences are defined as

$$\underline{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}^*(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n), \quad (66)$$

$$\overline{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}^*(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n), \quad (67)$$

$$\underline{\mathfrak{H}}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) := \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (r - \underline{D}_{s,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})), \quad (68)$$

$$\overline{\mathfrak{H}}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) := \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (r - \overline{D}_{s,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})). \quad (69)$$

where $\underline{D}_{s,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})$ and $\overline{D}_{s,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})$ are defined as in Definition 2.4. If the limits exist, we define the regularized Hoeffding divergence as

$$H_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}^*(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n), \quad (70)$$

$$\mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) := \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (r - D_{s,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})), \quad (71)$$

where $D_{s,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})$ is defined as in Definition 2.4.

Remark 3.6 (Attainment.) It is known that $H_{n,r}^*(\rho_n \| \sigma_n)$ is upper semicontinuous in (ρ_n, σ_n) [MSW22, Corollary V.16]. So the supremum in $H_{n,r}^*(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)$ is achieved for any compact sets.

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

Lemma 3.5 (Finite equivalence.) Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and $r > 0$ be a real number, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ be two sets of quantum states. Then

$$H_{n,r}^*(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) = \mathfrak{H}_{n,r}^*(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n). \quad (72)$$

³The anti-divergence is monotone non-decreasing under CPTP maps, so the extension to sets is based on the supremum rather than the infimum.

Proof. By definition, we have

$$H_{n,r}^*(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) = \sup_{\substack{\rho_n \in \mathcal{A}_n \\ \sigma_n \in \mathcal{B}_n}} \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (nr - D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_n \| \sigma_n)) \quad (73)$$

$$= \sup_{\alpha > 1} \sup_{\substack{\rho_n \in \mathcal{A}_n \\ \sigma_n \in \mathcal{B}_n}} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (nr - D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_n \| \sigma_n)) \quad (74)$$

$$= \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \left(nr - \inf_{\substack{\rho_n \in \mathcal{A}_n \\ \sigma_n \in \mathcal{B}_n}} D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_n \| \sigma_n) \right) \quad (75)$$

$$= \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (nr - D_{S,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)) \quad (76)$$

$$= \mathfrak{H}_{n,r}^*(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n), \quad (77)$$

where in the third line we exchange the two suprema. $\square$

It is important to note that $H_{n,r}^*(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)$ is defined as a supremum over the feasible states, which makes its additivity property for stable sequences unclear—even though we know the Hoeffding anti-divergence for states is subadditive. As a result, we cannot directly apply Remark 2.2 as in previous discussions of Remark 3.2. Nevertheless, the following result shows that the regularization $H_r^{*,\infty}$ indeed exists for stable sequences and coincides with $\mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}$ in general.

Lemma 3.6 (Asymptotic equivalence.) *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and $r > 0$ be a real number. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be two stable sequences of sets of quantum states, where each $\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$. Then it holds that*

$$H_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) = \mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}). \quad (78)$$

Proof. We have the following chain of inequalities:

$$\underline{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}^*(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \quad (79)$$

$$= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathfrak{H}_{n,r}^*(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \quad (80)$$

$$= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (nr - D_{S,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)) \quad (81)$$

$$\geq \sup_{\alpha > 1} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (nr - D_{S,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)) \quad (82)$$

$$= \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \left(r - \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} D_{S,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \right) \quad (83)$$

$$= \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \left(r - D_{S,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) \right) \quad (84)$$

$$= \mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}), \quad (85)$$

where the second line follows from Lemma 3.5, the inequality follows by the fact that for any sequence of numbers $x_{\alpha,n}$, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\alpha > 1} x_{\alpha,n} \geq \sup_{\alpha > 1} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{\alpha,n}$, the second last line follows from Remark 2.2 and the stability of the sequences.

In the other direction, we have

$$\overline{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}^*(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) \quad (86)$$

$$= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathfrak{H}_{n,r}^*(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) \quad (87)$$

$$= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (nr - D_{s,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n)), \quad (88)$$

where the second line follows from Lemma 3.5. Note that $D_{s,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n)$ is subadditive for stable sequences, so we have $\frac{1}{n} D_{s,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) \geq D_{s,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This gives

$$\frac{1}{n} \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (nr - D_{s,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n)) \leq \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (r - D_{s,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})). \quad (89)$$

Then taking the limit of n , we have

$$\overline{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) \leq \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (r - D_{s,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})) = \mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}). \quad (90)$$

Combining Eq. (85) and Eq. (90), we have the asserted result. $\square$

4 Hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states

In this section, we present our main framework for hypothesis testing between sets of quantum states, extending beyond the traditional i.i.d. setting to handle composite correlated hypotheses. We also show how the optimal Type-I error for sets reduces to a worst-case optimization over individual state pairs, providing a key simplification that enables our subsequent analysis.

4.1 Composite correlated hypotheses

While much of the existing literature has focused on i.i.d. sources, practical scenarios often involve quantum states that are not fully specified (i.e., *composite hypotheses* [BP10, BBH21, MSW22]) such as in adversarial or black-box settings [FFF25, WT24] and exhibit correlations that preclude a simple tensor product structure (i.e., *correlated hypotheses* [HMO07, HMO08, MO15b]). In this context, the general task is to discriminate between two *sets of correlated quantum states*. That is, a tester receives samples prepared according to either the set $\mathcal{A}_n$ or the set $\mathcal{B}_n$, and determines, via a quantum measurement $\{M_n, I - M_n\}$, from which set the samples originate.

As in standard hypothesis testing, two types of errors can occur: a Type-I error, where a sample from $\mathcal{A}_n$ is incorrectly classified as coming from $\mathcal{B}_n$, and a Type-II error, where a sample from $\mathcal{B}_n$ is incorrectly classified as coming from $\mathcal{A}_n$. Since we aim to control the errors for any state within the given sets, regardless of which one is drawn, the (worst-case) Type-I error is defined by

$$\alpha(\mathcal{A}_n, M_n) := \sup_{\rho_n \in \mathcal{A}_n} \text{Tr}[\rho_n(I - M_n)], \quad (91)$$

and the (worst-case) Type-II error is defined by

$$\beta(\mathcal{B}_n, M_n) := \sup_{\sigma_n \in \mathcal{B}_n} \text{Tr}[\sigma_n M_n]. \quad (92)$$

4.2 Optimal Type-I error probability

The error exponent and strong converse exponent regimes study the optimal behavior of the Type-I error provided that the Type-II error exponentially decays. More explicitly, the optimal Type-I error for hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states, $\mathcal{A}_n$ and $\mathcal{B}_n$, is defined as

$$\alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) := \min_{0 \leq M_n \leq I} \left\{ \alpha(\mathcal{A}_n, M_n) : \beta(\mathcal{B}_n, M_n) \leq 2^{-nr} \right\}, \quad (93)$$

where the measurement M_n is chosen to minimize the worst-case Type-I error $\alpha(\mathcal{A}_n, M_n)$, subject to the constraint that the Type-II error $\beta(\mathcal{B}_n, M_n)$ decays exponentially at a rate r . In other words, the measurement must perform universally well for all states in $\mathcal{A}_n$ and $\mathcal{B}_n$.

The following result shows that the optimal Type-I error for hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states is precisely determined by the most challenging pair of states from these sets. This implies that there exists a universal measurement for $\mathcal{A}_n$ and $\mathcal{B}_n$ whose performance matches that of the optimal measurement for the worst-case pair of states.

Lemma 4.1 *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and $r > 0$ be a real number, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ be two convex sets of quantum states. Then it holds that*

$$\alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) = \sup_{\substack{\rho_n \in \mathcal{A}_n \\ \sigma_n \in \mathcal{B}_n}} \alpha_{n,r}(\rho_n \| \sigma_n). \quad (94)$$

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

$$\alpha(\mathcal{A}_n, M_n) = \beta(\mathcal{A}_n, I - M_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta(\mathcal{B}_n, M_n) = \alpha(\mathcal{B}_n, I - M_n). \quad (95)$$

This allows us to rewrite the optimization in Eq. (93) as

$$\alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) = \min_{0 \leq M_n \leq I} \{ \beta(\mathcal{A}_n, I - M_n) : \alpha(\mathcal{B}_n, I - M_n) \leq 2^{-nr} \} \quad (96)$$

$$= \min_{0 \leq M_n \leq I} \{ \beta(\mathcal{A}_n, M_n) : \alpha(\mathcal{B}_n, M_n) \leq 2^{-nr} \} \quad (97)$$

$$= \sup_{\substack{\rho_n \in \mathcal{A}_n \\ \sigma_n \in \mathcal{B}_n}} \min_{0 \leq M_n \leq I} \{ \beta(\rho_n, M_n) : \alpha(\sigma_n, M_n) \leq 2^{-nr} \} \quad (98)$$

$$= \sup_{\substack{\rho_n \in \mathcal{A}_n \\ \sigma_n \in \mathcal{B}_n}} \min_{0 \leq M_n \leq I} \{ \beta(\rho_n, I - M_n) : \alpha(\sigma_n, I - M_n) \leq 2^{-nr} \} \quad (99)$$

$$= \sup_{\substack{\rho_n \in \mathcal{A}_n \\ \sigma_n \in \mathcal{B}_n}} \min_{0 \leq M_n \leq I} \{ \alpha(\rho_n, M_n) : \beta(\sigma_n, M_n) \leq 2^{-nr} \} \quad (100)$$

$$= \sup_{\substack{\rho_n \in \mathcal{A}_n \\ \sigma_n \in \mathcal{B}_n}} \alpha_{n,r}(\rho_n \| \sigma_n), \quad (101)$$

where the first and fourth equalities use Eq. (95), the second and fifth equalities follow by substituting M_n to $I - M_n$ in the optimization, the third equality uses [FFF24, Lemma 31] which allows us to pull out the optimization over $\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n$ for the optimal Type-II error probability when Type-I error is restricted to a constant threshold, and the last equality is by definition. $\square$

Remark 4.1 *Note that for general sets $\mathcal{A}_n$ and $\mathcal{B}_n$, i.e., not necessarily convex, we have*

$$\alpha(\mathcal{A}_n, M_n) = \alpha(\text{conv}(\mathcal{A}_n), M_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta(\mathcal{B}_n, M_n) = \beta(\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_n), M_n), \quad (102)$$

where $\text{conv}(\mathcal{C})$ denotes the convex hull of set $\mathcal{C}$. Therefore, we have the relation that

$$\alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) = \alpha_{n,r}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{A}_n) \| \text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_n)). \quad (103)$$

5 Quantum Hoeffding bound for composite correlated hypotheses

In this section, we establish the quantum Hoeffding bound for composite correlated hypotheses. Notably, the result holds under minimal and standard assumptions, which are satisfied by many frameworks of interest, such as those considered in [HY25, Lam25, FFF24].

Assumption 5.1 (Assumptions for sets of quantum states.) *We denote the following assumptions for a sequence of sets of quantum states $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{C}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ where each $\mathcal{C}_n \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$.*

(C1) *Convexity: For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the sets $\mathcal{C}_n$ are convex.*

(C2) *Compactness: For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the sets $\mathcal{C}_n$ are compact.*

(C3) *Stability under tensor product: For any $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that $\mathcal{C}_m \otimes \mathcal{C}_n \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{m+n}$.*

(C4) *Finiteness: $D_{P,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_1 \| \mathcal{B}_1) < \infty$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.⁴*

Theorem 5.1 (Quantum Hoeffding bound for composite correlated hypotheses.) *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be two sequences of sets of quantum states, where each $\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$. Let $0 < r < D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B})$ be a real number.*

- (Lower bound:) *If $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ satisfy assumptions (C1) and (C2):*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \geq \underline{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}). \quad (104)$$

- (Upper bound:) *If $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ satisfy assumptions (C3) and (C4):*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \leq H_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}). \quad (105)$$

Consequently, if $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ satisfy (C1), (C2), (C3) and (C4), then the following limit exists and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) = H_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}). \quad (106)$$

Remark 5.1 By Remark 4.1, we can remove the convexity on $\mathcal{A}_n$ and $\mathcal{B}_n$ in Theorem 5.1 and get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) = H_r^\infty(\text{conv}(\mathcal{A}) \| \text{conv}(\mathcal{B})), \quad (107)$$

where $\text{conv}(\mathcal{C}) := \{\text{conv}(\mathcal{C}_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ represents the sequences of the convex hulls. This result strengthens [MSW22, Eq. (II.65)] by establishing the tightness of the regularized Hoeffding bound. Another related analysis of the Hoeffding bound for composite correlated hypotheses was undertaken in [HI25, Theorem 2] for the specific case where $\mathcal{A}_n$ is a singleton and $\mathcal{B}_n$ is the set of separable states. However, the lower bound provided therein is not tight in general.

5.1 Proof of the lower bound

Recall that for any $V, W \in \mathcal{H}_+$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, it holds that [ACMT⁺07],

$$\text{Tr}[V^\alpha W^{1-\alpha}] \geq \text{Tr } W \{W \leq V\} + \text{Tr } V \{W > V\}. \quad (108)$$

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

$$\text{Tr } 2^{nR} \sigma_n \{2^{nR} \sigma_n \leq \rho_n\} + \text{Tr } \rho_n \{2^{nR} \sigma_n > \rho_n\} \leq 2^{n(1-\alpha)R} Q_\alpha(\rho_n \| \sigma_n). \quad (109)$$

⁴This is a mild technical assumption, requiring that there exist $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_1$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{B}_1$ which are not orthogonal.

This implies that

$$\text{Tr } \rho_n \{2^{nR} \sigma_n > \rho_n\} \leq 2^{n(1-\alpha)R} Q_\alpha(\rho_n \| \sigma_n), \quad (110)$$

$$\text{Tr } \sigma_n \{2^{nR} \sigma_n \leq \rho_n\} \leq 2^{-n\alpha R} Q_\alpha(\rho_n \| \sigma_n). \quad (111)$$

Now, letting the constant

$$R = \frac{nr + \log Q_\alpha(\rho_n \| \sigma_n)}{n\alpha}. \quad (112)$$

we get

$$\text{Tr } \rho_n \{2^{nR} \sigma_n > \rho_n\} \leq 2^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} n (r - \frac{1}{n} D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_n \| \sigma_n))}, \quad (113)$$

$$\text{Tr } \sigma_n \{2^{nR} \sigma_n \leq \rho_n\} \leq 2^{-nr}. \quad (114)$$

Let $M_n = \{2^{nR} \sigma_n \leq \rho_n\}$, which is a valid quantum measurement operator. Then Eq. (114) implies that it is a feasible solution to the optimization problem in Eq. (5). Therefore, we have

$$\alpha_{n,r}(\rho_n \| \sigma_n) \leq 2^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} n (r - \frac{1}{n} D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_n \| \sigma_n))}. \quad (115)$$

This gives

$$-\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\rho_n, \sigma_n) \geq \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \left(r - \frac{1}{n} D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_n \| \sigma_n) \right). \quad (116)$$

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

$$-\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n) \geq \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \left(r - \frac{1}{n} D_{P,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \right), \quad (117)$$

where we use Lemma 4.1 and the assumption (C1). Taking supremum over $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$-\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n) \geq \frac{1}{n} \mathfrak{H}_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) = \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n), \quad (118)$$

where the equality follows from Lemma 3.2 and the assumptions (C1) and (C2).

