# Quantum Resource Theories beyond Convexity

Roberto Salazar,<sup>1,\*</sup> Jakub Czartowski,<sup>2,3,†</sup> Ricard Ravell Rodríguez,<sup>4</sup>

Grzegorz Rajchel-Mieldzioć,<sup>5,6</sup> Paweł Horodecki,<sup>7</sup> and Karol Życzkowski<sup>1,8</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Physics, Astronomy and Applied Computer Science, Jagiellonian University, 30-348 Kraków, Poland

<sup>2</sup>Doctoral School of Exact and Natural Sciences,

Jagiellonian University, ul. Lojasiewicza 11, 30-348 Kraków, Poland

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Physics, Astronomy and Applied Computer Science, Jagiellonian University, 30-348 Kraków, Poland

<sup>4</sup>Institute for Cross-Disciplinary Physics and Complex Systems IFISC (UIB-CSIC),

Campus Universitat Illes Balears, E-07122 Palma de Mallorca, Spain

<sup>5</sup>NASK National Research Institute, ul. Kolska 12, 01-045 Warszawa, Poland

<sup>6</sup>ICFO-Institut de Ciencies Fotoniques, The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology,

Av. Carl Friedrich Gauss 3, 08860 Castelldefels (Barcelona), Spain

<sup>7</sup>International Centre for Theory of Quantum Technologies,

University of Gdańsk, Wita Stwosza 63, 80-308 Gdańsk, Poland

<sup>8</sup>Center for Theoretical Physics, Polish Academy of Sciences, 02-668 Warszawa, Poland

(Dated: May 08, 2024)

A class of quantum resource theories, based on non-convex star-shape sets, presented in this work captures the key quantum properties that cannot be studied by standard convex theories. We provide operational interpretations for a resource of this class and demonstrate its advantage to improve performance of correlated quantum discrimination tasks and testing of quantum combs. Proposed techniques provide useful tools to describe quantum discord, total correlations in composite quantum systems and to estimate the degree of non-Markovianity of an analyzed quantum dynamics. Other applications include the problem of unistochasticity of a given bistochastic matrix, with relevance for quantization of classical dynamics and studies of violation of CP-symmetry in high energy physics. In all these cases, the non-linear witnesses introduced here outperform the standard linear witnesses. Importance of our findings for quantum information theory is also emphasized.

# I. INTRODUCTION

In the realm of quantum information theory, resource theories stand as a foundational framework [1-3], elucidating significant results of invaluable quantum resources such as entanglement [4, 5], coherence [6], and quantum thermodynamics [7], among others [8–14]. Resource theories provide a structured understanding of the constraints and manipulations inherent to quantum devices, enabling us to harness their properties for various applications, for instance, quantum computing and quantum communication [8]. An important classification of quantum resources divides them into the categories of convex and non-convex, contingent upon the convexity or nonconvexity of the set of resourceless devices, respectively [8, 15]. While convex resource theories have seen substantial progress, non-convex theories have received less attention due to their mathematical challenges [8].

However, convex resource theories cannot capture crucial properties such as memory in stochastic processes and total correlations in quantum networks, necessitating the development of appropriate non-convex resource theories [8, 16]. These properties, present in processes with an output dependent on a long sequence of past states, are prevalent in various science fields and applied mathematics [17, 18]. Additionally, limitations in classical communication between nodes in large-scale networks [19] make total correlations a crucial resource for future quantum networks such as the quantum internet [20]. Whereas quantifiers applicable to the potential non-convex theories have surfaced [21, 22], the development of free operations, an indispensable part in classifying them in a distinct non-convex class, has remained elusive.

This article addresses the challenge of going beyond the paradigm of convexity, unveiling a novel class of resource theories: Star Resource Theories (SRTs). Unlike previous theories, SRTs pivot on a distinctive geometric attribute; the mathematical representation of their resourceless devices form *star domains* [23]. This characteristic trait delineates SRTs as a unique class, including all convex theories and crucial non-convex resource theories hitherto unexplored in their full depth and potential (see Fig. 1). Within the SRTs class, we present two quantifiers, both novel in their inception, and show their operational meaning, opening new avenues for assessing and characterizing resources within the domain of non-convex theories. Notably, these quantifiers indicate advantages for *correlated* discrimination tasks or the *surplus* of cooperative discrimination tasks, providing novel directions for applications in quantum information.

Moreover, this article marks a pioneering effort, introducing a class of non-trivial free operations for the whole class of SRTs. Additionally, we study the conditions for resource non-generating operations and their connection with the internal structure of the corresponding star do-

<sup>\*</sup> rb.salazar.vargas@gmail.com

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup> jakub.czartowski@doctoral.uj.edu.pl



FIG. 1. Hierarchy of Quantum Resource Theories. Since every convex set is also a star set, the well known family of convex resource theories is a subset of a more general class of star resource theories.

main. The above universal operations shed light on the inter-convertibility of resources within SRTs, paving the way for a deeper understanding of their properties and potential applications.

Intuitively, our setup provides means to exclude that a particular point belongs to a specific set, like the resourceless objects. This capacity can be helpful in various settings, even outside quantum information. Suppose that the evolution of a system cannot lead out of a particular set. Then, the certification that it is outside of it means that either the model or the experimental test is wrong.

Furthermore, we illustrate our results in well-known cases beyond the limitations of convex theories: quantum discord, total correlations, and non-Markovian processes. Additionally, we apply our methods to disprove the unistochasticity of a particular matrix, providing an operational test to demonstrate that, e.g., a classical walk could not have originated from a quantum one. We emphasize that traditional linear witness approaches have negligible (or even none) usefulness in our study cases, underscoring the value of our methods.

Beyond the previous immediate applications, the significance of this work extends to the very foundations of mathematical analysis. The introduction of SRTs hints at a broader mathematical generalization, a leap from the confines of convex analysis to the broader landscape of *star-convex analysis* by pointing out the key features of star domains relevant for practical applications. Additionally, this work aligns with other recent developments in non-linear witnesses [24–26], supporting a transformation in our understanding of constrained sets and offering a mathematical framework that transcends traditional boundaries.

In essence, this article not only presents a novel paradigm in resource theory but also serves as a cornerstone for future explorations. It paves the way for a foundational shift, offering a novel lens to study and manipulate resources, with potential implications ranging from quantum properties to particle physics and ushering in a new era of non-convex analysis. The structure of this work is as follows: In Section II, we introduce the necessary concepts of quantum mechanics related to our study and review the fundamental concepts of quantum resource theories. Section III presents the star resource theories, along with their operational interpretations. Section IV illustrates the practical application of our main result through specific examples of quantum discord, total correlations, unistochasticity, and non-Markovian processes. Finally, in Section V, we discuss our results' implications and potential future applications.

# II. SETTING THE SCENE

# A. Quantum formalism

A compact review of key concepts within quantum formalism becomes indispensable as we explore resource theories of quantum devices. Let us begin with the essentials: The space of pure states of an *d*-level system is described in quantum mechanics by a *d*-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  and the states  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$  are given by vectors of a unit norm,  $|\langle \psi | \psi \rangle| = 1$ , equivalent up to a global phase change  $|\psi\rangle \sim e^{i\phi} |\psi\rangle$ .

Observables within the quantum theory are described by the bounded operators  $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$  on the Hilbert space. A special subset  $\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$  of positive semidefinite operators  $\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{H}) \ni \rho \geq 0$  with unit trace,  $\operatorname{Tr}(\rho) = 1$ , describe what is called density operators, which give the full state-space of quantum mechanics. More specifically, the rank-1 projectors are in one-to-one correspondence with the pure states,  $|\psi\rangle \rightarrow \rho_{\psi} = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ , and their convex combinations provide the mixed states. The set S of quantum states can be endowed with a metric relevant to the single-shot discrimination of the states, namely the trace distance induced by the trace norm,  $\|\rho\|_1 := \operatorname{Tr} |\rho|$ . With this, the optimal minimum-error probability of distinguishing between two states  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  by a single measurement is stated by Helstrom theorem to be  $p = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1)$ .