Taking limit of n , we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) = \underline{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}). \quad (119)$$

5.2 Proof of the upper bound

We can easily prove the upper bound for limit inferior as follows. For any fixed $m \in \mathbb{N}$ any $\rho_m \in \mathcal{A}_m, \sigma_m \in \mathcal{B}_m$, then

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{mn} \log \alpha_{mn,r}(\mathcal{A}_{mn}, \mathcal{B}_{mn}) \quad (120)$$

$$\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{mn} \log \sup_{\substack{\rho_{mn} \in \mathcal{A}_{mn} \\ \sigma_{mn} \in \mathcal{B}_{mn}}} \alpha_{mn,r}(\rho_{mn}, \sigma_{mn}) \quad (121)$$

$$\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{mn} \log \alpha_{mn,r}(\rho_m^{\otimes n}, \sigma_m^{\otimes n}) \quad (122)$$

$$= \frac{1}{m} H_{m,r}(\rho_m \| \sigma_m), \quad (123)$$

where the first inequality follows as the lower limit of a subsequence is no smaller than the lower limit of the sequence, the second inequality holds trivially as $\alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \geq \alpha_{n,r}(\rho_n \| \sigma_n)$ for

any $\rho_n \in \mathcal{A}_n, \sigma_n \in \mathcal{B}_n$ by definition, the third inequality follows by taking a particular feasible solution and the assumption (C3), the equality follows from the quantum Hoeffding bound between two quantum states (see Eq. (6)). As this holds for any $\rho_m \in \mathcal{A}_m, \sigma_m \in \mathcal{B}_m$, we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \leq \frac{1}{m} H_{m,r}(\mathcal{A}_m \| \mathcal{B}_m). \quad (124)$$

Taking limit of m , we get

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} H_{m,r}(\mathcal{A}_m \| \mathcal{B}_m) = H_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}), \quad (125)$$

where the equality follows from the stability assumption (C3) and Eq. (42).

The above argument only gives the upper bound for limit inferior by choosing a suitable subsequence of i.i.d. states. However, we show that the upper bound can be strengthened further to limit superior by carefully designing a sequence of states whose limit superior is also upper bounded by the regularized Hoeffding divergence. However, as this sequence is not i.i.d. states anymore, its analysis is more challenging and requires the Nussbaum-Szkoła distributions [NS09] and the Gärtner-Ellis theorem [DZ10].

Let the spectral decompositions of ρ and σ be given by

$$\rho = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i |u_i\rangle\langle u_i| \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma = \sum_{j=1}^d \mu_j |v_j\rangle\langle v_j|, \quad (126)$$

where $|u_i\rangle$ and $|v_j\rangle$ are two orthonormal bases and λ_i and μ_j are the corresponding eigenvalues, respectively. Then the Nussbaum-Szkoła distributions of ρ, σ are defined by

$$(P_{\rho,\sigma})(i, j) = \lambda_i |\langle u_i | v_j \rangle|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad (Q_{\rho,\sigma})(i, j) = \mu_j |\langle u_i | v_j \rangle|^2, \quad (127)$$

where $i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$.

In the remaining discussion of this section, let $\log$ be a logarithm with natural base e for simplicity. Given a sequence of random variables $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, the asymptotic cumulant generating function is defined as

$$\Lambda_X(t) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E} [\exp(ntX_n)], \quad (128)$$

provided that the limit exists. For our purpose, it is sufficient to use the following variant of the Gärtner-Ellis theorem due to [Che00, Theorem 3.6] (see also [HT16, Proposition 17]).

Lemma 5.1 *Assume that the asymptotic cumulant generating function $t \mapsto \Lambda_X(t)$ exists and is differentiable in some interval (a, b) . Then, for any $x \in (\lim_{t \rightarrow a^+} \Lambda'_X(t), \lim_{t \rightarrow b^-} \Lambda'_X(t))$,*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \Pr\{X_n \geq x\} \leq \sup_{t \in (a, b)} \{tx - \Lambda_X(t)\}. \quad (129)$$

Lemma 5.2 *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be any integer. Let $\rho_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1, \sigma_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1$ and $\rho_m \in \mathcal{A}_m, \sigma_m \in \mathcal{B}_m$ be quantum states such that $D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_1 \| \sigma_1) < \infty$ and $D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_m \| \sigma_m) < \infty$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. We set $k := \lfloor n/m \rfloor$ and construct quantum states*

$$\rho^{(n)} := \rho_1^{\otimes n-km} \otimes \rho_m^{\otimes k} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^{(n)} := \sigma_1^{\otimes n-km} \otimes \sigma_m^{\otimes k}. \quad (130)$$

Let $\phi(s) := \frac{1}{m} \log \rho_m^{1-s} \sigma_m^s$. If $R \in (-\frac{1}{m} D(\sigma_m \| \rho_m), \frac{1}{m} D(\rho_m \| \sigma_m))$, then for any $0 \leq T_n \leq I$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \left[\text{Tr} e^{-nR} \rho^{(n)} (I - T_n) + \text{Tr} \sigma^{(n)} T_n \right] \leq \max_{s \in (0,1)} (1-s)R - \phi(s). \quad (131)$$

Proof. Let $P^{(n)}$ and $Q^{(n)}$ be the Nussbaum-Szkoła distributions of $\rho^{(n)}$ and $\sigma^{(n)}$. Let

$$S_n = \left\{ e^{-nR} P^{(n)} > Q^{(n)} \right\}, \quad (132)$$

be a likelihood ratio test. Consider the random variable

$$X_n(x) := \frac{1}{n} \left(\log Q^{(n)}(x) - \log P^{(n)}(x) \right), \quad (133)$$

where x is drawn from the distribution $P^{(n)}$. Then we have the asymptotic cumulant generating function of the random variable X_n as,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_x P^{(n)}(x) \exp(snX_n(x)) \\ = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \text{Tr} (Q^{(n)})^s (P^{(n)})^{1-s} \end{aligned} \quad (134)$$

$$= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \text{Tr} (\sigma^{(n)})^s (\rho^{(n)})^{1-s} \quad (135)$$

$$= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \left((n - km) \log \text{Tr} \rho_1^{1-s} \sigma_1^s + k \log \text{Tr} \rho_m^{1-s} \sigma_m^s \right) \quad (136)$$

$$= \phi(s), \quad (137)$$

where the second equality is a simple fact of the Nussbaum-Szkoła distributions (c.f. [ANSV08, Proposition 1]). Note that $\phi(s)$ is differentiable and $\phi'(0) = -\frac{1}{m} D(\rho_m \| \sigma_m)$ and $\phi'(1) = \frac{1}{m} D(\sigma_m \| \rho_m)$ (see Appendix B). Applying the Gärtner-Ellis theorem in Lemma 5.1 for the random variable X_n , interval $(0, 1)$ and $x = -R$, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \Pr\{X_n \geq -R\} \leq \sup_{s \in (0,1)} -sR - \phi(s). \quad (138)$$

Similarly, consider the random variable

$$Y_n(x) := \frac{1}{n} \left(\log P^{(n)}(x) - \log Q^{(n)}(x) \right), \quad (139)$$

where x is drawn from the distribution $Q^{(n)}$. Then we have the asymptotic cumulant generating function of the random variable Y_n as,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_x Q^{(n)}(x) \exp(tnY_n(x)) \\ = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \text{Tr} (Q^{(n)})^{1-t} (P^{(n)})^t \end{aligned} \quad (140)$$

$$= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \text{Tr} (\sigma^{(n)})^{1-t} (\rho^{(n)})^t \quad (141)$$

$$= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \left((n - km) \log \text{Tr} \rho_1^t \sigma_1^{1-t} + k \log \text{Tr} \rho_m^t \sigma_m^{1-t} \right) \quad (142)$$

$$= \phi(1 - t). \quad (143)$$

Applying again the Gärtner-Ellis theorem in Lemma 5.1 for the random variable Y_n , interval $(0, 1)$ and $x = R$, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \Pr\{Y_n \geq R\} \leq \sup_{t \in (0,1)} tR - \phi(1 - t). \quad (144)$$

By direct calculation, we have the relations

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \Pr\{X_n \geq -R\} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \text{Tr } P^{(n)}(I - S_n), \quad (145)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \Pr\{Y_n \geq R\} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \text{Tr } Q^{(n)} S_n. \quad (146)$$

Moreover, the Nussbaum-Szkoła theorem (c.f. [Hay17, Lemma 3.4]) implies that for any test T_n ,

$$\text{Tr } e^{-nR} \rho^{(n)}(I - T_n) + \text{Tr } \sigma^{(n)} T_n \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{Tr } e^{-nR} P^{(n)}(I - S_n) + \text{Tr } Q^{(n)} S_n \right). \quad (147)$$

Combining Eqs. (138), (144), (145), (146) and (147), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \left[\text{Tr } e^{-nR} \rho^{(n)}(I - T_n) + \text{Tr } \sigma^{(n)} T_n \right] \\ \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{2} \left[\text{Tr } e^{-nR} P^{(n)}(I - S_n) + \text{Tr } Q^{(n)} S_n \right] \end{aligned} \quad (148)$$

$$\leq \min \left\{ R + \sup_{s \in (0,1)} -sR - \phi(s), \sup_{t \in (0,1)} tR - \phi(1-t) \right\} \quad (149)$$

$$= \sup_{s \in (0,1)} (1-s)R - \phi(s), \quad (150)$$

where the last equality follows by replacing t with $1-s$. Finally, as the objective function in Eq. (150) is concave and its first derivative is given by $-R - \phi'(s)$, there is a unique critical point that achieves the maximum if $R \in (-\phi'(1), -\phi'(0))$. Therefore, the supremum is attained. $\square$

With the above Lemma 5.2, we are ready to show the upper bound for limit superior. That is, we aim to show that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \leq H_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}). \quad (151)$$

For this, we plan to show for any fixed $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \leq \frac{1}{m} H_{m,r}(\mathcal{A}_m \| \mathcal{B}_m). \quad (152)$$

If $H_{m,r}(\mathcal{A}_m \| \mathcal{B}_m) = \infty$, the upper bound holds trivially. It remains to show Eq. (152) when $H_{m,r}(\mathcal{A}_m \| \mathcal{B}_m) < \infty$. So for any $\delta > 0$, there exist $\rho_m \in \mathcal{A}_m$ and $\sigma_m \in \mathcal{B}_m$ such that

$$H_{m,r}(\rho_m \| \sigma_m) \leq H_{m,r}(\mathcal{A}_m \| \mathcal{B}_m) + \delta < \infty. \quad (153)$$

This implies that $D_{\mathbb{P},\alpha}(\rho_m \| \sigma_m) < \infty$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Otherwise, we will have a contradiction to the finiteness of $H_{m,r}(\rho_m \| \sigma_m)$ by definition in Eq. (27). Using this choice of ρ_m and σ_m , we construct the sequence of states $\rho^{(n)}$ and $\sigma^{(n)}$ as in Lemma 5.2.

Combining Lemma 5.2 and Lemma A.4, we have for any test with $\text{Tr } \sigma^{(n)} T_n \leq e^{-nr}$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \left[\text{Tr } e^{-nR} \rho^{(n)}(I - T_n) + \text{Tr } \sigma^{(n)} T_n \right] \\ \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \left[\text{Tr } e^{-nR} \rho^{(n)}(I - T_n) + e^{-nr} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (154)$$

$$= \min \left\{ r, R + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \text{Tr } \rho^{(n)}(I - T_n) \right\}, \quad (155)$$

where the equality follows from Lemma A.4. Therefore, by Lemma 5.2, we have

$$\min \left\{ r, R + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \text{Tr } \rho^{(n)}(I - T_n) \right\} \leq \max_{s \in (0,1)} (1-s)R - \phi(s). \quad (156)$$

Let $r' < r$. From Lemma B.2, we know that the optimization

$$\max_{s \in (0,1)} \frac{-\phi(s) - sr'}{1-s} \quad (157)$$

has a unique maximizer $s_{r'} \in (0, 1)$ such that $r' = (s_{r'} - 1)\phi'(s_{r'}) - \phi(s_{r'})$. We set

$$R_{r'} := \frac{\phi(s_{r'}) + r'}{1 - s_{r'}} = -\phi'(s_{r'}). \quad (158)$$

It is clear that $R_{r'} \in (-\phi'(1), -\phi'(0)) = (-\frac{1}{m}D(\sigma_m \parallel \rho_m), \frac{1}{m}D(\rho_m \parallel \sigma_m))$. By the proof of Lemma 5.2, $\max_{s \in (0,1)} (1-s)R - \phi(s)$ is uniquely achieved at point s such that $R = -\phi'(s)$. For $R = R_{r'}$, Eq. (158) implies that the maximum is uniquely achieved at $s = s_{r'}$. That is,

$$\max_{s \in (0,1)} (1-s)R_{r'} - \phi(s) = (1-s_{r'})R_{r'} - \phi(s_{r'}) = r'. \quad (159)$$

Then, by Eq. (156) we have

$$\min \left\{ r, R_{r'} + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \text{Tr} \rho^{(n)}(I - T_n) \right\} \leq r'. \quad (160)$$

Then, we have

$$R_{r'} + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \text{Tr} \rho^{(n)}(I - T_n) \leq r. \quad (161)$$

Otherwise, it will contradict to the assumption that $r' < r$. Thus, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \text{Tr} \rho^{(n)}(I - T_n) \leq r - R_{r'}. \quad (162)$$

Since s_r is continuous function in r (see Lemma B.3) and $\phi(s)$ is a continuous function in s (see Lemma B.1), $R_{r'}$ is a continuous function in r' . Therefore,

$$\lim_{r' \rightarrow r^-} R_{r'} = R_r := \frac{\phi(s_r) + r}{1 - s_r}. \quad (163)$$

This gives

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \text{Tr} \rho^{(n)}(I - T_n) \leq r - R_r. \quad (164)$$

By direct calculation, the right-hand side gives

$$r - R_r = \frac{-\phi(s_r) - s_r r}{1 - s_r} = \max_{s \in (0,1)} \frac{-\phi(s) - sr}{1-s} = \frac{1}{m} H_{m,r}(\rho_m \parallel \sigma_m), \quad (165)$$

where the second equality follows from the optimality of s_r . By the choice of ρ_m, σ_m in Eq. (153), we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \text{Tr} \rho^{(n)}(I - T_n) \leq \frac{1}{m} H_{m,r}(\mathcal{A}_m \parallel \mathcal{B}_m) + \frac{\delta}{m}. \quad (166)$$

This implies that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\rho^{(n)} \parallel \sigma^{(n)}) \leq \frac{1}{m} H_{m,r}(\mathcal{A}_m \parallel \mathcal{B}_m) + \frac{\delta}{m}. \quad (167)$$

As we have the trivial relation that $\alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n\|\mathcal{B}_n) \geq \alpha_{n,r}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)$ for any $\rho_n \in \mathcal{A}_n, \sigma_n \in \mathcal{B}_n$ by definition, this implies that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n\|\mathcal{B}_n) \leq \frac{1}{m} H_{m,r}(\mathcal{A}_m\|\mathcal{B}_m) + \frac{\delta}{m}. \quad (168)$$

As this holds for any $\delta > 0$, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n\|\mathcal{B}_n) \leq \frac{1}{m} H_{m,r}(\mathcal{A}_m\|\mathcal{B}_m). \quad (169)$$

Finally, taking the limit $m \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n\|\mathcal{B}_n) \leq H_r^\infty(\mathcal{A}\|\mathcal{B}), \quad (170)$$

where the existence of the limit on the right hand side follows from the stability assumption (C3) and Eq. (42). This finishes the proof of the upper bound.