Evolution of closed systems in quantum mechanics is described by unitary operations, which act on pure states as  $|\psi\rangle \rightarrow |\psi'\rangle = U |\psi\rangle$  and by extension, density operators evolve as  $\rho \to \rho' = U\rho U^{\dagger}$ . Evolution of open quantum systems can be more diverse and is described by completely positive trace preserving (CPTP) maps  $\Theta$  :  $\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{H})$  which take density matrices to density matrices. It has been shown that any CPTP map can be written in terms of Kraus operators,  $\Theta(\rho) = \sum_{i} K_{i} \rho K_{i}^{\dagger}$ , which satisfy the identity resolution condition,  $\sum K_i^{\dagger} K_i = 1$ . Unitary evolution therefore can be seen as a special case of a CPTP map defined by a single Kraus operator. A norm for the channels similar to the trace norm for the states is called the diamond norm. It is defined by the trace norm of the state resulting from acting with a channel  $\Theta$ , optimized over all possible states  $X \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$  on an extended space,  $\|\Theta\|_{\diamondsuit} := \max_{X:\|X\|_1 \leq 1} (\mathbb{1}_d \otimes \Theta)(X)$ . It has been shown that the diamond norm can be approximated efficiently using convex programming procedures [27]. Similarly to the Helstrom theorem for the states, the optimal probability of distinguishing between two channels  $\Theta_1$  and  $\Theta_2$ is expressed as  $p = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \|\Theta_1 - \Theta_2\|_{\diamondsuit})$ . Furthermore, it has been used to prove several results concerning the complexity classes of several categories of quantum computation [28, 29].

Quantum channels on a *d*-dimensional space and states of dimension  $d^2$  are closely related by Choi-Jamiołkowski isomorphism. Consider a maximally entangled Bell state of dimension  $d^2$ ,  $|\Psi_+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=1}^d |i,i\rangle$  and an arbitrary channel  $\Theta$ , which takes *d*-dimensional quantum states to *d*-dimensional states. The Jamiołkowski state is defined by acting with a channel  $\Phi$  on the second party of the Bell state  $|\Psi_+\rangle$  and leaving the first party unperturbed  $J_{\Theta} := (\mathbb{1} \otimes \Theta)(|\Psi_+\rangle\langle\Psi_+|)$  [30, 31].

### B. Geometric fundamentals

A foundational take of essential geometric concepts becomes paramount in developing our framework. In this section, we explore fundamental analytical and geometric definitions necessary for constructing and comprehending our theory of star quantum resource theories (See Fig 2).

In the following, given a set A, we use the standard notation  $\overline{A}$  and  $\operatorname{Int}(A)$  for the complement and interior of A, respectively. Additionally, we write  $\partial A$  to designate the boundary of A,  $\operatorname{Conv}(A)$  to the convex hull of Aand  $\operatorname{Ext}(A) \equiv \overline{\operatorname{Int}(A)}$ , which we name the *exterior* of A, equivalent to the closure of the interior of A. When  $A \subset V$  of some vector space V, we write  $(A \pm x)$  for a particular  $x \in V$  to denote the set of all elements  $a \pm x$ , with  $a \in A$ .

Central in our work is the definition of *star domains* in a vector space V, also known as *star-shaped sets* [23, 32]:

**Definition 1.** Let V be a vector space, then a subset  $\mathcal{K} \subset V$  is *star-shaped* and is called a *star domain* if there exists an element  $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{K}$  such that for all  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}, \lambda \in [0, 1]$  the convex combination  $\lambda \mu_0 + (1 - \lambda)\mu \in \mathcal{K}$ . Any such element  $\mu_0$  is denoted as a *centre* of  $\mathcal{K}$ . Additionally, the property of being a *star domain* is known as *star-convexity*.

Conceptually, imagine a star domain as a set where at least a single point links to every other point in the set via lines that never leave its boundaries. The definition of the star domain includes all non-empty convex sets and a selection of non-convex sets, such as stars or crosses.

Star domains have already a long history of mathematical research, dating back to early Kepler studies of regular star polygons [23] up to other modern exceptional cases such as stellations [33] with an impact on art, culture and graphics [34, 35]. Also, star domains recently found applications in some areas like discrete computational geometry, fixed point theory, optimization and neural networks [36–41].



FIG. 2. Examples of star domains and their natural structures. a) shows a center of the star connected to the whole set, while b) shows the set of all possible centers, known as the kernel of the star. c) Shows some of the largest convex subsets on the star under inclusion, and d) shows support cones tightly separating the star from outer space.

An important aspect of a star domain  $\mathcal{K}$  is its *kernel*, denoted as Ker ( $\mathcal{K}$ ), which comprises the union of all the centres  $\mu_0$  of  $\mathcal{K}$  in a unique, convex set [36]. In addition to the kernel, star-convex sets have multiple internal structures, among which the *convex components* stand out. Precisely, a *convex component*  $\mathcal{K}_y$  of a star domain  $\mathcal{K}$  is a maximal, with respect to inclusion, convex subset of  $\mathcal{K}$ . Evidently, the convex components form a tight covering for  $\mathcal{K}$ :

$$\mathcal{K} = \bigcup_{y \in Y} \mathcal{K}_y. \tag{1}$$

Moreover, the full collection of convex components  $\{\mathcal{K}_y\}_{y\in Y}$  of  $\mathcal{K}$  could be infinite and uncountable, but always their intersection is the kernel of  $\mathcal{K}$  [36]:

$$\operatorname{Ker}\left(\mathcal{K}\right) = \bigcap_{y \in Y} \mathcal{K}_{y}.$$
(2)

Another key aspect of our construction is the use of cones in a vector space V [42, 43]. A subset  $C \subset V$  is a cone if there is an element  $v_0 \in V$  such that for each  $v \in V, \lambda \in ]0, \infty[$  we have:

$$v \in \mathcal{C} \Rightarrow v_0 + \lambda \left( v - v_0 \right) \in \mathcal{C},\tag{3}$$

which often is writen as  $\lambda (\mathcal{C} - v_0) \subset (\mathcal{C} - v_0)$ . If  $\mathcal{C}$  is also a convex set, we call it a *convex cone*. A set  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{C}$  is called a *frame* of C, if T, but no proper subset of T, spans C positively. Particularly relevant to us is the specific case of *convex polyhedral cones*:

**Definition 2.** Let V be a vector space; then a set C is a *convex polyhedral cone* if it is generated by the following convex combination of finitely many vectors  $\{v_0, v_1, ..., v_n\}$  in V,

$$\mathcal{C}: \left\{ v_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \left( v_i - v_0 \right) \mid \alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}, v_i \in V \right\}, \quad (4)$$

where we denote  $v_0$  as an *apex* of C. Additionally if  $\{v_0, v_1, ..., v_n\}$  is the minimal number of vectors to write every  $v \in C$  as in (4) we denote them as *principal vectors*, and n is the *degree* of the cone. In fact, the difference between principal vectors and the apex form the finite frame of the convex polyhedral cone C, See Fig 3.

Notably, when C has a unique apex  $v_0$ , the differences between the principal vectors and  $v_0$  are conically independent, hence  $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i (v_i - v_0) = 0$  implies  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \ldots = \alpha_n = 0$  [44].

A way to visualize a convex polyhedral cone C is as a cone made up of flat faces, like a pyramid. Additionally, the flat faces that make up the cone must be polyhedra, meaning they have a finite number of flat faces and vertices. A fundamental property of every C is their equivalence to an intersection of a finite collection of halfspaces in V with a common vector  $v_0$  [45].



FIG. 3. Two exemplary convex cones, with the one on the left possessing an infinite frame, and the second requiring only a finite frame of degree 7. In each case we highlighted the vectors in the frame, with the full frame for the first cone sketched, as it is infinite.

Likewise, other key types of cones worth to mention are dual and support cones. For a given convex cone Cwith frame  $\mathcal{T}$ , the dual cone Dual (C) has the same apex vectors as C, but with frame  $-\mathcal{T}$ . A convex cone  $C_x$  with apex x and non-empty interior is a support cone of A at xif  $x \in V$ ,  $\text{Ext}(C_x) \supseteq A$  and  $C_x$  is a maximal (with respect to inclusion) convex cone with these properties. Support cones play the same role for star domains as support halfspaces for convex sets, hence in [46] is shown that for a closed and bounded star domain  $\mathcal{K} \subset V = \mathbb{R}^d$ , there exist a support cone  $\mathcal{C}_x$  at every  $x \in \partial \mathcal{K}$ , See Fig. 4.



FIG. 4. An example of a support cone  $C_x$  for the star set  $\mathcal{K}$  with the apex  $x \in \partial \mathcal{K}$  (red gradient with solid boundary), with the entire star set in the exterior of the cone,  $\mathcal{K} \in \text{Ext}(C_x)$ .