6 Strong converse exponent for composite correlated hypotheses

In this section, we extend the strong converse exponent from the i.i.d. setting to the broader context of composite correlated hypotheses and shows that the strong converse exponent is lower bounded by a regularized quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence between the sets in general. We also provide a matching upper bound when the null hypothesis is a singleton i.i.d. state.

For the upper bound, we need to introduce the permutation invariance. Let U_{A^n} denote the natural unitary representation of the permutation group S_n that permutes the subsystems of $A^n := A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n$. A linear operator $X_{A^n} \in \mathcal{L}(A^n)$ is called permutation invariant if it satisfies $X_{A^n} = U_{A^n}(\pi) X_{A^n} U_{A^n}(\pi)^\dagger$ for all $\pi \in S_n$. A set of quantum state $\mathcal{A}_n$ is called permutation invariant if $\rho_n \in \mathcal{A}_n$ implies that $U_{A^n}(\pi) \rho_n U_{A^n}(\pi)^\dagger \in \mathcal{A}_n$ for all $\pi \in S_n$. Let A be a system with $|A| = d$. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a permutation invariant state $\omega_{A^n}^n \in \mathcal{D}(A^n)$, which we call *universal state*, such that for all permutation invariant states $\rho_{A^n} \in \mathcal{D}(A^n)$, we have

$$\rho_{A^n} \leq g_{n,d} \omega_{A^n}^n, \quad \text{with} \quad g_{n,d} \leq (n+1)^{d^2-1}. \quad (171)$$

Note that such a universal state exists and has been explicitly constructed in [HT16].

Assumption 6.1 (Assumptions for sets of quantum states.) *We denote the following assumptions for a sequence of sets of quantum states $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{C}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ where each $\mathcal{C}_n \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$.*

(C5) *Permutation invariance: For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the sets $\mathcal{C}_n$ are permutation invariant.*

(C6) *Universal state containment: For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the sets $\mathcal{C}_n$ contains a universal state.*

Theorem 6.1 (Strong converse exponent for composite correlated hypotheses.) *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be two sequences of sets of quantum states, where each $\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$. Let $r > D^\infty(\mathcal{A}\|\mathcal{B})$ be a real number.*

- (Lower bound:) *Then, regardless of the structure of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, we have*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n\|\mathcal{B}_n)) \geq \underline{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A}\|\mathcal{B}). \quad (172)$$

- (Upper bound:) *If $\mathcal{A}_n = \{\rho^{\otimes n}\}$ is a singleton i.i.d. state and $\mathcal{B}$ satisfies assumptions (C1),*

(C5) and (C6), and moreover, $D_{S,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})$ exists and is differentiable for $\alpha \geq 1$, then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n)) \leq \mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}). \quad (173)$$

Consequently, with the same assumptions for the upper bound and additionally assuming that $\mathcal{B}$ satisfies assumption (C3), then the limit exists and is given by

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n)) = H_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}). \quad (174)$$

Remark 6.1 This recovers the result of [HT16] by taking $\mathcal{A}_n = \{\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}\}$ and $\mathcal{B}_n = \{\rho_A^{\otimes n} \otimes \sigma_{B^n} : \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(B^n)\}$, which satisfy all the required assumptions. It also applies to other interesting cases, such as the resource theory of coherence and entanglement, as discuss in Section 7.4. Moreover, by Remark 4.1, the convexity of $\mathcal{A}_n$ and $\mathcal{B}_n$ can be removed by replacing the right hand side with $H_r^{*,\infty}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{A}) \parallel \text{conv}(\mathcal{B}))$, where $\text{conv}(\mathcal{C}) := \{\text{conv}(\mathcal{C}_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ denotes the convex hulls.

6.1 Proof of the lower bound

For any $\delta > 0$, let $\rho_n \in \mathcal{A}_n, \sigma_n \in \mathcal{B}_n$ such that

$$D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_n \parallel \sigma_n) \leq D_{S,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) + \delta. \quad (175)$$

By standard arguments, e.g. [CMW16, Lemma 5], we have for any $0 \leq M_n \leq I$, that

$$\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \text{Tr}[(I - M_n)\rho_n]) \leq \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{n} D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_n \parallel \sigma_n) + \frac{1}{n} \log \text{Tr}[M_n \sigma_n] \right). \quad (176)$$

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

$$\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha(\mathcal{A}_n, M_n)) \leq \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{n} D_{S,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) + \delta + \frac{1}{n} \log \beta(\mathcal{B}_n, M_n) \right). \quad (177)$$

As this holds for any $\delta > 0$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha(\mathcal{A}_n, M_n)) \leq \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{n} D_{S,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) + \frac{1}{n} \log \beta(\mathcal{B}_n, M_n) \right). \quad (178)$$

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

$$\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha(\mathcal{A}_n, M_n)) \leq \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{n} D_{S,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) - r \right). \quad (179)$$

Taking the supremum over all such M_n , we find

$$-\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n)) \geq \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \left(r - \frac{1}{n} D_{S,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) \right). \quad (180)$$

Since this holds for any $\alpha > 1$, we have

$$-\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n)) \geq H_{n,r}^*(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n), \quad (181)$$

where we use the finite equivalence in Lemma 3.5. Taking limit inferior of n on both sides,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n)) \geq \underline{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}). \quad (182)$$

6.2 Proof of the upper bound

Before the proof of the upper bound, we require the following lemma that simplifies the optimization over $\mathcal{B}_n$ via the universal state. Let $X = \sum_{\lambda \in \text{spec}(X)} \lambda E_\lambda$ be the spectral decomposition of the Hermitian operator X , where E_λ are projectors and $\text{spec}(X)$ is its discrete spectrum. Then the pinching map for this spectral decomposition is defined as $\mathcal{P}_X(\cdot) := \sum_i E_i(\cdot) E_i$.

Lemma 6.1 *Let $\mathcal{A}_n = \{\rho_n\}$ be a permutation invariant state and $\mathcal{B}_n$ be a convex and permutation invariant set, which contains a universal state ω_n as defined in Eq. (171). Then for any $\alpha \geq 1/2$,*

$$\frac{1}{n} D_{S,\alpha}(\mathcal{P}_{\omega_n}(\rho_n) \parallel \omega_n) = \frac{1}{n} D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) + O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right). \quad (183)$$

In particular,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} D_{S,\alpha}(\mathcal{P}_{\omega_n}(\rho_n) \parallel \omega_n) = D_{S,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}). \quad (184)$$

Proof. By the permutation invariance and the convexity of the sandwiched Rényi divergence, we know that $D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n)$ can be achieved at some permutation invariant state $\sigma_n \in \mathcal{B}_n$. Note also that $\sigma_n \leq g_{n,d} \omega_n$ for any permutation invariant state σ_n . Therefore, we have

$$D_{S,\alpha}(\mathcal{P}_{\omega_n}(\rho_n) \parallel \omega_n) \leq D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_n \parallel \omega_n) \leq D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_n \parallel \sigma_n) + \log g_{n,d}, \quad (185)$$

where the first inequality uses the data processing inequality and the second inequality uses the monotonicity of the sandwiched Rényi divergence under scaling of the second argument. As this holds for any permutation invariant state $\sigma_n \in \mathcal{B}_n$, we have

$$D_{S,\alpha}(\mathcal{P}_{\omega_n}(\rho_n) \parallel \omega_n) \leq D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) + \log g_{n,d}. \quad (186)$$

On the other hand, we have [HT16, Lemma 3],

$$D_{S,\alpha}(\mathcal{P}_{\omega_n}(\rho_n) \parallel \omega_n) \geq D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_n \parallel \omega_n) - 2 \log |\text{spec}(\omega_n)|, \quad (187)$$

where $|\text{spec}(\cdot)|$ denotes the number of distinct eigenvalues. Since $\omega_n \in \mathcal{B}_n$, we have

$$D_{S,\alpha}(\mathcal{P}_{\omega_n}(\rho_n) \parallel \omega_n) \geq D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) - 2 \log |\text{spec}(\omega_n)|. \quad (188)$$

As ω_n is permutation invariant, we have $|\text{spec}(\omega_n)| \leq (n+1)^d$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Remark 6.2 *In the above case, $D_{S,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})$ is a pointwise limit of $\frac{1}{n} D_{S,\alpha}(\mathcal{P}_{\omega_n}(\rho_n) \parallel \omega_n)$ and the convergence is uniform in α . Therefore, $D_{S,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})$ is continuous and monotonically increasing in α . Similarly, the function $t D_{S,1+t}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})$ is continuous and convex in t .*

Now, we are ready to prove the upper bound. The proof follows the similar idea as in [HT16]. Let $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_n}(\rho_n)$ be the pinching of ρ_n with respect to ω_n . Then $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_n}(\rho_n)$ and ω_n commute. Let $|v_{x_n}\rangle$ be a common orthonormal eigenbasis and we define the classical probability distributions

$$P_n(x) := \langle v_{x_n} | \mathcal{P}_{\omega_n}(\rho_n) | v_{x_n} \rangle, \quad Q_n(x) := \langle v_{x_n} | \omega_n | v_{x_n} \rangle. \quad (189)$$

Let X_n be a random variable distributed according to P_n and X'_n be a random variable distributed according to Q_n . Define

$$S_n := \{\mathcal{P}_{\omega_n}(\rho_n) \geq \exp(\lambda_n) \omega_n\}. \quad (190)$$

Then we have the relation that

$$\alpha(\rho_n, S_n) = \text{Tr}[\rho_n(I - S_n)] \quad (191)$$

$$= \text{Tr}[\mathcal{P}_{\omega_n}(\rho_n)(I - S_n)] \quad (192)$$

$$= \Pr[P_n(X_n) < \exp(\lambda_n)Q_n(X_n)], \quad (193)$$

where the second equality follows as $\text{Tr } \mathcal{P}_X(Y)X = \text{Tr } YX$ for all Y . Similarly, we have

$$\beta(\mathcal{B}_n, S_n) = \sup_{\sigma_n \in \mathcal{B}_n} \text{Tr}[\sigma_n S_n] \quad (194)$$

$$= \text{Tr}[\sigma'_n S_n] \quad (195)$$

$$\leq \text{Tr}[g_{n,d} \omega_n S_n] \quad (196)$$

$$\leq g_{n,d} \Pr[P_n(X'_n) \geq \exp(\lambda_n)Q_n(X'_n)]. \quad (197)$$

Here we use the fact that S_n is permutation invariant and therefore the optimal solution is achieved at some permutation invariant state σ'_n , which is then upper bounded by $g_{n,d} \omega_n$. For arbitrary fixed $s \in (1, \infty)$, we choose λ_n such that

$$\lambda_n := \frac{1}{s} \left[\phi(1 - s|P_n||Q_n) + \log g_{n,d} + nr \right]. \quad (198)$$

Consider a random variable

$$Z_n := \frac{1}{n} (\log P_n(X_n) - \log Q_n(X_n) - \lambda_n). \quad (199)$$

Recall that for any $V, W \in \mathcal{H}_+$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, it holds that [ACMT⁺07],

$$\text{Tr}[V^\alpha W^{1-\alpha}] \geq \text{Tr } W\{W \leq V\} + \text{Tr } V\{W > V\}. \quad (200)$$

Let $V = \rho_n$ and $W = \exp(\lambda_n)\omega_n$. Then we have

$$\beta(\mathcal{B}_n, S_n) \leq g_{n,d} \text{Tr}[S_n \omega_n] \leq g_{n,d} \exp(-s\lambda_n) \text{Tr}[P_n^s Q_n^{1-s}]. \quad (201)$$

Hence, by the choice of λ_n , we have $\beta(\mathcal{B}_n, S_n) \leq \exp(-nr)$. Moreover,

$$1 - \alpha(\rho_n, S_n) = \Pr[P_n(X_n) \geq \exp(\lambda_n)Q_n(X_n)] = \Pr[Z_n \geq 0]. \quad (202)$$

So the optimal Type-I error satisfies

$$1 - \alpha_{n,r}(\rho_n || \mathcal{B}_n) \geq 1 - \alpha(\rho_n, S_n) = \Pr[Z_n \geq 0]. \quad (203)$$

This implies that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha_{n,r}(\rho_n || \mathcal{B}_n)) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \Pr[Z_n \geq 0]. \quad (204)$$

In the following, we will use the Gärtner-Ellis theorem to upper bound the right-hand side. For this, we need to compute the asymptotic cumulant generating function of Z_n . For $t \geq -\frac{1}{2}$,

$$\Lambda_Z(t) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}[e^{ntZ_n}] \quad (205)$$

$$= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left[\sum_x P_n(x) \exp(t(\log P_n(x) - \log Q_n(x) - \lambda_n)) \right] \quad (206)$$

$$= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \left[\log \sum_x P_n(x)^{1+t} Q_n(x)^{-t} - \frac{t}{s} [\phi(1 - s|P_n||Q_n) + \log g_{n,d} + nr] \right] \quad (207)$$

$$= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \left[\log \text{Tr } P_n^{1+t} Q_n^{-t} - \frac{t}{s} [\phi(1 - s|P_n||Q_n) + \log g_{n,d} + nr] \right] \quad (208)$$

$$= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \left[\phi(-t|P_n||Q_n) - \frac{t}{s} [\phi(1 - s|P_n||Q_n) + \log g_{n,d} + nr] \right]. \quad (209)$$