Additionally, to eliminate redundancy in our constructions, the following mathematical tool will be helpful: Let  $\mathfrak{A} \succ_{\mathcal{K}} \mathfrak{B}$  be a map from a collection of sets  $\mathfrak{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_x\}_{x \in X}$ into another  $\mathfrak{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_x\}_{x \in X'}$  such that the sets in  $\mathfrak{B}$  are those sets in  $\mathfrak{A}$  with the maximal intersections with  $\mathcal{K}$  under inclusion. The above, means that if  $\mathcal{A}_{x_{\alpha}}, \mathcal{A}_{x_{\beta}} \in \mathfrak{A}$ , but  $\mathcal{A}_{x_{\alpha}} \cap \mathcal{K} \supset \mathcal{A}_{x_{\beta}} \cap \mathcal{K}$ , then  $\mathcal{A}_{x_{\beta}} \notin \mathfrak{B}$ , and the sets in  $\mathfrak{B}$  are only those  $\mathcal{A}_{x_{\alpha}} \in \mathfrak{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{A}_{x_{\delta}} \cap \mathcal{K} \not\supset \mathcal{A}_{x_{\alpha}} \cap \mathcal{K}$ for any other  $\mathcal{A}_{x_{\delta}} \in \mathfrak{A}$ . In this case we will say that  $\mathfrak{B}$  is a *redundancy deletion* from  $\mathfrak{A}$  through  $\mathcal{K}$ , or just a redundancy deletion when  $\mathcal{K}$  is known from the context.

Having covered the previous concepts, we are ready to define the final crucial geometrical concept:

**Definition 3.** We will say that a *fortress*  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{K}}$  for set  $\mathcal{K}$  is a collection of convex cones  $\{\mathcal{C}_x\}_{x \in X}$  such that:

- i)  $\{\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{C}_x\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$  is a covering for V,
- ii)  $\operatorname{Ext}(\mathcal{C}_x) \supseteq \mathcal{K}$  for every  $\mathcal{C}_x$  in  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{K}}$ ,
- iii)  $\operatorname{Dual}(\mathcal{C}_x) \supseteq \operatorname{Ker}(\mathcal{K})$  for every  $\mathcal{C}_x$  in  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{K}}$ ,
- iv)  $\partial \mathcal{K} = \bigcup_{\mathcal{C}_x \in \mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{K}}} (\mathcal{C}_x \cap \mathcal{K})$  with  $\mathcal{C}_x \cap \mathcal{K} \neq \emptyset$  for all  $\mathcal{C}_x$ .

A fortress,  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{K}}$  could be infinite and uncountable, thus when all cones  $\mathcal{C}_x$  are convex polyhedral, that is, of finite frame, we will denote it as a *polyhedral fortress*. Evenmore, note that in the case of  $V = \mathbb{R}^d$  the support cones of  $\mathcal{K}$  always form a fortress  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{K}}$ . Precisely, condition ii) follows from the definition of support cone, while iv) is a simple consequence that a support cone with apex at xexist for every  $x \in \partial \mathcal{K}$ . Validating i) requires considering any point  $z \notin \mathcal{K}$ , and selecting  $w \in \operatorname{Ker}(\mathcal{K})$  to obtain  $z_w = \lambda z + (1 - \lambda)w, \lambda \in [0, 1]$  at the boundary  $\partial \mathcal{K}$ , ensuring  $\mathcal{C}_{z_w} \ni z$  holds for a cone with  $z_w$  as its apex. This property extends to every support cone at  $z_w$ , establishing  $\{\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{C}_x\}_{x \in \partial \mathcal{K}}$  as a covering of V. Finally, note that from the above argument  $w = x + [\lambda/(1-\lambda)](x-x_w)$  is a vector in  $\text{Dual}(\mathcal{C}_x)$  for some  $x_w \in \mathcal{C}_x$ , but since w and x are arbitrary, follows  $\text{Dual}(\mathcal{C}_x) \supseteq \text{Ker}(\mathcal{K})$  certifying iii).

Intuitively, a fortress is a collection of cones whose outer surfaces are glued together to sections of the set, defining the maximal visibility region from a point to the outer space, analogously to the shooting visibility area for artillery at a defense wall of an 18th-century fortress. Indeed,  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{K}}$  must allow each part of the set's outer space to be distinguished, including every point outside it in at least one of the collection's cones. In the 18th-century defensive structures, the above condition recalls the need for exterior points to serve as clear targets for the defender's cannons while excluding the fortress's interior from the potential targets.

# (Summary 1)

# Key geometrical concepts:

- 1) **Star domain:** Abstract geometrical definition of sets with a star shape.
- 2) Kernel: Set of all centers of a star domain.
- 3) **Convex components:** Largest convex sets inside a star domain.
- 4) **Convex polyhedral cones:** Cones generated by a finite collection of vectors.
- 5) Fortress of a set: A collection of convex cones tightly separating the set from the outer vector space.

### C. Quantum Resource Theories

Quantum resource theories (QRTs) offer a way to analyze the employment of quantum properties as resources for practical tasks. It's common to manipulate fundamental quantum objects like states  $\rho$ , measurements **M**, and quantum channels  $\Theta$  in order to exploit the desired quantum properties [8]. In our investigation, we describe objects as quantum channels for convenience, but our results can be extended to states and measurements, which will be covered later.

A resource theory starts by defining the free set  $\mathcal{F}$ , a specific subset of the objects under study  $\mathcal{S}$ . The free set must consist solely of objects lacking the desired property and serves as a benchmark for measuring the advantage of objects with the property. Then, we should include the theory operations  $\mathcal{O}$ , known as free operations, that formally preserve the free set  $\mathcal{F}$  and are naturally suitable for their intended use. At last, we quantify the resourcefulness of  $\mathcal{S}$  by a monotone measure  $\mathcal{M}$  defined as

a non-negative valued function,  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{S} \mapsto [0, +\infty[$ , satisfying  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{f}) = 0$  for all  $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$  and being non-increasing under free operations:  $\mathcal{M}(\psi(\mathbf{s})) \leq \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{s})$  for all  $\psi \in \mathcal{O}$ and  $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$  [8].

The mathematical structure of a resource theory is comprised of the triple  $\{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{O}, \mathcal{M}\}$ , but for it to be considered physically meaningful, it needs an operational interpretation. This interpretation links  $\mathcal{M}(s)$  to the advantage of s in performing a practical task, as described in [8]. Typically, the operational interpretation is specific to each case and based on a prior understanding of the particular task at hand [8]. However, there are also examples of universal interpretations, where the mathematical structure guarantees it to hold for a wide range of resource theories.

An essential class of QRTs with universal interpretation are those in which  $\mathcal{F}$  is a convex set and the limit of any sequence  $\{\psi_n \in \mathcal{O}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is also a free operation, designated as convex resource theories. This class encompasses several well-known QRTs, including entanglement, coherence, asymmetry, and athermality [8]. Convex QRTs, with their inherent mathematical structure, gain from the rich outcomes of convex analysis. The hyperplane separation theorem [47] plays a crucial role in explicitly providing a universal interpretation for these theories. The study in [15] revealed a crucial insight: hyperplane separations determine discrimination tasks for each class of quantum mechanics objects. This breakthrough led to a universal interpretation of convex QRTs.

Takagi and Regula's work in [15] revealed the significance of separation hyperplanes in determining universal interpretations for convex QRTs and opened up a new avenue in convex QRT research. However, this raises the question: Can other hypersurfaces achieve the same outcome? The following section answers in the affirmative and presents a unified class of theories with applications in quantum discord, total correlations, unistochasticity and markovianity.

# **III. STAR RESOURCE THEORIES**

The captivating allure of star-shaped geometrical objects transcends the boundaries between art, mathematics, and the exploration of natural phenomena. Throughout history, artists have woven these intricate shapes into a fabric of expression, ancient symbols from natives of Latin America, adorning Islamic architectural wonders, and finding their place in the meticulous knotwork of Celtic art. Beyond their aesthetic appeal, star-shaped figures have also fascinated mathematicians, particularly in studying star domains and intricate star polygons. As we delve into the depths of aesthetic mathematics, where beauty and precision converge, the historical significance of these shapes beckons us to unravel their secrets for practical applications. Indeed, envisioning the free set as a star domain in the theory of resources opens new possibilities.

### Summary 2

## Quantum resource theory:

It comprises a triple  $\{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{O}, \mathcal{M}\}$ . Here,  $\mathcal{F}$  represents the set of free objects, encompassing entities like quantum states or operations, within a larger set  $\mathcal{S}$ , encompassing the same kind of quantum objects. The set  $\mathcal{O}$  comprises free operations, consisting of functions  $\psi : \mathcal{S} \mapsto \mathcal{S}$  that leave the set of free objects invariant. A function  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{S} \mapsto [0, +\infty[$ , exhibiting monotonicity under free operations and satisfying  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{f}) = 0$  for all  $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$ , is crucial. This function  $\mathcal{M}$  is designated to quantify the resourcefulness inherent to objects within the set  $\mathcal{S}$ .

### Quantum convex resource theory:

An important class of resource theories, characterized by a free set  $\mathcal{F}$  which is convex. Remarkably, there are monotones with universal operational interpretation for this class.