Denote $g(\alpha) := D_{s,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})$ for $\alpha > 1$ and $g(1) = D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})$. We have the relation that

$$\phi(s|P_n \parallel Q_n) = \log \text{Tr}[P_n^{1-s} Q_n^s] = -s D_{1-s}(P_n \parallel Q_n). \quad (210)$$

This means that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \phi(-t|P_n \parallel Q_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} t D_{1+t}(P_n \parallel Q_n) \quad (211)$$

$$= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} t D_{s,1+t}(\mathcal{P}_{\omega_n}(\rho_n) \parallel \omega_n) = t g(1+t), \quad (212)$$

where the second equality follows as $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_n}(\rho_n)$ and ω_n commute and the last equality follows from Lemma 6.1. Similarly, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \phi(1-s|P_n \parallel Q_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} (s-1) D_s(P_n \parallel Q_n) \quad (213)$$

$$= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} (s-1) D_{s,s}(\mathcal{P}_{\omega_n}(\rho_n) \parallel \omega_n) = (s-1) g(s). \quad (214)$$

Define the function

$$f(s, t) := t(r - s g(1+t) + (s-1) g(s)). \quad (215)$$

Then we have

$$\Lambda_Z(t) = -\frac{f(s, t)}{s}. \quad (216)$$

As we assume that $g(\alpha)$ is differentiable in α for $\alpha \geq 1$. Then $f(s, t)$ is differentiable in both s and t . Moreover, we have

$$\Lambda'_Z(t) = -\frac{1}{s} (r - s g(1+t) + (s-1) g(s) - t s g'(1+t)). \quad (217)$$

Since $g(\alpha)$ is monotonically increasing and differentiable for $\alpha \geq 1$, we have for any $s > 1$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \Lambda'_Z(t) = -\frac{1}{s} (r - s g(1) + (s-1) g(s)) \quad (218)$$

$$= g(1) - \frac{s-1}{s} g(s) - \frac{r}{s} \quad (219)$$

$$\leq g(1) - \frac{s-1}{s} g(1) - \frac{r}{s} \quad (220)$$

$$= \frac{1}{s} (g(1) - r) \quad (221)$$

$$< 0, \quad (222)$$

where we use the assumption that $r > g(1) = D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})$ in the last inequality. On the other hand, using the convexity of $t \mapsto \psi(t) := t g(1+t)$ and $\psi(0) = 0$ (see Remark 6.2), we have $\psi(\lambda t) \leq \lambda \psi(t)$ for all $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. This implies that

$$\psi'(t) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{\psi(t) - \psi(\lambda t)}{t(1-\lambda)} \geq \frac{\psi(t)}{t}. \quad (223)$$

and therefore we have $t g'(1+t) \geq 0$. Let t_0 be such that $r < g(t_0 + 1)$. Then for any $s \leq t_0 + 1$, we find that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow t_0^-} \Lambda'_Z(t) \geq g(t_0 + 1) - \frac{s-1}{s} g(s) - \frac{r}{s} \quad (224)$$

$$\geq g(t_0 + 1) - \frac{s-1}{s} g(t_0 + 1) - \frac{r}{s} \quad (225)$$

$$= \frac{1}{s} (g(t_0 + 1) - r) > 0, \quad (226)$$

where we have used that $r < g(t_0 + 1)$. Hence, applying the Gärtner-Ellis theorem in Lemma 5.1 for the random variable Z_n on the interval $(0, t_0)$ and with the threshold value 0, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \Pr[Z_n \geq 0] \leq \sup_{t \in (0, t_0)} \{-\Lambda_Z(t)\} \leq \sup_{t \in [0, t_0]} \frac{f(s, t)}{s}. \quad (227)$$

As this holds for any $s \in (1, t_0 + 1]$, we have from Eq. (204) that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha_{n,r}(\rho_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)) \leq \inf_{s \in (1, t_0 + 1]} \sup_{t \in [0, t_0]} \frac{f(s, t)}{s}. \quad (228)$$

By the convexity of $tg(1+t)$ (Remark 6.2), we know that $f(s, t)$ is concave in t and convex in s . We optimize t over a compact convex set and s over a convex set. Therefore, by the minimax theorem in [HT16, Proposition 21], we can exchange the order of inf and sup. This gives

$$\inf_{s \in (1, t_0 + 1]} \sup_{t \in [0, t_0]} \frac{f(s, t)}{s} = \sup_{t \in [0, t_0]} \inf_{s \in (1, t_0 + 1]} \frac{f(s, t)}{s} \quad (229)$$

$$= \sup_{t \in (0, t_0]} \inf_{s \in (1, t_0 + 1]} \frac{f(s, t)}{s} \quad (230)$$

$$\leq \sup_{t \in (0, t_0]} \frac{f(t+1, t)}{t+1} \quad (231)$$

$$\leq \sup_{t > 0} \frac{f(t+1, t)}{t+1}, \quad (232)$$

where the second line follows as $f(s, 0) = 0$ and the penultimate line follows by choosing $s = 1 + t$. This gives

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha_{n,r}(\rho_n \| \mathcal{B}_n)) \leq \sup_{t > 0} \frac{f(t+1, t)}{t+1} = \mathfrak{H}_r^{*, \infty}(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}). \quad (233)$$

7 Applications

Since the error exponent and strong converse exponent regimes provide a finer characterization of the trade-off between Type-I and Type-II errors than the Stein regime, we apply our results to refine and extend several existing studies. Specifically, we: (i) strengthen the generalized quantum Stein's lemma in [FFF24] for hypothesis testing between sets of states; (ii) provide counterexamples to the continuity of the regularized Petz Rényi divergence and Hoeffding divergence; (iii) derive error exponents for adversarial quantum channel discrimination; and (iv) obtain error exponents for resource detection problems in coherence theory and entanglement theory.

7.1 Refining quantum Stein's lemma between two sets of quantum states

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

Theorem 7.1 (Generalized quantum Stein's lemma.) *Let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be two sequences of sets of quantum states satisfying [FFF24, Assumption 24] and $\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ and $D_{\max}(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \leq cn$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$. For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \beta_\varepsilon(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) = D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}). \quad (234)$$

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

Theorem 7.2 Let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be two sequences of sets satisfying the same assumptions in Theorem 7.1. For any $0 < r < D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})$, then

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) \geq \mathfrak{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) > 0. \quad (235)$$

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

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n)) \geq \mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) > 0. \quad (236)$$

This result shows that any Type-II error exponent below $D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})$ is achievable, with the corresponding Type-I error decaying exponentially at a rate at least $\mathfrak{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})$. Conversely, if the Type-II error exponent exceeds $D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})$, the Type-I error inevitably converges to one exponentially, with a rate at least $\mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})$. Thus, the regularized quantum relative entropy $D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})$ delineates a sharp threshold for the asymptotic trade-off in hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states. In particular, these results apply to adversarial quantum channel discrimination, which satisfies all the required assumptions [FFF25]. See Section 7.3 for more detailed discussion in this setting.

Proof. By the assumptions on the sequences, we have

$$D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} D_{M,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) \leq \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) \leq D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}), \quad (237)$$

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

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}). \quad (238)$$

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

$$\mathfrak{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (r - D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})) > 0, \quad (239)$$

By Theorem 5.1 and Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) = H_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) \geq \mathfrak{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) > 0 \quad (240)$$

which shows that the Type-I error decays exponentially, and thus r is an achievable rate. This recovers the direct part of the generalized quantum Stein's lemma in Theorem 7.1.

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

$$\mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (r - D_{S,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})) > 0. \quad (241)$$

Applying Theorem 6.1 and Lemma 3.6, we obtain

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n)) \geq H_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = \mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) > 0. \quad (242)$$

This shows that the Type-I error converges to one exponentially, and thus r is not an achievable rate, recovering the converse part of the generalized quantum Stein's lemma in Theorem 7.1. $\square$

It is worth emphasizing that the quantum Hoeffding bound in Theorem 5.1 and the strong converse exponent in Theorem 6.1 (Eq. (172)) hold in great generality and do not require, particularly, the polar assumption as used in [FFF24]. However, to recover the Stein's setting from the error exponent regime, one needs the continuity of the regularized Petz Rényi divergences, i.e., $\sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})$. For this, we require the polar assumption in Eq. (237). Interestingly, a similar situation also arises in the context of best-case channel discrimination, where the continuity of the regularized sandwiched Rényi divergence between channels is sufficient to establish the quantum Stein's lemma for two quantum channels (particularly the strong converse part); see [FGW25, Theorem 21] for further details.

7.2 Counterexamples for the continuity of $D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})$ at $\alpha = 1$

As discussed above, our error exponent results can recover the Stein's exponent provided the continuity of the regularized Petz Rényi divergence holds at $\alpha = 1$, i.e.,

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}). \quad (243)$$

Therefore, for any sequences of sets $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ that satisfy our error exponent assumptions but violate the Stein's lemma, there must be a discontinuity in $D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B})$ at $\alpha = 1$, i.e., a violation of Eq. (243). Such examples can be found in [Hay25].

In this section, we provide a more direct analysis of these counterexamples and introduce additional ones. We show that such discontinuities can occur in both nonconvex and convex settings, as well as in scenarios where a composite hypothesis is tested against a simple hypothesis (see Example 7.1 and Example 7.2), and conversely, where a simple hypothesis is tested against a composite hypothesis (see Example 7.3). Furthermore, the example presented in [LBR24] for the nonadditivity of the Petz Rényi divergence between two sets, makes both sides of Eq. (243) diverge, which is not a valid counterexample for discontinuity.

In the following, we denote $H(p) := -p \log p - (1-p) \log(1-p)$ as the binary entropy function and $D(p \parallel q) := p \log \frac{p}{q} + (1-p) \log \frac{1-p}{1-q}$ as the classical relative entropy between two binary distributions $(p, 1-p)$ and $(q, 1-q)$. Denote the set of types with length n by $\mathcal{P}_n$, which is the set of all empirical distributions. Give $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$, the type class of P , denoted as $\mathcal{T}_n(P)$, is the set of bit strings whose empirical distribution is P . We choose two rational numbers $p_1 = \frac{m_1}{m}$ and $p_2 = \frac{m_2}{m}$ such that $p_1 < p_2 \in (0, p_3)$. Let $P_j = (p_j, 1-p_j)$ be the binary distribution. Consider a two-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ spanned by $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ and define the qubit state

$$\rho(p) := p|0\rangle\langle 0| + (1-p)|1\rangle\langle 1|. \quad (244)$$

We denote the uniform distribution over $\mathcal{T}_{km}(P_j)$ in $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes km}$ by

$$\rho_{j,km} := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{T}_{km}(P_j)|} \sum_{x^{km} \in \mathcal{T}_{km}(P_j)} |x^{km}\rangle\langle x^{km}| \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \quad (245)$$

where $|\mathcal{T}_{km}(P_j)| = \binom{km}{km_j}$ is the size of the type class. Note that $\rho_{1,km}$ and $\rho_{2,km}$ are orthogonal, as their supports are defined by different type classes. We have $\rho(p_j) = \text{Tr}_{km-1} \rho_{j,km}$, where the partial trace can be understood as tracing out any $km-1$ subsystems, as it gives the same marginal state. In the following examples, we regard the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m}$ as a one-copy system.

Example 7.1 (Nonconvex sets, $\mathcal{A}_n$ composite and $\mathcal{B}_n$ simple i.i.d.) *Let $\rho(p)$ and $\rho_{j,km}$ defined as Eqs. (244) and (245), respectively. We define the convex mixture,*

$$\rho_{km} := \lambda \rho_{1,km} + (1-\lambda) \rho_{2,km}, \quad (246)$$

with the choice of $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\min \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{2\pi m_1(m - m_1)}{m}, \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{2\pi m_2(m - m_2)}{m} \right\} \geq H(\lambda). \quad (247)$$

Consider the set of states

$$\mathcal{A}_n := \left\{ \rho_{k_1 m} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_{k_l m} : k_1, \dots, k_l \geq 1, \sum_{i=1}^l k_i = n \right\}, \quad \mathcal{B}_n = \left\{ \rho(p_3)^{\otimes mn} \right\}. \quad (248)$$

Then sequences $\mathcal{A} := \{\mathcal{A}_n\}$ and $\mathcal{B} := \{\mathcal{B}_n\}$ are stable under tensor product. But we have

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) < D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}). \quad (249)$$

Moreover, we have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} H_r^\infty(\mathcal{B} \parallel \mathcal{A}) < D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}), \quad (250)$$

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \mathfrak{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{B} \parallel \mathcal{A}) < D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}), \quad (251)$$

indicating that the Hoeffding bound cannot recover the Stein's exponent in this case.

Proof. Using the standard result in type method [CT06, Theorem 11.1.2], we have

$$D(\rho_{1,km} \parallel \rho(p_3)^{\otimes km}) = -\log \binom{km}{km_1} + km(D(p_1 \parallel p_3) + H(p_1)), \quad (252)$$

$$D(\rho_{2,km} \parallel \rho(p_3)^{\otimes km}) = -\log \binom{km}{km_2} + km(D(p_2 \parallel p_3) + H(p_2)). \quad (253)$$

As $\rho_{1,km}$ and $\rho_{2,km}$ are orthogonal, we have

$$D(\rho_{km} \parallel \rho(p_3)^{\otimes km}) = \lambda D(\rho_{1,km} \parallel \rho(p_3)^{\otimes km}) + (1 - \lambda) D(\rho_{2,km} \parallel \rho(p_3)^{\otimes km}) - H(\lambda). \quad (254)$$

Note that the binomial coefficient $\binom{n}{l}$ is evaluated as [MS81]

$$\binom{n}{l} \leq \sqrt{\frac{n}{2\pi l(n-l)}} 2^{nH(l/n)}, \quad \forall 1 \leq l \leq n-1. \quad (255)$$

Thus, we have

$$-\log \binom{km}{km_1} + kmH(p_1) - H(\lambda) \geq \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{2\pi km_1(m - m_1)}{m} - H(\lambda) \geq 0, \quad (256)$$

$$-\log \binom{km}{km_2} + kmH(p_2) - H(\lambda) \geq \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{2\pi km_2(m - m_2)}{m} - H(\lambda) \geq 0, \quad (257)$$

where the last inequality follows from the choice of λ in Eq. (247). Discarding these two positive terms, we have

$$D(\rho_{km} \parallel \rho(p_3)^{\otimes km}) \geq km((1 - \lambda)D(p_2 \parallel p_3) + \lambda D(p_1 \parallel p_3)). \quad (258)$$

By the additivity of quantum relative entropy, we have

$$D(\rho_{k_1 m} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_{k_l m} \parallel \rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm}) \geq nm((1 - \lambda)D(p_2 \parallel p_3) + \lambda D(p_1 \parallel p_3)). \quad (259)$$

This implies that

$$D(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \geq nm((1 - \lambda)D(p_2 \| p_3) + \lambda D(p_1 \| p_3)), \quad (260)$$

$$D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) \geq m((1 - \lambda)D(p_2 \| p_3) + \lambda D(p_1 \| p_3)). \quad (261)$$

Using $k = n$ in Eq. (254), we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} D(\rho_{nm} \| \rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm}) = m((1 - \lambda)D(p_2 \| p_3) + \lambda D(p_1 \| p_3)), \quad (262)$$

where some terms vanish because of the Stirling's approximation [CT06, Example 11.1.3]

$$\frac{1}{n+1} 2^{nH(k/n)} \leq \binom{n}{k} \leq 2^{nH(k/n)}. \quad (263)$$

Note that $\rho_{nm} \in \mathcal{A}_n$ by choosing $l = 1$, so we have $D(\mathcal{A}_n \| \mathcal{B}_n) \leq D(\rho_{nm} \| \rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm})$. Combined with Eq. (262), this implies that

$$D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) \leq m((1 - \lambda)D(p_2 \| p_3) + \lambda D(p_1 \| p_3)). \quad (264)$$

Therefore, we have from Eqs. (261) and (264) that

$$D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) = m((1 - \lambda)D(p_2 \| p_3) + \lambda D(p_1 \| p_3)). \quad (265)$$

We now estimate the Petz Rényi divergence. For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\text{Tr}(\rho_{1,km})^\alpha (\rho(p_3)^{\otimes km})^{1-\alpha} = \left[\binom{km}{km_1} 2^{-km(D(p_1 \| p_3) + H(p_1))} \right]^{1-\alpha}, \quad (266)$$

$$\text{Tr}(\rho_{2,km})^\alpha (\rho(p_3)^{\otimes km})^{1-\alpha} = \left[\binom{km}{km_2} 2^{-km(D(p_2 \| p_3) + H(p_2))} \right]^{1-\alpha}, \quad (267)$$

by the type method [CT06, Theorem 11.1.2]. Since $\rho_{1,km}$ and $\rho_{2,km}$ are orthogonal, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr}(\rho_{km})^\alpha (\rho(p_3)^{\otimes km})^{1-\alpha} \\ &= \lambda^\alpha \text{Tr}(\rho_{1,km})^\alpha (\rho(p_3)^{\otimes km})^{1-\alpha} + (1 - \lambda)^\alpha \text{Tr}(\rho_{2,km})^\alpha (\rho(p_3)^{\otimes km})^{1-\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (268)$$

Using Lemma A.4 and the fact that $D(p_2 \| p_3) < D(p_1 \| p_3)$, we have for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_{nm} \| \rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm}) = mD(p_2 \| p_3), \quad (269)$$

where some terms vanish because of the Stirling's approximation in Eq. (263).

Combining Eqs.(265) and (269), we have the strict inequality,

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) < D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}). \quad (270)$$

Now, we further analyze the Hoeffding bound. For $r > 0$, we have from the alternative expression of the Hoeffding bound (similar to Remark 3.4) that

$$H_{n,r}(\rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm} \| \rho_{nm}) = \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \left(-\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} nr + D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_{nm} \| \rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm}) \right). \quad (271)$$

By Eq. (262), we have for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\frac{1}{n} D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_{nm} \| \rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm}) \leq \frac{1}{n} D(\rho_{nm} \| \rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm}) \quad (272)$$

$$\leq m((1 - \lambda)D(p_2 \| p_3) + \lambda D(p_1 \| p_3)) + \delta =: z, \quad (273)$$

for sufficiently large n . Then for any $\alpha > t_r := \frac{z}{r+z} \in (0, 1)$, we can check that

$$-\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}nr + D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_{nm}\|\rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm}) < 0. \quad (274)$$

So for $r > 0$, we have

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \left(-\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}nr + D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_{nm}\|\rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm}) \right) \quad (275)$$

$$= \sup_{\alpha \in (0,t_r]} \left(-\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}nr + D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_{nm}\|\rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm}) \right). \quad (276)$$

Therefore, we have

$$H_{n,r}(\rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm}\|\rho_{nm}) = \sup_{\alpha \in (0,t_r]} \left(-\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}nr + D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_{nm}\|\rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm}) \right). \quad (277)$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}(\rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm}\|\rho_{nm}) \\ = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sup_{\alpha \in (0,t_r]} \left(-\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}nr + D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_{nm}\|\rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (278)$$

$$\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sup_{\alpha \in (0,t_r]} D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_{nm}\|\rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm}) \quad (279)$$

$$= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} D_{P,t_r}(\rho_{nm}\|\rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm}) \quad (280)$$

$$= mD(p_2\|p_3), \quad (281)$$

where the inequality follows by throwing away a negative term, the second equality follows by the monotonicity of Petz Rényi divergence in α and the last equality follows from Eq. (269).

This implies that

$$H_r^\infty(\mathcal{B}\|\mathcal{A}) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}(\rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm}\|\rho_{nm}) \leq mD(p_2\|p_3). \quad (282)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\mathfrak{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{B}\|\mathcal{A}) = \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \left(-\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}r + D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A}\|\mathcal{B}) \right) \quad (283)$$

$$\leq \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \left(-\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}nr + mD(p_2\|p_3) \right) = mD(p_2\|p_3), \quad (284)$$

where the inequality follows from Eq. (269).

Thus, combining Eqs. (265), (282), and (284), we have


$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} H_r^\infty(\mathcal{B}\|\mathcal{A}) < D^\infty(\mathcal{A}\|\mathcal{B}), \quad (285)$$

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \mathfrak{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{B}\|\mathcal{A}) < D^\infty(\mathcal{A}\|\mathcal{B}). \quad (286)$$


This completes the proof. $\square$

Here we note that, through additional analysis, we can also establish that $D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A}\|\mathcal{B}) = mD(p_2\|p_3)$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ satisfying

$$\lambda^\alpha 2^{-(1-\alpha)mD(p_1\|p_3)} \leq (1 - (1-\lambda)^\alpha) 2^{-(1-\alpha)mD(p_2\|p_3)}. \quad (287)$$



(a) Petz Rényi divergence



(b) Hoeffding divergence

Figure 5: Discontinuities in the regularized Petz Rényi divergence and Hoeffding divergence given in Example 7.1. We choose $m_1 = 1$, $m_2 = 3$, $m = 10$, $p_3 = \lambda = 0.5$. Panel (a) shows the upper bound for Petz Rényi divergence $\frac{1}{n} D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_{nm} \parallel \rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm})$ for different values of n as a function of α , which can be computed from Eq. (268). The solid line indicates tightness of the upper bound as analyzed in Eq. (297), and the marked dot at $\alpha = 1$ corresponds to the regularized relative entropy in Eq. (265). Panel (b) displays the upper bound for Hoeffding divergence $\frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}(\rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm} \parallel \rho_{nm})$ from Eq. (271) for different n as a function of r ; for $n = \infty$, the upper bound from Eq. (282) is used. The marked dot at $r = 0$ again indicates the regularized relative entropy from Eq. (265).

At least, when α is sufficiently close to 1, the above condition holds. Since

$$\binom{l_1 + l_2}{l} = \sum_{l'=0}^l \binom{l_1}{l-l'} \binom{l_2}{l'} \geq \binom{l_1}{l-l''} \binom{l_2}{l''} \quad (288)$$

for $l'' \in [0, l]$, we have

$$\binom{km}{km_j}^l \leq \binom{lkm}{lkm_j} \leq 2^{klmH(p_j)}, \quad (289)$$

for $j = 1, 2$, where the second inequality follows from Eq. (255). Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^\alpha \left[\binom{km}{km_1} 2^{-km(D(p_1\|p_3)+H(p_1))} \right]^{1-\alpha} \\ \leq \lambda^\alpha 2^{-(1-\alpha)kmD(p_1\|p_3)} \end{aligned} \quad (290)$$

$$\leq (1 - (1 - \lambda)^\alpha) 2^{-(1-\alpha)mD(p_2\|p_3)} 2^{-(1-\alpha)(k-1)mD(p_1\|p_3)} \quad (291)$$

$$\leq (1 - (1 - \lambda)^\alpha) 2^{-(1-\alpha)kmD(p_2\|p_3)}, \quad (292)$$

where the first inequality follows from Eq. (289) and the second inequality follows from Eq. (287) and the fact that $D(p_2\|p_3) < D(p_1\|p_3)$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\rho_{km})^\alpha (\rho(p_3)^{\otimes km})^{1-\alpha} \\ \leq (1 - (1 - \lambda)^\alpha) 2^{-(1-\alpha)kmD(p_2\|p_3)} + (1 - \lambda)^\alpha 2^{-(1-\alpha)kmD(p_2\|p_3)} \end{aligned} \quad (293)$$

$$= 2^{-(1-\alpha)kmD(p_2\|p_3)}, \quad (294)$$

where the inequality follows from Eqs. (289) and (292). By the additivity of Petz Rényi divergence, we have

$$D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_{k_1m} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_{k_l m} \| \rho(p_3)^{\otimes nm}) \geq nmD(p_2\|p_3). \quad (295)$$

This implies that

$$D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) \geq mD(p_2\|p_3). \quad (296)$$

Combining Eqs. (269) and (296), we have

$$D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \| \mathcal{B}) = mD(p_2\|p_3), \quad (297)$$

for Example 7.1 when α satisfies Eq. (287).

An illustration for the discontinuities of the regularized Petz Rényi divergence and the Hoeffding divergence is shown in Figure. 5, where we can clearly see the discontinuities of both regularized quantities at $\alpha = 1$ and $r = 0$, respectively.

The second example follows the construction in [Hay25, Appendix C], though that reference omits the technical details which we provide here.

Example 7.2 (Convex sets, $\mathcal{A}_n$ composite and $\mathcal{B}_n$ simple i.i.d.) *Let $\rho(p_3)$ and ρ_{km} defined as in Example 7.1. Consider the sets $\mathcal{S}_n := \{\text{Tr}_{km-n} \rho_{km} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where Tr_{km-n} is the partial trace*

over the initial $km - n$ subsystems. Define

$$\mathcal{A}_n := \text{conv} \left\{ \rho_{n_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_{n_l} : n_1, \dots, n_l \geq 1, \rho_{n_j} \in \mathcal{S}_{n_j}, \sum_{j=1}^l n_j = n \right\}, \quad (298)$$

and $\mathcal{B}_n = \{\rho(p_3)^{\otimes n}\}$. Then the sequences $\mathcal{A} := \{\mathcal{A}_n\}$ and $\mathcal{B} := \{\mathcal{B}_n\}$ are convex compact and stable under tensor product. But we have

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) < D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}). \quad (299)$$

Moreover, we have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} H_r^\infty(\mathcal{B} \parallel \mathcal{A}) < D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}), \quad (300)$$

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \mathfrak{H}_r^\infty(\mathcal{B} \parallel \mathcal{A}) < D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}), \quad (301)$$

indicating that the Hoeffding bound cannot recover the Stein's exponent in this case.

Proof. Let ρ be any quantum state on n subsystems. We can easily check the identity

$$D\left(\rho \parallel \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \sigma_i\right) = D\left(\rho \parallel \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \rho_i\right) + \sum_{i=1}^n D(\rho_i \parallel \sigma_i), \quad (302)$$

where ρ_i is the reduced state of ρ on the i -th subsystem. Then we have for any $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_n$,

$$D(\rho \parallel \rho(p_3)^{\otimes n}) = D(\rho \parallel (\text{Tr}_{n-1} \rho)^{\otimes n}) + D((\text{Tr}_{n-1} \rho)^{\otimes n} \parallel \rho(p_3)^{\otimes n}). \quad (303)$$

Since $\text{Tr}_{n-1} \rho = \rho(\lambda p_1 + (1 - \lambda)p_2)$, we have

$$D(\rho \parallel \rho(p_3)^{\otimes n}) \geq nD(\rho(\lambda p_1 + (1 - \lambda)p_2) \parallel \rho(p_3)) = nD(\lambda p_1 + (1 - \lambda)p_2 \parallel p_3). \quad (304)$$

This implies that

$$D(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) \geq nD(\lambda p_1 + (1 - \lambda)p_2 \parallel p_3). \quad (305)$$

On the other hand, since $\rho(\lambda p_1 + (1 - \lambda)p_2)^{\otimes n} \in \mathcal{A}_n$ and $\rho(p_3)^{\otimes n} \in \mathcal{B}_n$, the above bound is achievable at these states and therefore, we have

$$D(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) = nD(\lambda p_1 + (1 - \lambda)p_2 \parallel p_3) \quad (306)$$

Thus, we have

$$D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = D(\lambda p_1 + (1 - \lambda)p_2 \parallel p_3) \quad (307)$$

Since $\rho_{km} \otimes \rho_{n-km} \in \mathcal{A}_n$ with $0 \leq n - km < m$, we have

$$D_{P,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) \leq D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_{km} \parallel \rho(p_3)^{\otimes km}) + D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_{n-km} \parallel \rho(p_3)^{\otimes n-km}). \quad (308)$$

Using the same calculation as in Eq. (269), we have for $\alpha > 0$,

$$D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) \leq D(p_2 \parallel p_3). \quad (309)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) \leq D(p_2 \parallel p_3) < D(\lambda p_1 + (1 - \lambda)p_2 \parallel p_3) = D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}). \quad (310)$$

Finally, the statement for the Hoeffding bounds can be shown in the same way as in Example 7.1. This completes the proof. $\square$

The next example demonstrates an extreme case where the regularized Petz Rényi divergence vanishes while the regularized relative entropy diverges.