Embarking on the journey to construct a star resource theory necessitates solely a closed star domain as the free set  $\mathcal{F}$ , coupled with a fortress  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$ . Remarkably, we demonstrate the consistent construction of an appropriate fortress  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$  for any closed star domain  $\mathcal{F}$  encompassing quantum states, channels, or measurements with suitable representations. Building upon this foundation, we introduce two novel quantifiers  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}$  ( $\cdot | \mathcal{F}$ ) and  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}$  ( $\cdot | \mathcal{F}$ ), depicting their practical significance in correlated discrimination tasks and the surplus of cooperative discrimination tasks, respectively.

Later, in our quest for non-trivial free operations  $\mathcal{O}$ , we unveil a universally valid class applicable to any closed star domain  $\mathcal{F}$ . Furthermore, we delve into expanded classes imposing additional suitable constraints on the star structure of  $\mathcal{F}$  and its relation with the corresponding fortress  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$ , uncovering their meaningful implications across multiple concrete applications.

Aside from the fascinating geometry of star shapes, we will see how to exploit their features to construct resource theories applicable in quantum technologies, deepen our understanding of physical models and motivate the development of new mathematical tools. Then, formally we denote a star resource theory in the following:

**Definition 4. (SRT)**: We designate a resource theory  $\{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{O}, \mathcal{M}\}$  as a *star resource theory* if:

- 1) The free set  $\mathcal{F}$  is a closed star domain.
- 2) There exist a fortress  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$  for the free set.

3) The limit of any sequence  $\{\widehat{\Lambda}_n \in \mathcal{O}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is also a free operation in  $\mathcal{O}$ .



Examples of geometrical shapes satisfying the conditions for a free set in a SRT are common in some ancient cultures as well as artistic designs (See Fig. 5). Exploiting these geometrical wonders becomes a conduit for understanding and harnessing the inherent properties of nature, revealing a harmonious intersection where artistry, mathematics, and resource theory coalesce to unlock the mysteries of the world around us.

# A. Free set and fortress

The crucial feature of the free set in our theories stems from being a *star domain* closed subset  $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{S}$  of the objects under study, where  $\mathcal{S}$  also possesses a vector space structure with an inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ . However, it is worth noting that linear real representations, like the generalized Bloch ball [48, 49], exhibit a property where convex combinations of two quantum objects transform into convex combinations of the same objects. Consequently, this property ensures that convex sets of quantum objects retain their convexity within the linear real representation. Furthermore, the above phenomenon extends to star domains, transforming them into star domains as well, as they retain their characteristic structure by pre-



serving convex combinations involving quantum objects within the kernel.

The previous property allows us to consistently choose  $V = \mathbb{R}^D$  in the geometric definitions of subsection IIB when restricted to quantum objects. Indeed, any quantum star domain within the original set translates to a star domain within a linear real representation. Even more, appropriate linear representations exist in the larger landscape of causal general probabilistic theories [50, 51], and quantifiers analogous to the ones we use in this work [15]. In summary, our methods are extensive to essentially all meaningful physical theories.

Utilizing the above observation, we could regard a quantum  $\mathcal{F}$  as a star domain within  $\mathbb{R}^D$ , and select the collection  $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{F}} = \{\mathcal{C}'_x\}_{x\in\partial\mathcal{F}}$  comprised of support cones, as the fortress in the linear representation. While this fact already proves the existence of a fortress for quantum SRTs, employing the entire set of support cones might prove unpractical due to its demand for a cone at each boundary point of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Since, later, we will evaluate the quantifier separately at each cone in the fortress, selecting  $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{F}}$  would often necessitate redundant evaluations. Nonetheless, we provide a method for substantial enhancement in this selection, offering the prospect of a notable reduction in the required support cones, limiting the evaluation of quantifiers to a finite number in several scenarios.

Addressing the previous difficulty, we employ the process of redundancy deletion through  $\mathcal{F}$  on the collection  $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{F}}$ . This streamlining method eliminates unnecessary cones while retaining vital information about boundary  $\partial \mathcal{F}$ , resulting in a more practical  $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{F}} \succ_{\mathcal{F}} \{\mathcal{C}_x\}_{x \in X}$ . Ensuring that the crucial properties of  $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{F}}$  persist within  $\{\mathcal{C}_x\}_{x \in X}$  requires confirming that every cone in  $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{F}}$  satisfies the fortress conditions i)-iv). Since  $\mathcal{C}_x$  is a support cone, conditions ii) and iii) are satisfied. In addition, as the deletion process  $\succ_{\mathcal{F}}$  preserves the maximal intersections iv) is also fulfilled. The demonstration of i) is more involved, so to keep clarity in our exposition we leave it for the Appendix V A 1.

Next, it is relevant for us a structure induced by the fortress into  $\mathcal{F}$ . For every  $\mathcal{F}$  which is a closed star domain we can decompose it in a unique collection of convex components  $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}} = \{\mathcal{F}'_y\}_{y \in Y}$ , moreover if we can construct a fortress  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{F}} = \{\mathcal{C}_x\}_{x \in X}$ , for every convex cone  $\mathcal{C}_x \in \mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$  we can generate a sub-collection  $\{\mathcal{F}_y\}_{y \in Y_x}$  of convex components by redundancy deletion  $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}} \succ_{\mathcal{C}_x} \{\mathcal{F}_y\}_{y \in Y_x}$ . Nevertheless, there still might be many convex components with the same maximal intersection with  $\mathcal{C}_x$ , a redundancy which it is also desirable to eliminate. To solve the previous inconvenience, first consider a sub-collection of all  $\{\mathcal{F}_y\}_{y \in Y_x}$ , with the same overlap with  $\mathcal{C}_x$ , i.e.  $\{\mathcal{F}_z\}_{z \in \mathbb{Z}_x^n} \subset \{\mathcal{F}_y\}_{y \in Y_x}$  such that for all  $z \in \mathbb{Z}_x^n$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_z \cap \mathcal{C}_x = \mathcal{J}_\eta^x$ , with  $\mathcal{J}_\eta^x$  a maximal intersection of convex components and  $\mathcal{C}_x$ . Second, we define a *free section*  $\mathcal{F}_\eta^{(x)}$ 

components  $\{\mathcal{F}_z\}_{z\in \mathbb{Z}_r^\eta}$ :

$$\mathcal{F}_{\eta}^{(x)} = \bigcap_{z \in Z_{x}^{\eta}} \mathcal{F}_{z}, \tag{5}$$

which are all convex subsets of  $\mathcal{F}$ , and  $\operatorname{Conv}(\operatorname{Ker}(\mathcal{F}) \cup \mathcal{J}_{\eta}^{x}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\eta}^{(x)}$ . Also, from the definition of fortress  $\partial \mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{x,\eta} \mathcal{J}_{\eta}^{x}$ , and since for a star domain  $\mathcal{F}$  every point is a convex combination between a point at the boundary and the kernel, we have:

$$\bigcup_{x,\eta} \mathcal{F}_{\eta}^{(x)} \supseteq \bigcup_{x,\eta} \operatorname{Conv}(\operatorname{Ker}(\mathcal{F}) \cup \mathcal{J}_{\eta}^{x}) = \mathcal{F}.$$
 (6)

Even more, since each  $\mathcal{F}_{\eta}^{(x)}$  is a subset of  $\mathcal{F}$  follows:

$$\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{x,\eta} \mathcal{F}_{\eta}^{(x)},\tag{7}$$

and hence  $\{\mathcal{F}_{\eta}^{(x)}\}_{\eta\in\Sigma_x,x\in X}$  is a covering of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Later, by taking  $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)} = \{\mathcal{F}_{\eta}^{(x)}\}_{\eta\in\Sigma_x}$  we obtain a collection containing all the information about the intersection between  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_x$ , using a minimal number of convex subsets. If at this point every number  $\Sigma_x$  of maximal sections  $\mathcal{J}_{\eta}^x$  is finite we are done and we could select  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{F}} = \{\mathcal{C}_x\}_{x\in X}$ , denoting it as the *canonical fortress*.

For any type of quantum object there is linear representations where the set of valid objects  $\mathcal{S}$  is bounded [48, 49], which implies that also  $\mathcal{F}$  is bounded. Moreover, it is known that each closed subset of the reals is the disjoint union of a perfect set and a countable set [52]. While a perfect set could still be pathological, such as a Cantor set and the countable set could be infinite, in practice quantum objects have always a finite fidelity  $\epsilon$  which determines a neighborhood of the object where each one is indistinguishable from others. Assuming a finite distinguishability  $\delta_{\epsilon}$ , we could use a minimal finite union of disjoint compact intervals in the reals,  $\delta_{\epsilon}$ -indistinguishable from both perfect and countable sets composing the set of intersections  $\mathcal{J}_{\eta}^{x}$ , to replace it. Similarly, a finite  $\delta_{\epsilon}$ -approximation of every frame  $\mathcal{T}_x$ corresponding to a  $C_x$  generates a polyhedral fortress. Hence, for quantum objects with finite distinguishability  $\delta_{\epsilon}$ , we always can find a fortress  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{F}} = \{\mathcal{C}_x\}_{x \in X}$  leading to sections  $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)} = \{\mathcal{F}_{\eta}^{(x)}\}_{\eta \in \Sigma_x}$  where  $\Sigma_x$  is finite and any further refinement is physically irrelevant.