Example 7.3 (Convex sets, $\mathcal{A}_n$ simple i.i.d. and $\mathcal{B}_n$ composite.) Let $\rho(p_2)$ and $\rho_{2,km}$ defined as Eqs. (244) and (245), respectively. Consider the sets

$$\mathcal{A}_n = \left\{ \rho(p_2)^{\otimes mn} \right\}, \quad \mathcal{B}_n := \text{conv} \left\{ \rho_{2,k_1 m} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_{2,k_l m} : k_1, \dots, k_l \geq 1, \sum_{i=1}^l k_i = n \right\}. \quad (311)$$

Then the sequences $\mathcal{A} := \{\mathcal{A}_n\}$ and $\mathcal{B} := \{\mathcal{B}_n\}$ are convex compact and stable under tensor product. But we have

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = 0 < \infty = D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}). \quad (312)$$

Proof. Note that the support of the state $\rho_{2,k_1 m} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_{2,k_l m}$ with $\sum_{i=1}^l k_i = n$ is included in the typical subspace $\mathcal{T}_{nm}(P_2)$. The support $\rho(p_2)^{\otimes nm}$ is full space. Thus, we have

$$D(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) = \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{B}_n} D(\rho(p_2)^{\otimes nm} \parallel \sigma) = \infty, \quad (313)$$

and therefore,

$$D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = \infty. \quad (314)$$

For the Petz Rényi divergence, we have

$$D_{P,\alpha}(\rho(p_2)^{\otimes km} \parallel \rho_{2,km}) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \left[2^{-kmH(p_2)} \binom{km}{km_2} \right]^\alpha, \quad (315)$$

by the standard result in type method as in [CT06, Eq. (11.15)]. By the Stirling's approximation in Eq. (263), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} D_{P,\alpha}(\rho(p_2)^{\otimes nm} \parallel \rho_{2,nm}) = 0. \quad (316)$$

Thus, we have for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} D_{P,\alpha}(\rho(p_2)^{\otimes nm} \parallel \rho_{2,nm}) = 0. \quad (317)$$

As the divergence is always nonnegative, the above equality is attained. Finally, the combination of Eqs. (314) and (317) implies that

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} D_{P,\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = 0 < \infty = D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}). \quad (318)$$

This complete the proof. $\square$

The last example is presented in [LBR24] to demonstrate the nonadditivity of the Petz Rényi divergence between two sets of quantum states. However, we show that this example does not give a violation of Eq. (243) as both sides diverge.

Example 7.4 (Convex sets.) Let $\mathcal{A}_n := \text{SEP}_n$ be the set of bipartite separable states on n subsystems. Let $\mathcal{B}_n := \{\rho^{\otimes n}\}$ with $\rho := \frac{1}{d(d-1)}(I - \sum_{i,j=1}^d |ij\rangle\langle ji|)$ being the antisymmetric Werner state on $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$. Then the sequences $\mathcal{A} := \{\mathcal{A}_n\}$ and $\mathcal{B} := \{\mathcal{B}_n\}$ are convex compact and stable under tensor product. But we have

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} D_{\text{P},\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = \infty. \quad (319)$$

Proof. It has been shown in [LBR24, Eq. (E5)] that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$D_{\text{P},\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} D(\mathcal{B}_n \parallel \mathcal{A}_n). \quad (320)$$

This implies

$$D_{\text{P},\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} D^\infty(\mathcal{B} \parallel \mathcal{A}), \quad (321)$$

by taking regularization on both sides. Note that we have an explicit lower bound $D^\infty(\mathcal{B} \parallel \mathcal{A}) \geq \log_2 \sqrt{4/3} > 0$ [CSW12, Corollary 3]. Taking supremum over $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} D_{\text{P},\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} D^\infty(\mathcal{B} \parallel \mathcal{A}) = \infty. \quad (322)$$

However, as we always have the direction,

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} D_{\text{P},\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) \leq D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}), \quad (323)$$

this implies that

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} D_{\text{P},\alpha}^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = D^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) = \infty. \quad (324)$$

□

7.3 Error exponents in adversarial quantum channel discrimination

The adversarial quantum channel discrimination was recently proposed and analyzed in [FFF25], where a tester interacts with an untrusted quantum device that generates quantum states upon request. The device guarantees that the states are produced by either a quantum channel $\mathcal{N}$ or a quantum channel $\mathcal{M}$. More formally, let $\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{A \rightarrow B}$ be the two quantum channels to be distinguished, and let $\mathcal{U}_{A \rightarrow BE}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{A \rightarrow BE}$ denote their respective Stinespring dilations, with E representing the environmental system. Let $\text{CPTP}(X : Y)$ denote the set of completely positive and trace-preserving maps from input system X to output system Y .

An *adaptive strategy* for adversarial discrimination proceeds as follows. Suppose the device operates as channel $\mathcal{N}$. Initially, the adversary prepares a quantum state via an operation $\mathcal{P}^1 \in \text{CPTP}(R_0 E_0 : A_1 R_1)$, where R_0 and E_0 are trivial ($|R_0| = |E_0| = 1$), and sends system A_1 through the channel $\mathcal{U}$, generating the output state $\mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{P}^1$ and returning system B_1 to the tester. In the next round, the adversary performs an internal update $\mathcal{P}^2 \in \text{CPTP}(E_1 R_1 : A_2 R_2)$, utilizing information stored in the quantum memory R_1 and the environmental system E_1 from the previous round. The adversary then sends system A_2 through the channel $\mathcal{U}$ again, producing the output state $\mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{P}^2 \circ \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{P}^1$ and returning system B_2 to the tester. This process can be repeated for n rounds. A *non-adaptive strategies* for adversarial discrimination is a subclass of adaptive strategies that disregards the environmental systems E_i and performs no updates between rounds, that is, taking the operations $\mathcal{P}_i, \mathcal{Q}_i$ ($i \geq 2$) simply as identity maps, with the choice $R_i = A_{i+1} \cdots A_n$.

After n rounds of state generation, the tester obtains an overall state on $B_1 \cdots B_n$ in their possession as:

$$\rho[\{\mathcal{P}^i\}_{i=1}^n] := \text{Tr}_{R_n E_n} \prod_{i=1}^n \left[\mathcal{U}_{A_i \rightarrow B_i E_i} \circ \mathcal{P}_{R_{i-1} E_{i-1} \rightarrow A_i R_i}^i \right].$$

Similarly, if the device is governed by $\mathcal{M}$ and the internal operations by the adversary are given by $\mathcal{Q}^i$, then the overall state is given by

$$\sigma[\{\mathcal{Q}^i\}_{i=1}^n] := \text{Tr}_{R_n E_n} \prod_{i=1}^n \left[\mathcal{V}_{A_i \rightarrow B_i E_i} \circ \mathcal{Q}_{R_{i-1} E_{i-1} \rightarrow A_i R_i}^i \right].$$

The tester needs to perform a binary quantum measurement $\{M_n, I - M_n\}$ on systems $B_1 \cdots B_n$ to determine which channel was used inside the black box.

Due to limited knowledge of the device's internal workings and the adversary's strategies, the tester only gets partial information, knowing that their state belongs to one of two sets:

$$\mathcal{A}_n := \{\rho[\{\mathcal{P}^i\}_{i=1}^n] : \mathcal{P}^i \in \text{CPTP}(R_{i-1} E_{i-1} : A_i R_i), \forall R_i, \forall i\}, \quad (325)$$

$$\mathcal{B}_n := \{\sigma[\{\mathcal{Q}^i\}_{i=1}^n] : \mathcal{Q}^i \in \text{CPTP}(R_{i-1} E_{i-1} : A_i R_i), \forall R_i, \forall i\}, \quad (326)$$

where the adversary's internal memory R_i may have arbitrarily large dimension. In particular, for non-adaptive strategies, where the adversary ignores the environmental systems E_i and performs no updates between rounds, the sets $\mathcal{A}_n$ and $\mathcal{B}_n$ reduce to

$$\mathcal{A}'_n := \{\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\rho_n) : \rho_n \in \mathcal{D}(A^{\otimes n})\}, \quad (327)$$

$$\mathcal{B}'_n := \{\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\sigma_n) : \sigma_n \in \mathcal{D}(A^{\otimes n})\}. \quad (328)$$

It has been shown in [FFF25] that the optimal Stein exponent for both adaptive and non-adaptive strategies is given by the regularized quantum relative entropy between the two channels:

$$D^{\text{inf},\infty}(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{M}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} D^{\text{inf}}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n} \parallel \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}), \quad (329)$$

where the quantum relative entropy between two channels is defined as

$$D^{\text{inf}}(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{M}) := \inf \{D(\mathcal{N}(\rho) \parallel \mathcal{M}(\sigma)) : \rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(A)\}. \quad (330)$$

Error exponents. We can check that $\{\mathcal{A}_n\}, \{\mathcal{A}'_n\}, \{\mathcal{B}_n\}, \{\mathcal{B}'_n\}$ are all stable sequences of convex and compact sets of quantum states (the convexity of $\{\mathcal{A}_n\}, \{\mathcal{B}_n\}$ is proved in [FFF25]). Therefore, our result directly apply to adversarial quantum channel discrimination. In particular, for any $0 < r < D^{\text{inf},\infty}(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{M})$, the optimal Type-I error exponent under an exponential constraint on the Type-II error is given by

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n \parallel \mathcal{B}_n) = H_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}), \quad (331)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}'_n \parallel \mathcal{B}'_n) = H_r^\infty(\mathcal{A}' \parallel \mathcal{B}') > 0, \quad (332)$$

where we can ensure the strict positivity as the continuity of the regularized Petz Rényi divergence holds in this case [FFF25]. It would be interesting to further investigate whether adaptive strategies can outperform non-adaptive strategies in terms of the error exponent, i.e., whether $H_r^\infty(\mathcal{A} \parallel \mathcal{B}) < H_r^\infty(\mathcal{A}' \parallel \mathcal{B}')$ for some channels $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}$ and rate r .

The authors in [HT16] consider the error exponent and strong converse exponents for distinguishing the null hypothesis $\mathcal{A}''_n = \{\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}\}$ from the composite alternative $\mathcal{B}''_n = \{\rho_A^{\otimes n} \otimes \sigma_{B^n} : \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(B^n)\}$, which reflects the scenario of correlation detection. This can be modelled as an

adversarial channel discrimination problem as well. In particular, let $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ be a replacer channel that always outputs ρ regardless of the input. Then the above $\mathcal{A}_n''$ can be regarded as the image set of the replacer channel $(\mathcal{R}_{\rho_{AB}})^{\otimes n}$ and $\mathcal{B}_n''$ is the image set of the channel $(\mathcal{R}_{\rho_A} \otimes I_B)^{\otimes n}$. All assumptions in Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 6.1 are satisfied in this case. Therefore, we can recover the results in [HT16] as:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n'' \| \mathcal{B}_n'') = \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (r - I_{P,\alpha}(A:B)_\rho), \quad (333)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n'' \| \mathcal{B}_n'')) = \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (r - I_{S,\alpha}(A:B)_\rho), \quad (334)$$

where $I_{P,\alpha}(A:B)_\rho := D_{P,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_1'' \| \mathcal{B}_1'')$ is the Petz Rényi mutual information and $I_{S,\alpha}(A:B)_\rho := D_{S,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_1'' \| \mathcal{B}_1'')$ is the sandwiched Rényi mutual information, which are both additive.

Examples for nonadditivity. The adversarial channel discrimination also provides a scenario where we can find nonadditivity examples for the Petz Rényi divergence and Hoeffding divergence between two sets of quantum state. For this, we consider two qutrit quantum channels. Let $\mathcal{N}(\cdot) = \text{Tr}[\cdot]\rho$ to be the replacer channel with

$$\rho = 0.9 \cdot |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + 0.1 \cdot \frac{I}{3}, \quad \text{where} \quad |\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |2\rangle). \quad (335)$$

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the platypus channel [LLS⁺23], $\mathcal{M}(X) = M_0 X M_0^\dagger + M_1 X M_1^\dagger$ with Kraus operators

$$M_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{p} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad M_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{1-p} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (336)$$

In this case, we have the image sets of these channels as

$$\mathcal{A}_n' = \{\rho^{\otimes n}\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B}_n' = \{\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\sigma_n) : \sigma_n \in \mathcal{D}((\mathbb{C}^3)^{\otimes n})\}. \quad (337)$$

As these sets are given by semidefinite constraints, we can efficiently evaluate the Petz Rényi divergence and Hoeffding divergence between them via semidefinite programming (see Remark 3.3). More explicitly, for fixed $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we can efficiently evaluate


$$D_{P,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n' \| \mathcal{B}_n') = \inf_{\sigma_n \in \mathcal{D}} D_{P,\alpha}(\rho^{\otimes n} \| \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\sigma_n)), \quad (338)$$

by the QICS package [HSF24]. Moreover, we can also evaluate the Hoeffding divergence


$$H_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n' \| \mathcal{B}_n') = \mathfrak{H}_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n' \| \mathcal{B}_n') = \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (nr - D_{P,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n' \| \mathcal{B}_n')), \quad (339)$$

by scanning the parameter $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ with fine grid.

The numerical results are shown in Figure 6 where we use channel parameter $s = 0.01$ and scan $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ with step size 0.01. Panel (a) displays the Petz Rényi divergence $D_{P,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_n' \| \mathcal{B}_n')/n$ for $n = 1, 2, 3$ as a function of α , while panel (b) shows the objective function of the Hoeffding divergence versus α , together with its maximum (i.e., the Hoeffding divergence $H_{n,r}(\mathcal{A}_n' \| \mathcal{B}_n')/n$) for $n = 1, 2, 3$. Here we choose the rate $r = 1$. The plots exhibit a clear separation between different numbers of copies for both the Petz Rényi and Hoeffding divergences, illustrating non-additivity in this example and justifying the necessity of regularization in our main results.



(a) Petz Rényi divergence



(b) Hoeffding divergence

Figure 6: Non-additivity for the Petz Rényi divergence and the Hoeffding divergence between the image set of two channels. Here, we consider the replacer channel $\mathcal{N}$ with output state $\rho = 0.9 \cdot |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + 0.1 \cdot I/3$, where $|\psi\rangle = (|0\rangle + |2\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, and the platypus channel $\mathcal{M}$ with channel parameter $s = 0.01$. We plot (a) the Petz Rényi divergence $D_{P,\alpha}(\mathcal{A}'_n \| \mathcal{B}'_n)/n$ and (b) the objective function in Hoeffding divergence for $n = 1, 2, 3$ as functions of $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, respectively. The Hoeffding divergence $H_{n,1}(\mathcal{A}'_n \| \mathcal{B}'_n)/n$ is indicated by the maximum value in dashed lines.

7.4 Error exponents in quantum resource detection

As our results only require minimal assumptions, they can be readily applied to the detection problem in various quantum resource theories (see e.g. [HI25]), where the stability of the set of free states is naturally satisfied [BG15, CG19], including entanglement [BP10, FWTD19, RFWG19, TFG25], coherence [WY16, DFW⁺18, FWL⁺18, RFWA18, HFW21], asymmetry [MS13], thermodynamics [BHN⁺15] and purity [HHO03] and magic [BK05, FL20, FL22, FL25]. Our refined analysis of error exponents can thus provide better understanding of the trade-offs between Type-I and Type-II errors in hypothesis testing within these resource theories.

We showcase coherence theory and entanglement theory as two illustrative examples with explicit expressions. These examples have been previously studied in [HI25], but the error exponents obtained therein are not tight. Here we provide tight characterizations using our results.

Quantum coherence detection. In the resource theory of coherence, the set of free states is given by the set of incoherent states $\mathcal{I}_n$, which is convex, compact, and stable under tensor products. Moreover, the Petz Rényi divergence between a quantum state and the set of incoherent states is known to be additive [ZHC17, Theorem 3]. Therefore, our results yield explicit expressions for the error exponent in hypothesis testing between a quantum state and the set of incoherent states

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\rho^{\otimes n} \| \mathcal{I}_n) = \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (r - C_\alpha(\rho)), \quad (340)$$

where $C_\alpha(\rho) := D_{P,\alpha}(\rho \| \mathcal{I}_1)$ has closed form expression [CG16] as

$$C_\alpha(\rho) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \text{Tr} \left[(\Delta(\rho^\alpha))^{1/\alpha} \right]. \quad (341)$$

where $\Delta(\cdot)$ is the completely dephasing operation in the reference basis.

As for the strong converse exponent, the sandwiched Rényi divergence between these sets is also additive [ZHC17, Theorem 3] and is given by

$$C_\alpha^*(\rho) := D_{S,\alpha}(\rho \| \mathcal{I}_1) = \inf_{\sigma_B \in \mathcal{D}(B)} D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_{\text{mc}} \| I_A \otimes \sigma_B), \quad (342)$$

where $\rho_{\text{mc}} := \sum_{i,j} \rho_{ij} |ii\rangle\langle jj|$ is the associated maximally correlated state if $\rho = \sum_{i,j} \rho_{ij} |i\rangle\langle j|$. The differentiability of $C_\alpha^*(\rho)$ with respect to α has been established in [HT16, Proposition 11]. Therefore, our results yield the strong converse exponent in this case as well:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha_{n,r}(\rho^{\otimes n} \| \mathcal{I}_n)) = \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (r - C_\alpha^*(\rho)). \quad (343)$$

Quantum entanglement detection. In the resource theory of entanglement, the set of free states is the set of separable states SEP_n , which is convex, compact, and stable under tensor products. For a maximally correlated state $\rho_{\text{mc}} := \sum_{i,j} \rho_{ij} |ii\rangle\langle jj|$ —which includes many important cases of interest, e.g., pure states and mixtures of Bell states—the Petz and sandwiched Rényi divergences relative to the set of separable states are known to be additive. The error exponent and strong converse exponent are then analogous to those in the resource theory of coherence. In particular, the error exponent is given by

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n,r}(\rho_{\text{mc}}^{\otimes n} \| \text{SEP}_n) = \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (r - E_\alpha(\rho_{\text{mc}})), \quad (344)$$

where $E_\alpha(\rho_{\text{mc}}) := D_{P,\alpha}(\rho_{\text{mc}} \| \text{SEP}_1) = D_{P,\alpha}(\rho \| \mathcal{I}_1)$ is the Rényi relative entropy of entanglement, which has the closed-form expression [ZHC17, Corollary 1]:

$$E_\alpha(\rho_{\text{mc}}) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \text{Tr} \left[(\Delta(\rho_{\text{mc}}^\alpha))^{1/\alpha} \right]. \quad (345)$$

Similarly, the strong-converse exponent is given by

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha_{n,r}(\rho_{\text{mc}}^{\otimes n} \|\text{SEP}_n)) = \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} (r - E_{\alpha}^*(\rho_{\text{mc}})), \quad (346)$$

where $E_{\alpha}^*(\rho_{\text{mc}}) := D_{S,\alpha}(\rho_{\text{mc}} \|\text{SEP}_1) = D_{S,\alpha}(\rho \|\mathcal{S}_1)$ is the sandwiched Rényi relative entropy of entanglement and we can choose a universal state as the tensor product of the universal state on A^n and B^n , respectively. Finally, we note that the same result works if we consider the set of PPT states as the free states, as the Petz and sandwiched Rényi divergences are the same as those relative to the set of separable states for maximally correlated states [ZHC17].

8 Discussion

We have established a comprehensive framework for analyzing error exponents in quantum hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states, extending beyond the conventional i.i.d. setting to encompass composite correlated hypotheses. Our main contributions include a generalization of the quantum Hoeffding bound and strong converse exponent to stable sequences of convex, compact sets of quantum states. These results provide a finer characterization than the Stein regime, yielding deeper insights into the fundamental trade-offs between Type-I and Type-II errors in quantum state discrimination with composite correlated hypotheses. The broad applicability of our framework is demonstrated through concrete applications to adversarial quantum channel discrimination and various quantum resource theories, highlighting its potential for further advances across quantum information theory.

Several open questions remain. While we showed $H_r^{\infty}(\mathcal{A} \|\mathcal{B}) \geq \mathfrak{H}_r^{\infty}(\mathcal{A} \|\mathcal{B})$, proving equality in full generality remains open and would likely require a minimax theorem suited to the regularized setting. Extending the strong converse upper bound beyond the current technical restrictions is another important challenge. Resolving these issues would complete the asymptotic characterization of quantum state discrimination for composite, correlated hypotheses. Finally, since the generalized quantum Stein’s lemma implies asymptotic reversibility in the corresponding resource theory [FFF24, HY25, Lam25], our refined error exponent analysis may shed new light on conversion rates and convergence properties of resource interconversion, enabling finer control of asymptotic reversibility and efficiency. We leave these questions for future work.

Acknowledgements. K.F. is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 92470113 and 12404569), the Shenzhen Science and Technology Program (Grant No. JCYJ20240813113519025), the Shenzhen Fundamental Research Program (Grant No. JCYJ2024 1202124023031), and the University Development Fund (Grant No. UDF01003565). M.H. is supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 62171212). Both authors are supported by the General R&D Projects of 1+1+1 CUHK-CUHK(SZ)-GDST Joint Collaboration Fund (Grant No. GRDP2025-022).

References

- [ACMT⁺07] K. M. Audenaert, J. Calsamiglia, R. Muñoz-Tapia, E. Bagan, L. Masanes, A. Acín, and F. Verstraete. Discriminating states: The quantum Chernoff bound. *Physical Review Letters*, 98(16):160501, 2007.
- [ANSV08] K. M. Audenaert, M. Nussbaum, A. Szkoła, and F. Verstraete. Asymptotic error rates in quantum hypothesis testing. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 279(1):251–283, 2008.
- [BBH21] M. Berta, F. G. Brandão, and C. Hirche. On composite quantum hypothesis testing. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 385(1):55–77, 2021.

- [BDB23] S. Ben-David and E. Blais. A new minimax theorem for randomized algorithms. *Journal of the ACM*, 70(6):1–58, 2023.
- [BG15] F. G. Brandao and G. Gour. Reversible framework for quantum resource theories. *Physical Review Letters*, 115(7):070503, 2015.
- [BHN⁺15] F. Brandão, M. Horodecki, N. Ng, J. Oppenheim, and S. Wehner. The second laws of quantum thermodynamics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(11):3275–3279, 2015.
- [BK05] S. Bravyi and A. Kitaev. Universal quantum computation with ideal Clifford gates and noisy ancillas. *Physical Review A*, 71(2), February 2005.
- [Bla74] R. Blahut. Hypothesis testing and information theory. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 20(4):405–417, 1974.
- [BP10] F. G. Brandao and M. B. Plenio. A generalization of quantum Stein’s lemma. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 295(3):791–828, 2010.
- [CG16] E. Chitambar and G. Gour. Comparison of incoherent operations and measures of coherence. *Physical Review A*, 94:052336, Nov 2016.
- [CG19] E. Chitambar and G. Gour. Quantum resource theories. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 91(2):025001, 2019.
- [Che52] H. Chernoff. A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 493–507, 1952.
- [Che00] P.-N. Chen. Generalization of Gartner-Ellis theorem. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 46(7):2752–2760, November 2000.
- [CMW16] T. Cooney, M. Mosonyi, and M. M. Wilde. Strong converse exponents for a quantum channel discrimination problem and quantum-feedback-assisted communication. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 344(3):797–829, 2016.
- [CSW12] M. Christandl, N. Schuch, and A. Winter. Entanglement of the antisymmetric state. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 311(2):397–422, 2012.
- [CT06] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas. *Elements of Information Theory*, volume 1. John Wiley & Sons, 2006.
- [DFW⁺18] M. G. Díaz, K. Fang, X. Wang, M. Rosati, M. Skotiniotis, J. Calsamiglia, and A. Winter. Using and reusing coherence to realize quantum processes. *Quantum*, 2:100, 2018.
- [DWH25] A. Dasgupta, N. A. Warsi, and M. Hayashi. Universal tester for multiple independence testing and classical-quantum arbitrarily varying multiple access channel. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 71(5):3719–3765, 2025.
- [DZ10] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni. *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010.
- [FFF24] K. Fang, H. Fawzi, and O. Fawzi. Generalized quantum asymptotic equipartition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.04035*, 2024.
- [FFF25] K. Fang, H. Fawzi, and O. Fawzi. Adversarial quantum channel discrimination. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.03060*, 2025.

- [FGW25] K. Fang, G. Gour, and X. Wang. Towards the ultimate limits of quantum channel discrimination and quantum communication. *Science China Information Sciences*, 68(8):180509, 2025.
- [FL20] K. Fang and Z.-W. Liu. No-go theorems for quantum resource purification. *Physical Review Letters*, 125(6):060405, 2020.
- [FL22] K. Fang and Z.-W. Liu. No-go theorems for quantum resource purification: New approach and channel theory. *PRX Quantum*, 3(1):010337, 2022.
- [FL25] K. Fang and Z.-W. Liu. One-shot distillation with constant overhead using catalysts. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2410.14547*, 2025.
- [FR06] B. Farkas and S. G. Révész. Potential theoretic approach to rendezvous numbers. *Monatshefte für mathematik*, 148(4):309–331, 2006.
- [FWL⁺18] K. Fang, X. Wang, L. Lami, B. Regula, and G. Adesso. Probabilistic distillation of quantum coherence. *Physical Review Letters*, 121(7):070404, 2018.
- [FWTD19] K. Fang, X. Wang, M. Tomamichel, and R. Duan. Non-asymptotic entanglement distillation. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 65(10):6454–6465, 2019.
- [Hay02] M. Hayashi. Optimal sequence of quantum measurements in the sense of Stein’s lemma in quantum hypothesis testing. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 35(50):10759, 2002.
- [Hay07] M. Hayashi. Error exponent in asymmetric quantum hypothesis testing and its application to classical-quantum channel coding. *Physical Review A—Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics*, 76(6):062301, 2007.
- [Hay17] M. Hayashi. Quantum information theory. *Graduate Texts in Physics*, Springer, 2017.
- [Hay25] M. Hayashi. General detectability measure. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 406(12):289, 2025.
- [HFW21] M. Hayashi, K. Fang, and K. Wang. Finite block length analysis on quantum coherence distillation and incoherent randomness extraction. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 67(6):3926–3944, 2021.
- [HHO03] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and J. Oppenheim. Reversible transformations from pure to mixed states and the unique measure of information. *Physical Review A*, 67:062104, Jun 2003.
- [HI25] M. Hayashi and Y. Ito. Entanglement measures for detectability. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 71(6):4385–4405, April 2025.
- [HMO07] F. Hiai, M. Mosonyi, and T. Ogawa. Large deviations and chernoff bound for certain correlated states on a spin chain. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 48(12), 2007.
- [HMO08] F. Hiai, M. Mosonyi, and T. Ogawa. Error exponents in hypothesis testing for correlated states on a spin chain. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 49(3), 2008.
- [HP91] F. Hiai and D. Petz. The proper formula for relative entropy and its asymptotics in quantum probability. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 143:99–114, 1991.
- [HSF24] K. He, J. Saunderson, and H. Fawzi. QICS: Quantum information conic solver. *arXiv: 2410.17803*, 2024.

- [HT16] M. Hayashi and M. Tomamichel. Correlation detection and an operational interpretation of the Rényi mutual information. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 57(10), 2016.
- [HY25] M. Hayashi and H. Yamasaki. The generalized quantum Stein’s lemma and the second law of quantum resource theories. *Nature Physics*, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41567-025-03047-9>.
- [KZ05] A. Kurdila and M. Zabrankin. *Convex Functional Analysis*. Systems & Control: Foundations & Applications. Birkhäuser Basel, 2005.
- [Lam25] L. Lami. A solution of the generalized quantum Stein’s lemma. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 71(6):4454–4484, June 2025.
- [LBR24] L. Lami, M. Berta, and B. Regula. Asymptotic quantification of entanglement with a single copy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.07067*, 2024.
- [LLS⁺23] F. Leditzky, D. Leung, V. Siddhu, G. Smith, and J. A. Smolin. The platypus of the quantum channel zoo. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 69(6):3825–3849, June 2023.
- [MH23] M. Mosonyi and F. Hiai. Some continuity properties of quantum Rényi divergences. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 70(4):2674–2700, 2023.
- [MLDS⁺13] M. Müller-Lennert, F. Dupuis, O. Szehr, S. Fehr, and M. Tomamichel. On quantum Rényi entropies: A new generalization and some properties. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 54(12), 2013.
- [MO15a] M. Mosonyi and T. Ogawa. Quantum hypothesis testing and the operational interpretation of the quantum Rényi relative entropies. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 334:1617–1648, 2015.
- [MO15b] M. Mosonyi and T. Ogawa. Two approaches to obtain the strong converse exponent of quantum hypothesis testing for general sequences of quantum states. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(12):6975–6994, 2015.
- [MS81] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane. *The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes*, volume 16. North-Holland, 3rd edition, 1981.
- [MS13] I. Marvian and R. W. Spekkens. The theory of manipulations of pure state asymmetry: I. basic tools, equivalence classes and single copy transformations. *New Journal of Physics*, 15(3):033001, March 2013.
- [MSW22] M. Mosonyi, Z. Szilagyi, and M. Weiner. On the error exponents of binary state discrimination with composite hypotheses. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(2):1032–1067, February 2022.
- [Nag06] H. Nagaoka. The converse part of the theorem for quantum hoeffding bound. *arXiv preprint quant-ph/0611289*, 2006.
- [NS09] M. Nussbaum and A. Szkoła. The Chernoff lower bound for symmetric quantum hypothesis testing. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37(2):1040–1057, 2009.
- [OH04] T. Ogawa and M. Hayashi. On error exponents in quantum hypothesis testing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 50(6):1368–1372, 2004.