#### B. Monotones

For every  $\mathcal{F}$  which is a closed star domain of quantum objects we can exploit the geometrical considerations of the previous section, to always obtain a fortress  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{F}} = {\mathcal{C}_x}_{x \in X}$ , with every cone  $\mathcal{C}_x$  leading to a finite collection of free sections  $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)} = {\mathcal{F}_j^{(x)}}_{j=1}^{M_x}$ . Then, provided a quantifier  $\mathcal{M}(\cdot|\mathcal{X}) : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , such that  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi \mid \mathcal{X}) = 0$ 

### Summary 3

### Key construction remarks of Quantum SRTs:

- 1) A star domain of quantum objects it is also a star domain in any lineal real representation.
- 2) For any star domain in a lineal real representation we can select the set of support cones as a fortress.
- 3) The full set of support cones is usually an unpractical choice of fortress. However, we show that under redundancy deletion, we obtain a more economic fortress.
- 4) We denote as free section the intersection of all convex components overlapping at the same maximal intersection surface with a cone of the fortress.

if  $\Phi \in \mathcal{X}$  we define for every  $\mathcal{C}_x \in \mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$  a domain  $\mathcal{D}^{(x)} = \mathcal{C}_x \cup_j \mathcal{F}_j^{(x)}$  and a monotone  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\cdot \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)}) : \mathcal{D}^{(x)} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ :

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)}\right) = \mathbb{G}_{j}\left[\mathcal{M}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}^{(x)}\right)\right]$$
(8)

where  $\mathbb{G}_j[x_j] := \sqrt[M]{\prod_{j=1}^M x_j}$  is the geometric average of the M variables  $x_j$ , which in our case are the  $M_x$  convex subsets  $\mathcal{F}_j^{(x)}$  when we evaluate an object  $\Theta \in \mathcal{D}^{(x)}$ . Some examples of  $\mathcal{M}(\cdot | \mathcal{F}_j^{(x)})$  used in QRTs are the generalized robustness, the minimum trace distance for states, diamond norm for channels and operator norm for measurements [8]. The geometric intuition of (8) becomes evident in the particular case that  $\mathcal{M}$  is a distance quantifier  $\mathcal{L}$ ; in such a case, the condition  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}(\Theta | \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)}) = \text{const deter$ mines a hyperbolic surface asymptotically approaching $the free sections <math>\mathcal{F}_j^{(x)}$ . This observation reveals that  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}$ corresponds to the hyperbolic hypersurface –asymptotic to the free sections of  $\mathcal{F}$ – that best distinguishes the resource from free objects. In this way, our quantifier extends previous methods based on separation hyperplanes [13, 15, 53] to hyperbolic separation hypersurfaces.

Because the collection  $\{\mathcal{D}^{(x)}\}_{x\in X}$  is a covering of  $\mathcal{S}$  for all  $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}$  there exist at least one  $x^*$  such that  $\Theta \in \mathcal{D}^{(x^*)}$ , allowing us to define:

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}\right) = \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{(x)}:\Theta \in \mathcal{D}^{(x)}} \left\{ \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)}\right) \right\}$$
(9)

By construction when  $\Phi \in \mathcal{F}$  we obtain  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Phi \mid \mathcal{F}) = 0$ since in that case  $\Phi \in \mathcal{F}_{j}^{(x)}$  for some j at the domains evaluated in (9). Evenmore, it is direct to verify that a quantifier  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$  is faithful if  $\mathcal{M}$  is faithful. Additionally, if  $\mathcal{M}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{X})$  is a convex function relative to a convex set  $\mathcal{X}$ , then every  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\cdot \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)})$  is also convex. Hence, for any convex combination of two resources  $\Theta_1, \Theta_2$  with the same domain  $\mathcal{D}^{(x)}$  of evaluation in (9), the quantifier  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$  is also convex. Consequently, the virtues of  $\mathcal{M}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{X})$  when  $\mathcal{X}$  is convex are inherited by  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$  when  $\mathcal{F}$  is a non-convex star domain, which does not happen when applying  $\mathcal{M}$  directly to  $\mathcal{F}$  [21].

A general case in which the quantifier  $\mathcal{M}(\cdot | \mathcal{X})$  is directly applicable to  $\mathcal{F}$ , we consider monotones based on a decomposition into sub-convex sets [22, 54]:

$$\mathcal{M}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}\right) = \inf_{\mathcal{F}_{\zeta} \subseteq \mathcal{F}} \mathcal{M}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{\zeta}\right)$$
(10)

with  $\{\mathcal{F}_{\zeta}\}$  any collection of convex subsets, satisfying  $\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{\zeta} \mathcal{F}_{\zeta}$ . For this case, it is straightforward to show the following simple upper and lower bounds:

$$\mathcal{M}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}) \le \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \Theta \mid \mathcal{F} \right) \le \mathcal{M}(\Theta \mid \operatorname{Ker} \left[ \mathcal{F} \right] \right).$$
(11)

Remarkably, Lipschitz-continuity of several  $\mathcal{M}(\cdot | \mathcal{F})$  is enforced by star-convexity of  $\mathcal{F}$ , for instance in the case of generalized robustness [21]. The former remark reveals that our fundamental assumptions also contribute to showing the existence of well-behaved lower bounds and underscores its relevance for the mathematical wellbehavior of quantifiers of the form (10).

Additionally, an upgrade of quantifier (9) helpful to deal with general resource non-generating operations is the following:

$$\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}, \overline{\mathcal{O}}\right) = \sup_{\widehat{\Lambda} \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}} \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\widehat{\Lambda}\left[\Theta\right] \mid \mathcal{F}\right)$$
(12)

where  $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$  is a subset of valid operations mapping  $\mathcal{F}$  into itself, and such that any sequence  $\{\widehat{\Lambda}_n \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to an operation in  $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ . With these definitions the supremum in (12) is reached by a concrete  $\widehat{\Lambda}^* \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}$  and the quantifier  $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{M}}$  is non increasing under the full set  $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ .

In contrast to previous approaches in the literature [21, 22], our resource quantifiers  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{M}}$ , when applied to non-convex sets, present a novel methodology that departs from the conventional practice of selecting a single convex section of the entire set. Earlier quantifiers often relied on identifying a minimally distinguishable subset from the resource, a process prone to non-uniqueness, thereby introducing ambiguity in the task for which the resource is advantageous. In our novel approach, we adopt a distinctive strategy by simultaneously considering all pertinent convex sections of the complete set. This simultaneous consideration significantly mitigates ambiguity in resource assessment, offering a distinct understanding of the advantage provided (Fig. 6).

Moreover, with simple error propagation arguments, we show in Appendix V B 1 that in a scenario of computational or measurement errors the relative error of the quantifier (9) is smaller than the corresponding relative error of monotone (10):

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Sigma}} \frac{\delta \mathcal{M}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F})}{\mathcal{M}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F})} \ge \frac{\delta \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F})}{\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F})}.$$
(13)

where  $\Sigma \geq 1$  depends of  $\Theta$  and  $\mathcal{F}$ . Thus, our approach suppresses the effect of relative errors in contrast to previous works. Hence, by encompassing multiple convex sections simultaneously, our method provides a robust and involved framework for quantifying resources in nonconvex sets, promising advancements in precision and reliability compared to previous methodologies.



FIG. 6. Comparison between different approaches. a) Previous methods associate the monotone  $\mathcal{M}$  with the least distinguishable convex subset of the free set  $\mathcal{F}$  from the resource, introducing ambiguity in the operational resource assessment. b) Our approach, selects the convex subsections of  $\mathcal{F}$  intersecting the support cone that best separates the resource, to constructs quantifier  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ . In this way we reduce ambiguity and make the quantifier more robust against measurement or computational errors.