- [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, feb 2000.
- [Pet86] D. Petz. Quasi-entropies for finite quantum systems. *Reports on Mathematical Physics*, 23(1):57–65, 1986.
- [RFA18] B. Regula, K. Fang, X. Wang, and G. Adesso. One-shot coherence distillation. *Physical Review Letters*, 121(1):010401, 2018.
- [RFG19] B. Regula, K. Fang, X. Wang, and M. Gu. One-shot entanglement distillation beyond local operations and classical communication. *New Journal of Physics*, 21(10):103017, 2019.
- [TFG25] T. Theurer, K. Fang, and G. Gour. Single-shot entanglement manipulation of states and channels revisited. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2025.
- [Ume54] H. Umegaki. Conditional expectation in an operator algebra. *Tohoku Mathematical Journal, Second Series*, 6(2-3):177–181, 1954.
- [WBHK20] M. M. Wilde, M. Berta, C. Hirche, and E. Kaur. Amortized channel divergence for asymptotic quantum channel discrimination. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 110:2277–2336, 2020.
- [Wol78] J. Wolfowitz. Coding theorems of information theory. *Mathematics of Computation*, 1978.
- [WT24] K. Watanabe and R. Takagi. Black box work extraction and composite hypothesis testing. *Physical Review Letters*, 133(25):250401, 2024.
- [WW19a] X. Wang and M. M. Wilde. Resource theory of asymmetric distinguishability. *Physical Review Research*, 1(3):033170, 2019.
- [WW19b] X. Wang and M. M. Wilde. Resource theory of asymmetric distinguishability for quantum channels. *Physical Review Research*, 1(3):033169, dec 2019.
- [WWY14] M. M. Wilde, A. Winter, and D. Yang. Strong converse for the classical capacity of entanglement-breaking and Hadamard channels via a sandwiched Rényi relative entropy. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 331:593–622, 2014.
- [WY16] A. Winter and D. Yang. Operational resource theory of coherence. *Physical Review Letters*, 116(12), March 2016.
- [ZHC17] H. Zhu, M. Hayashi, and L. Chen. Coherence and entanglement measures based on rényi relative entropies. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 50(47):475303, November 2017.

A Useful lemmas

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

Lemma A.1 [FR06, Theorem 5.2] Let X be a compact, convex subset of a Hausdorff topological vector space and Y be a convex subset of the linear space. Let $f : X \times Y \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ be lower semicontinuous on X for fixed $y \in Y$, and assume that f is convex in the first and concave in the second variable. Then

$$\sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} f(x, y) = \inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y). \quad (347)$$

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

Lemma A.2 Let X be a nonempty compact topological space, and let $f : X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be a function. Then if f is upper semicontinuous, it attains its maximum, meaning there is some $x \in X$ such that for all $x' \in X$, $f(x') \leq f(x)$. Similarly, if f is lower semicontinuous, it attains its minimum.

Lemma A.3 Let X be a topological space, let I be a set, and let $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a collection of functions $f_i : X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. Then if each f_i is upper semicontinuous, the function $f(x) = \inf_{i \in I} f_i(x)$ is also upper semicontinuous. Similarly, if each f_i is lower semicontinuous, the pointwise supremum is lower semicontinuous.

Lemma A.4 For two scalar sequences $x_n, y_n > 0$ with $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\log x_n}{n} = x_R$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\log y_n}{n} = y_R$, then $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(x_n + y_n) = \min\{x_R, y_R\}$.

Proof. For any scalars $x, y > 0$, we can verify that [ANSV08],

$$\max\{\log x, \log y\} \leq \log(x + y) \leq \max\{\log x, \log y\} + 1. \quad (348)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(x_n + y_n) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log x_n = x_R, \quad (349)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(x_n + y_n) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log y_n = y_R. \quad (350)$$

This gives $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(x_n + y_n) \leq \min\{x_R, y_R\}$. For the other direction, by the definition of x_R , for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an infinite subsequence n_m such that $-\frac{1}{n_m} \log x_{n_m} \geq x_R - \varepsilon$. As the limit of y_n exists, we know that for this subsequence $-\frac{1}{n_m} \log y_{n_m} \geq y_R - \varepsilon$. This implies that

$$\min \left\{ -\frac{1}{n_m} \log x_{n_m}, -\frac{1}{n_m} \log y_{n_m} \right\} \geq \min\{x_R, y_R\} - \varepsilon \quad (351)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(x_n + y_n) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \max\{\log x_n, \log y_n\} \quad (352)$$

$$= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min \left\{ -\frac{1}{n} \log x_n, -\frac{1}{n} \log y_n \right\} \quad (353)$$

$$\geq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \min \left\{ -\frac{1}{n_m} \log x_{n_m}, -\frac{1}{n_m} \log y_{n_m} \right\} \quad (354)$$

$$\geq \min\{x_R, y_R\} - \varepsilon. \quad (355)$$

As this holds for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(x_n + y_n) \geq \min\{x_R, y_R\}. \quad (356)$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Note that the existence of the limit for one sequence is necessary in Lemma A.4. Consider the case where $x_n = 1$ if n is odd and $x_n = 2^n$ if n is even; and $y_n = 2^n$ if n is odd and $y_n = 1$ if n is even. Then we have $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log x_n = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log y_n = 0$, but $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(x_n + y_n) = -1$. This gives a counterexample to Lemma A.4 if the limit does not exist for either sequence.

B Mathematical properties of $\phi(s)$

In this section, we discuss some useful properties of the function ⁵ $\phi(s|\rho||\sigma) := \log \text{Tr} \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s$. These results can be found in the book [Hay17, Chapter 3] and we list them here for completeness. Let $P_{\rho,\sigma}$ and $Q_{\rho,\sigma}$ denote the Nussbaum-Szkoła distributions for ρ and σ . These classical distributions preserve many important information of the original quantum states, including

$$D(\rho||\sigma) = D(P_{\rho,\sigma}||Q_{\rho,\sigma}), \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(s|\rho||\sigma) = \phi(s|P_{\rho,\sigma}||Q_{\rho,\sigma}). \quad (357)$$

Due to the second equality, we may simplify the notation as $\phi(s)$ when there is no confusion. Moreover, the Hoeffding divergence can also be expressed as

$$H_{1,r}(\rho||\sigma) = \max_{s \in (0,1)} \frac{-\phi(s) - sr}{1-s}. \quad (358)$$

Lemma B.1 *Let $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{H}_+$. Then the first and second derivatives of $\phi(s|\rho||\sigma)$ with respect to s are given by [Hay17, Exercise 3.5],*

$$\phi'(s|\rho||\sigma) = \frac{\text{Tr} \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s (\log \sigma - \log \rho)}{\text{Tr} \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s}, \quad (359)$$

$$\phi''(s|\rho||\sigma) = \frac{\text{Tr} \rho^{1-s} (\log \sigma - \log \rho) \sigma^s (\log \sigma - \log \rho)}{\text{Tr} \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s} - \frac{(\text{Tr} \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s (\log \rho - \log \sigma))^2}{(\text{Tr} \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s)^2}. \quad (360)$$

In particular, $\phi'(0||\rho||\sigma) = -D(\rho||\sigma)$ and $\phi'(1|\rho||\sigma) = D(\sigma||\rho)$. Moreover, using Schwarz inequality, we know that $\phi''(s|\rho||\sigma) \geq 0$ and therefore $\phi(s|\rho||\sigma)$ is convex in $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. For the first derivative, we have

$$\phi'(s|\rho||\sigma) = \frac{(\text{Tr} \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s)'}{\text{Tr} \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s} \quad (361)$$

$$= \frac{\text{Tr}[(\rho^{1-s} \sigma^s)']}{\text{Tr} \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s} \quad (362)$$

$$= \frac{\text{Tr}[(\rho^{1-s})' \sigma^s + \rho^{1-s} (\sigma^s)']}{\text{Tr} \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s} \quad (363)$$

$$= \frac{\text{Tr}[-\rho^{1-s} (\log \rho) \sigma^s + \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s (\log \sigma)]}{\text{Tr} \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s} \quad (364)$$

$$= \frac{\text{Tr}[-(\log \rho) \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s + \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s (\log \sigma)]}{\text{Tr} \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s} \quad (365)$$

$$= \frac{\text{Tr} \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s (\log \sigma - \log \rho)}{\text{Tr} \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s} \quad (366)$$

⁵Note that this definition differs slightly from the one in the main text Lemma 5.2, but they are equivalent up to a constant factor. Thus, all subsequent results work as the same.

For the second derivative, we have first that

$$(\text{Tr } \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s (\log \sigma - \log \rho))' = \text{Tr}[(\rho^{1-s} \sigma^s (\log \sigma - \log \rho))'] \quad (367)$$

$$= \text{Tr}[(\rho^{1-s} \sigma^s)' (\log \sigma - \log \rho)] \quad (368)$$

$$= \text{Tr}[-\rho^{1-s} (\log \rho) \sigma^s + \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s (\log \sigma)] (\log \sigma - \log \rho) \quad (369)$$

$$= \text{Tr}[-\rho^{1-s} (\log \rho) \sigma^s + \rho^{1-s} (\log \sigma) \sigma^s] (\log \sigma - \log \rho) \quad (370)$$

$$= \text{Tr}[\rho^{1-s} (\log \sigma - \log \rho) \sigma^s (\log \sigma - \log \rho)]. \quad (371)$$

The we have the second derivative as

$$\begin{aligned} \phi''(s|\rho||\sigma) &= \frac{(\text{Tr } \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s (\log \sigma - \log \rho))' (\text{Tr } \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s) - (\text{Tr } \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s (\log \sigma - \log \rho)) (\text{Tr } \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s)'}{(\text{Tr } \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s)^2} \quad (372) \\ &= \frac{\text{Tr}[\rho^{1-s} (\log \sigma - \log \rho) \sigma^s (\log \sigma - \log \rho)]}{\text{Tr } \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s} - \frac{(\text{Tr } \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s (\log \rho - \log \sigma))^2}{(\text{Tr } \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s)^2}. \quad (373) \end{aligned}$$

By the Schwarz inequality $|\text{Tr}(XY^\dagger)|^2 \leq |\text{Tr}(XX^\dagger)| |\text{Tr}(YY^\dagger)|$, we have

$$(\text{Tr } \rho^{1-s} \sigma^s (\log \rho - \log \sigma))^2 \leq \text{Tr}[\rho^{1-s} (\log \sigma - \log \rho) \sigma^s (\log \sigma - \log \rho)] \text{Tr}[\rho^{1-s} \sigma^s], \quad (374)$$

by consideing $X = \rho^{(1-s)/2} (\log \sigma - \log \rho) \sigma^{s/2}$ and $Y = \rho^{(1-s)/2} \sigma^{s/2}$. This implies that $\phi''(s|\rho||\sigma) \geq 0$ and therefore $\phi(s|\rho||\sigma)$ is convex in $s \in \mathbb{R}$. $\square$

The following result can be found in [Hay17, Exercise 3.45].

Lemma B.2 *Let $r < D(\rho||\sigma)$. There exists a unique maximum achieved at $s_r \in (0, 1)$ for*

$$\sup_{0 \leq s \leq 1} f(s), \quad \text{with} \quad f(s) := \frac{-sr - \phi(s|\rho||\sigma)}{1-s}. \quad (375)$$

Moreover, the optimal solution s_r satisfies

$$r = (s_r - 1)\phi'(s_r) - \phi(s_r). \quad (376)$$

Proof. Let P, Q be the Nussbaum-Szkoła distributions and let $P_s(x) := P(x)^{1-s} Q(x)^s e^{-\phi(s)}$. Then the derivative of $f(s)$ is given by

$$f'(s) = \frac{-r + (s-1)\phi'(s) - \phi(s)}{(1-s)^2}. \quad (377)$$

The sign of $f'(s)$ depends on the sign of its nominator $g(s) := -r + (s-1)\phi'(s) - \phi(s)$. By taking the derivative of $g(s)$, we have

$$g'(s) = (s-1)\phi''(s) < 0, \quad \text{for } s \in (0, 1). \quad (378)$$

This means that $g(s)$ is strictly decreasing in $s \in (0, 1)$. We also have [Hay17, Exercise 3.45] that,

- $D(P_s||P_1) = (s-1)\phi'(s) - \phi(s)$ and $D(P_s||P_0) = s\phi'(s) - \phi(s)$.
- $\frac{d}{ds} D(P_s||P_1) = (s-1)\phi''(s) < 0$ and $\frac{d}{ds} D(P_s||P_0) = s\phi''(s) > 0$ for $s \in (0, 1)$.
- Let $r < D(P||Q)$. Then there uniquely exists $s_r \in (0, 1)$ such that $D(P_{s_r}||P_1) = r$.

The last item implies that there exists a unique critical point $s_r \in (0, 1)$ such that $g(s_r) = -r + D(P_{s_r}||P_1) = 0$. Together with the monotonicity of $g(s)$, we know that $g(s) > 0$ for $s < s_r$ and $g(s) < 0$ for $s > s_r$. This implies that $f'(s) > 0$ for $s < s_r$ and $f'(s) < 0$ for $s > s_r$. So $f(s)$ is increasing for $s < s_r$ and decreasing for $s > s_r$. This shows that $f(s)$ attains its maximum at s_r . Moreover, we can show that $f(s_r) = D(P_{s_r}||P)$. $\square$

The following shows that the optimal solution s_r is differentiable in r .

Lemma B.3 *The optimal solution s_r is differentiable in r and [Hay17, Exercise 3.51],*

$$\frac{ds_r}{dr} = \frac{1}{(s_r - 1)\phi''(s_r)}. \quad (379)$$

Proof. We have the following

$$1 = \frac{dr}{dr} \quad (380)$$

$$= \frac{d}{dr}((s_r - 1)\phi'(s_r) - \phi(s_r)) \quad (381)$$

$$= \frac{ds_r}{dr} \cdot \frac{d}{ds}((s - 1)\phi'(s) - \phi(s))|_{s=s_r} \quad (382)$$

$$= \frac{ds_r}{dr} \cdot ((s_r - 1)\phi''(s_r)), \quad (383)$$

where the third line uses the chain rule of differentiation. This implies the desired result. □