While our quantifiers are tailored specifically for star domains, a seemingly restrictive condition compared to the broader applicability of previous quantifiers to any non-convex set, this distinction may not necessarily pose a significant disadvantage. Notably, all currently known connected free sets associated with quantum properties exhibit the characteristic of being star domains. Therefore, the limitation imposed by our methodology aligns seamlessly with the prevailing structure of relevant free sets. Furthermore, our approach remains versatile even in cases involving disconnected free sets. These disconnected sets often manifest as unions of individual sets, each inherently star domain (see Example 3 in [54]). We could handle the previous scenarios by applying our methodology at every star-convex subset in the iterations within the resource engines' framework [55], providing a concrete solution. Importantly, using the resource engines methodology to disconnected sets avoids any reduction in the free operations used to manipulate the composing connected subsets. The above situation contrasts with the challenges encountered when dealing directly with the union of disconnected sets, where the free operations undergo significant reduction (See p. 7 in [56]). Thus, our approach aligns with the prevalent structure of known free sets and offers an advantageous alternative to deal with disconnected free set scenarios through the resource engines framework.

### C. Free operations

Delineating the fundamental classes of free operations within star resource theories is crucial for defining how one can manipulate, interconvert, and model resources in the face of environmental degradation; we categorize them into distinct classes, each imbued with unique attributes. Foremost is the class of section preserving operations, which ensures the preservation of free sections within the star domain. Our exploration presents a notable non-trivial case within this category, demonstrating its relevance in real-world scenarios. The second class, Resource Non-Generating (RNG) operations, introduces natural sufficient conditions with the potential to provide profound physical insights. The third class, hyperbolic contraction operations, emerges as a beacon of practical significance, albeit demanding additional conditions. Hvperbolic contractions consistently manifest across diverse applications, underscoring their inherent relevance in resource theories. Beyond these established classes, our exploration extends to potential free operations such as hyperbolic rotations and squeezing maps, offering promising avenues for further refining of the framework.

#### 1. Section preserving operations

Given a free star-convex set of free objects  $\mathcal{F}$  with a suitable fortress  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{F}} = \{\mathcal{C}_x\}_{x \in X}$ , the most natural class of free operations  $\mathcal{O}$  would be those non-increasing, for any  $\mathcal{M}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{F}_j^{(x)})$  composing the quantifier (9), under mild conditions. The simplest way to achieve the above is by demanding every operation to leave invariant each free section  $\mathcal{F}_j^{(x)}$ , hence the name section preserving operations. Formally this requires every  $\hat{\psi} \in \mathcal{O}$  to satisfy:

$$\forall \Phi \in \mathcal{F}_j^{(x)} \Rightarrow \qquad \widehat{\psi}(\Phi) \in \mathcal{F}_j^{(x)}. \tag{14}$$

Depending on how complex the free sections  $\mathcal{F}_{j}^{(x)}$  are, a complete description of (14) could be a formidable task. However,  $\mathcal{F}$ 's star domain structure helps us narrow down the possibilities. Note, for instance, that from (14),  $\mathcal{O}$  must leave invariant Ker ( $\mathcal{F}$ ) since it is a subset of each free section. Hence, the set of kernel isomorphisms is a super-set of section preserving operations. The above fact is generally beneficial when the kernel has a simple structure, which is the usual case in most applications.

Nevertheless, we will see that we can always define section preserving free operations which are nontrivial and meaningful for the universal interpretations introduced later in this article. From the definition of a free section  $\mathcal{F}_{j}^{(x)}$  it directly follows that any operation  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}(\Phi) = \lambda \Phi + (1 - \lambda)\Delta$  with  $\lambda \in [0, 1], \Delta \in \text{Ker}(\mathcal{F})$  for  $\Phi \in \mathcal{F}_{j}^{(x)}$  satisfies (14). Moreover, in Appendix A, we show that each operation  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}$  is non-increasing for (9) if the  $\mathcal{M}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}^{(x)})$  are convex functions like in the case of the generalized robustness or satisfies the triangle inequality as in the case of the trace distance, or diamond norm.

Noteworthy, the previous result is not trivial as it exploits the star-convexity of  $\mathcal{F}$  in several ways. Formerly,

the very existence of Ker  $(\mathcal{F})$  and the convexity of every free section are a natural consequence of the star domain structure. Precisely faithful monotones  $\mathcal{M}(\cdot | \mathcal{X})$ , such as the generalized robustness, are convex functions only if the reference set  $\mathcal{X}$  is convex, as noted in [21]. The above remark points out an advantage of our framework for identifying free operations, in contrast with previous approaches considering arbitrary reference sets  $\mathcal{X}$  for simple faithful quantifiers  $\mathcal{M}(\cdot | \mathcal{X})$ . Later, in Appendix V B 2, the star properties, as well the fortress definition, play an explicit role in deriving that if  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}[\Theta] \in \mathcal{C}_x$  then also  $\Theta \in \mathcal{C}_x$ , a crucial step in demonstrating the monotonicity of (9) under  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}$ .

Furthermore, in our applications we will show this operations inherit a physical meaning from the special role of  $\Delta \in \text{Ker}(\mathcal{F})$  for the concrete examples of non-convex SRT's investigated.

#### 2. Resource non-generating operations

As in the traditional definitions, in our framework, we identify resource non-increasing operations (RNG) mapping the free set into itself, comprising the broadest set of potentially free operations. In addition, the structure determined by  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{F}} = \{\mathcal{C}_x\}_{x \in X}$  within our framework enables us to articulate two distinct sufficient conditions with potential physical implications. Let's denote by  $\hat{\psi}(\mathcal{F}_j^{(x)})$  to the sets of objects  $\hat{\psi}(\Phi)$ , when  $\Phi \in \mathcal{F}_j^{(x)}$ , then the first sufficient condition requires that for every j in  $\Sigma_x$ :

$$\widehat{\psi}\left(\mathcal{F}_{j}^{(x)}\right) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{k}^{(x)} \tag{15}$$

for some k in  $\Sigma_x$ . A direct consequence of (15) is that for every two free objects  $\Phi_1, \Phi_2 \in \mathcal{F}_j^{(x)}$ , each of their convex combinations, get mapped by a linear  $\widehat{\psi}$  into convex combinations of  $\widehat{\psi}(\Phi_1), \widehat{\psi}(\Phi_2) \in \mathcal{F}_k^{(x)}$ , hence preserving convex combinations inside the free sections. In this way, a linear  $\widehat{\psi}$  satisfying (15), not only is RNG, but in some sense evokes the property of preserving commutations, where free sections play the role of a common basis. Similarly, if the collection  $\{\overline{\mathcal{F}}_y\}_{y \in Y}$  denote the convex components of  $\mathcal{F}$ , the second sufficient condition states that for every y in Y:

$$\psi\left(\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{y}\right)\subseteq\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{y'}$$
(16)

for some y' in Y. In this case a linear  $\widehat{\psi}$  satisfying (16) also possess the property of preserving convexity from one  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_y$  into another  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{y'}$ , and later we will see that in concrete cases, such as quantum discord, this property translates exactly into preservation of commutativity. Evidently, operations  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}$  with  $\Delta \in \text{Ker}(\mathcal{F})$  satisfy conditions (15) and (16), however we can find many others by simply studying the isometries of  $\mathcal{F}$ , which are rather simple to characterize in several applications. Once we collect the operations  $\widehat{\psi}$  satisfying conditions (15) or (16), to determine a subset  $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$  of RNGs, we can check if  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$  is non-increasing under  $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$  or arternatively, we can update it and obtain a quantifier  $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{M}}$  as described in Eq. (12).

### 3. Hyperbolic contraction operations

We introduce a distinctive class of potential free operations denoted hyperbolic contraction operations. While demanding additional assumptions, this class proves particularly relevant in numerous practical scenarios where these assumptions find fulfillment. This class consist in operations applied cone-wise, that is  $\widehat{\psi}^x : \mathcal{C}_x \to \mathcal{C}_x$ , forming a collection of operation sets  $\{\mathcal{O}_x\}_{x\in X}$  induced by the fortress  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$ . Consequently, for a cone  $\mathcal{C}_x$  with apex  $v_0^{(x)}$  and frame  $\mathcal{T}^{(x)} = \{t_y^{(x)}\}_{y\in Y_x}$  we can describe them in terms of their action over the frame positive span. For instance if  $\Theta \in \mathcal{C}_x$  with positive span:

$$\Theta = v_0^{(x)} + \sum_{y \in Y_x} \alpha_y t_y^{(x)} \tag{17}$$

with  $\alpha_y \geq 0$ . A hyperbolic contraction  $\widehat{\psi}^x$  is the following kind of unequal scaling over the frame elements:

$$\widehat{\psi}^{x}(\Theta) = v_{0}^{(x)} + \sum_{y \in Y_{x}} \alpha_{y} \lambda_{y} t_{y}^{(x)} \text{ with } \lambda_{y} \ge 0, \text{ and } 1 \ge \prod_{\lambda_{y} > 0} \lambda_{y}.$$
(18)

These operations include several interesting cases, such as squeeze maps when the product of all  $\lambda_y$  equals 1, conic non-increasing order maps when every  $\lambda_y \leq 1$ , or hyperbolic rotations when for every  $\lambda_{y+} = e^{\varphi}$  there is a  $\lambda_{y-} = e^{-\varphi}$ . However, for such operations to be authentic free operations in our framework, it is necessary to ensure the monotonically decrease of quantifier (9).

We can guarantee the previous property through multiple geometric arguments, which vary according to the geometry of the free set  $\mathcal{F}$  and the associated fortress  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$ . Since each argument cannot be applied to the most general case but covers a broad spectrum of possibilities, we will include them as observations when discussing our applications in specific cases. It is enough to establish two essential conditions that will aim to show such arguments: I) when applying a  $\widehat{\psi}^x$  operation, the evaluation of the domain in (9) is precisely  $\mathcal{D}^{(x)}$ , and II) the existence of a correspondence between the free sections and the boundary  $\partial \mathcal{C}_x$  within  $\mathcal{S}$ , which allows showing that each geometrical mean (8) is non-increasing under  $\widehat{\psi}^x$ .

### D. Universal operational interpretation

### 1. Interpretation for distance based monotone

Interactive proofs are a popular way of solving computational problems in computer science [57]. They involve

### Summary 4

### Key advantages of Quantum SRTs:

- 1) Free set: The simple condition of being a star domain applies to all known connected free sets of the literature, and provides a rich geometrical structure with potential physical meaning.
- 2) Quantifier: Faithful, convex function, well-behaved continuity, reduces ambiguity and suppresses the relative errors in contrast to previous approaches. We later show it has novel operational interpretations.
- 3) Free operations: We introduce class of free operations existing in every star resource theory. Additionally, we provide two simple, sufficient conditions to certify resource non-generating operations. Furthermore, we describe a third class of operations rich in instances and relevant for applications.

two types of players: provers and a verifier. The provers send messages to the verifier to help solve a problem, and the verifier uses these messages and their operations to determine the solution accurately. The problem's difficulty depends on the operations the verifier can perform and the resources used in the messages. If players use quantum resources like states, channels and measurements, the proof is called a *Quantum Interactive Proof* (QIP) [28]. In the following, we will follow the tradition in quantum information to simplify the nomenclature by presenting the QIP problems as a game between agents.

The promise game *Close-Images*, which we denote as  $G_I$ , is known to be complete for QIP [29] and it played a major role in proving QIP=PSPACE [28]. In the game  $\mathfrak{G}_{\mathfrak{I}}$  a verifier (Bob) should distinguish between two convex sets of devices, by using the information and devices provided by a yes-prover (Alice) and a no-prover (Eve), which attempt to convince him that both sets are always distinguishable or not, respectively.

We will use a particular instance of the  $G_{I}$  game to provide a universal operational interpretation to all SRT of channels, when the base monotones  $\mathcal{M}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}^{(x)})$  are given by the diamond norm distance of  $\Theta$  to the respective free section:

$$\mathcal{L}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}^{(x)}) = \inf_{\Phi \in \mathcal{F}_{j}^{(x)}} \frac{1}{2} \left\| \Theta - \Phi \right\|_{\diamondsuit}.$$
 (19)

We develop the operational interpretation for channels and diamond norm distances, since this later reduce naturally to the special cases of state, trace norm and measurement, operator norm respectively.

The game  $G_I$  we consider is the distinction between the convex sets  $\{\Theta\}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_1^{(x)}$ , for a  $\Theta \in \mathcal{D}^{(x)}$ . The setting is presented in Figure 7 where a referee (Charlie) provides

a black box to Bob with the promise of originally having the channel  $\{\Theta\}$ , but potentially affected by noise.

Simultaneously, Charlie inform Alice and Eve of the precise model of noise, represented by one of the free operations  $\mathcal{O}$ , say for instance  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}$  or any operation satisfying (14). In this setting, Eve sends to Bob a device with a channel  $\Phi \in \mathcal{F}_1^{(x)}$ . Since Eve is a no-prover, her best strategy is to choose a channel  $\Phi$  as close to  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}(\Theta)$  as possible.



FIG. 7. In the game  $G_I$ , Alice and Eve compete to convince Bob of the answer to a problem posed by Charlie. Bob must determine if a black box from Charlie is different from a test box from Eve. The process starts with Eve sending her box to Bob, then Alice and Bob exchange messages, and finally Bob decides if the boxes are different.

After this, Alice sends to Bob a subsystem A of a state  $\rho_{AA'}$ , Bob labels 0 the black box provided by Charlie and 1 the test box provided by Eve, selecting one of them with uniform probability and applying it to the system send by Alice. After this, Bob sends the output system B back to Alice, where Alice applies a measurement  $\mathbb{M}_{BA'}$  and sends a binary output back to him. Bob, accepts if Alice's output matches the label of the box applied and reject otherwise. Since, Alice is a yes-prover she will choose the best state  $\rho_{AA'}$  and measurements  $\mathbb{M}_{BA'}$  to distinguish between  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}(\Theta)$  and the closest  $\Phi \in \mathcal{F}_1^{(x)}$ . If the binary variable a takes value 1 when Alice succeed to convince Bob to accept and 0 if it fails, the optimal success probability for Alice is [28]:

$$P\left(a=1 \mid \widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}(\Theta)\right) = \frac{1 + \mathcal{L}\left(\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}(\Theta) \mid \mathcal{F}_{1}^{(x)}\right)}{2} \qquad (20)$$

with  $\mathcal{L}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{F}_1^{(x)})$  given by (19). It is known that the above protocol is optimal for Bob's certification [28]. Now, assume that for each set  $\mathcal{F}_j^{(x)}$  there is a pair of Alice(j) and Eve(j) performing independently with Bob an instance of  $G_I$  with the goal to distinguish between  $\{\Theta\}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_j^{(x)}$ , for a  $\Theta \in \mathcal{D}^{(x)}$  exactly as before (See Figure 8). Suppose for simplicity that there is no noise for channel  $\{\Theta\}$ , when Charlie send it to Bob, i.e.  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}$  is such that  $\lambda = 1$ . In this case, the success probability of every Alice(j) is:

$$P(a_j = 1 \mid \Theta) = \frac{1 + \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_j^{(x)}\right)}{2}.$$
 (21)

Note that knowing the success probability (21), is it possible to compute the correlation of success or failures in convincing Bob to accept. In Appendix V B 3, we demonstrate the following relation among the correlation between the success  $e_j = a_j \oplus 1$  of every Eve(j) and the monotone  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}(\cdot \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)})$  as defined in (8):

**Theorem 1.** For a given domain  $\mathcal{D}^{(x)}$  of a star resource theory with free sections  $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)} = \{\mathcal{F}_{j}^{(x)}\}_{j=1}^{M_{x}}$ , a channel  $\Theta \in \mathcal{D}^{(x)}$  and game  $\mathsf{G}_{\mathtt{I}}$  we have:

$$P\left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M_x} e_j = 0 \mid \Theta\right) = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \left[\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}(\Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)})\right]^{M_x}\right] \quad (22)$$

where  $\oplus$  is the sum mod(2) and  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}(\cdot \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)})$  is the geometric average of the diamond norm distances  $\mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}^{(x)}\right)$  of  $\Theta$  to the free sections in  $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)}$ .

Then, playing the same kind of game for every domain  $\mathcal{D}^{(x)}$  including  $\Theta$  and finding the domain with the maximum correlation  $\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M_x} e_j = 0$  we have the statement involving the conditional probability  $P(\cdot|\cdot)$ ,

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}\right) = \max_{\mathcal{D}^{(x)}:\Theta \in \mathcal{D}^{(x)}} \sqrt{\frac{2P\left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M_x} e_j = 0 \mid \Theta\right)}{1}} - 1.$$
(23)

We can effortlessly adapt the operational task described in Theorem 1 to the case in which the study set involves states or measurements. If the theory is about states, then each box is replaced by a channel that, for every input, generates a single output state; then, in the  $G_{I}$ game, each Alice(j) does not send any bipartite state to Bob but performs the optimal measurement to discriminate the resource output state from the output state sent by Eve(i). Likewise, if the theory is about POVMs, then each channel is replaced by a measure-and-prepare channel where the measurement is the POVM, and the output is a classic pointer state labeling the result of the measurement. Alice(i) selects the best simple system input state to discriminate the resource POVM from Eve(i)'s POVM and performs a projective measurement to distinguish the output pointer state. In the case of state theories, the diamond norm turns into a trace norm, while in the case of measurement theories, it turns into the operator norm. Additionally, we treat the particular case of a theory about probability distributions as a theory of diagonal states.

Moreover, our Theorem 1 provides an universal operational interpretation of SRT theories, also enabling the recovery of convex RTs as a limit case. If  $\mathcal{F}$  is a convex set, the cones  $\mathcal{C}^{(x)}$  transform into half-planes, implying  $M_x = 1$ , while due to convexity of  $\mathcal{F}$  we have,  $\mathcal{F}_1^{(x)} = \text{Ker}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{F}$  and thus  $\mathcal{L}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_1^{(x)}) = \mathcal{L}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F})$ . Furthermore, the additional restrictions (14) used in  $G_{I}$ , where the noises affecting  $\Theta$  must keep each  $\mathcal{F}_j^{(x)}$  invariant, reduce to invariance of a single  $\mathcal{F}$ , exactly as in convex resource theories. These facts show how SRTs allow for the recovery of resource quantification and manipulation from convex resource theories.

To sum up, we remark how the necessity for domains  $\mathcal{D}^{(x)}$  with multiple free sections reveals the novelty of SRTs for scenarios with a non-convex set  $\mathcal{F}$ . In such cases, the resource influences Eve's advantage over Alice in each game and simultaneously determines the correlation between game results, with the global correlation being the factor quantified by our measure.



FIG. 8. In the extended version of the  $G_{I}$  game, there is a pair of players,  $\operatorname{Alice}(j)$  and  $\operatorname{Eve}(j)$ , for each section  $\mathcal{F}_{j}$  of a domain  $\mathcal{D}$ . They try to convince a verifier player, Bob, whether a black box is different from a *j*-th test box sent by  $\operatorname{Eve}(j)$ .

#### 2. Interpretation for robustness based monotone

For the quantifier  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}(\cdot \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)})$  based on, the generalised robustness quantifier [5],

$$\mathcal{R}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{X}\right) = \min_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ r \ge 0 \mid \frac{\Theta + r\Lambda}{1 + r} \in \mathcal{X} \right\}$$
(24)

we demonstrate that it relates to the boost of a coalition of  $M_x$  players holding each, a different free set section  $\mathcal{F}_j^{(x)} \in \mathcal{D}^{(x)}$  in a discrimination game. The game's goal is to distinguishing between different evolution branches  $\Xi_i$ induced by a so-called quantum comb  $\Upsilon = \sum_i p_i \Xi_i$  [58], a class of maps taking M quantum operations as input and outputs a target new operation. Quantum combs are extensively used to address process transformation challenges and maximize performance potential. These problems encompass various transformations of unitary operations, such as inversion, complex conjugation, control-U analysis, and machine learning tasks [59–63]. Moreover, they serve as a tool for examining broader process analyses [64, 65] and resource dependence in algorithm success probability [66]. To simplify notation, we consider quantum combs with branches  $\Xi_j$  providing a classical output, i.e.  $\Xi_j : \text{CPTP}^M \longrightarrow q_j$ , for all j a probability  $q_j \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\sum_j q_j = 1$ . The previous quantum combs have quantum circuit implementations of the form:

$$\Upsilon(\cdot) = \operatorname{Tr} \left\{ \mathbb{N} \mathcal{I} \otimes (\cdot) \circ \mathcal{N}_{M-1} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{N}_1 \circ \mathcal{I} \otimes (\cdot) \left[ \zeta_0 \right] \right\} (25)$$

as illustrated in diagrams (26) and (27). In the diagrams the gate  $\mathcal{N}_{\zeta_0}$  is a channel always preparing the bipartite state  $\zeta_0$ , subsequent gates  $\mathcal{N}_j$  are general bipartite channels and finally gate  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{N}}$  performs a POVM  $\mathbb{N}$  with outputs j identifying the branch  $\Xi_j$ . The reason to choose the structure (25), is to integrate into the ensemble of branches  $\{p_j, \Xi_j\}_{j=1}^N$  the preparation  $\zeta_0$  and measurement  $\mathbb{N}$  of the discrimination strategy. We can assume the condition (25) without loss of generality, because later in the discrimination task, both  $\zeta_0$ , and  $\mathbb{N}$  are optimized together with the quantum comb.



In blue an implementation (25) of quantum comb  $\Upsilon$  tested by channels  $\{\Phi_1, ..., \Phi_M\}$  at the red slots.



Here the slots are all filled with the resource channel  $\{\Theta\}$  to distinguish the evolution branches of  $\Upsilon$ .

In games  $G_{\mathbb{D}}[M]$ , each player  $\operatorname{Alice}(j)$  holding channels  $\mathcal{F}_j \ni \Phi_j$  is allowed to test the causal network accessing only one comb slot of the quantum comb depict as red slots in diagram (26). Then, without loss of generality in each game  $\{p_i, \Xi_i\} \in G_{\mathbb{D}}[M]$  we compare the best strategy of the coalition  $\{\operatorname{Alice}(j)\}_{j=1}^M$  against the coalition  $\{\operatorname{Bob}(j)\}_{j=1}^M$  using  $\Theta$  in every comb slot as protrayed in diagram (27). Under this conditions we prove in Appendix V B 4 the following statement:

**Theorem 2.** For a given domain  $\mathcal{D}$  of an SRT with free sections  $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}} = \{\mathcal{F}_j\}_{j=1}^M$ , a channel  $\Theta \in \mathcal{D}$  and discrimination games  $\{p_i, \Xi_i\} \in \mathsf{G}_{\mathsf{D}}[M]$  we have:

$$\max_{\{p_i, \Xi_i\} \in \mathsf{G}_{\mathsf{D}}[M]} \frac{P_s(\{p_i, \Xi_i\}, \{\Theta\})}{\{\Phi_k \in \mathcal{F}_k\}_{k=1}^M} = \prod_{k=1}^M [1 + \mathcal{R}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_k)]$$
(28)

with  $P_s$  the optimal discrimination probability,  $\{\Phi_k\}$ stands for  $\{\Phi_1, \ldots, \Phi_M\}$  and  $\{\Theta\}$  for  $\{\Theta, \ldots, \Theta\}$ , Mtimes. Besides, each  $\mathcal{R}(\Theta | \mathcal{F}_k)$  is the generalised robustness of  $\Theta$  with respect to the free section  $\mathcal{F}_k$ .

Next, we will adopt the approach of cooperative games [67, 68] to evaluate the increase in a coalition's advantage

brought by resource  $\Theta$  when playing games  $G_{\mathbb{D}}[M]$  as a *dividend*. Cooperative games, a branch of game theory, have relevance in areas such as economics [69], machine learning [70, 71] and the voting power of coalitions [72]. A pair  $(S, \mathbf{u})$  formally defines a cooperative game, where S is the complete set of players, and  $\mathbf{u} : 2^{|S|} \to \mathbb{R}$  is a function that maps each possible coalition  $T \subseteq S$  of players within set S to their respective profit or utility and satisfies  $\mathbf{u}(\emptyset) = 0$ .

In our scenario, set S contains players  $\{\text{Bob}_j\}_{j=1}^M$ , and  $\mathbf{u} (\Theta \mid T)$  evaluates the relative advantage each coalition T of Bobs gains over a coalition of Alice's with the same labels j as Bob's in T when playing games  $G_D[|T|]$ , i.e.

$$\mathbf{u}(\Theta | T) = \max_{\{p_i, \Xi_i\} \in \mathsf{G}_{\mathsf{D}}[|T|]} \frac{P_{\mathsf{s}}(\{p_i, \Xi_i\}, \{\Theta\}) - P_{\mathsf{s}}(\{p_i, \Xi_i\}, \{\Phi_k^*\})}{P_{\mathsf{s}}(\{p_i, \Xi_i\}, \{\Phi_k^*\})}$$
(29)

where we set  $\mathbf{u} (\Theta | \emptyset) = 0$  by default and  $\{\Phi_k^*\}$  represents the best strategy of Alice's coalition for the discrimination of  $\{p_i, \Xi_i\}$ . Afterwards, we use the well-known Harsanyi method [73] to calculate the surplus or *dividend* for each coalition T in S. This method identifies a coalition's surplus as the difference between its utility and the surplus of its smaller sub-coalitions. To this end, the Harsanyi dividend  $\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{u}} (\Theta \mid T)$  of coalition T with utility  $\mathbf{u} (\Theta \mid T)$  is recursively determined by:

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{u}}\left(\Theta \mid T\right) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{u}\left(\Theta \mid T\right) - \sum_{T' \subset T} \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{u}}\left(\Theta \mid T'\right) & ; |T| > 1\\ \mathbf{u}\left(\Theta \mid T\right) & ; |T| = 1\\ (30)\end{cases}$$

By using Harsanyi dividends, we can effectively study games and associated solution concepts. One such concept is the *Shapley value*, calculated by dividing the coalition surplus evenly among its members [67, 72]. Notably, employing Theorem 2 in Appendix V B 4, we demonstrate that the dividend determined by utility (29) completely describes the robustness based quantifier:

**Theorem 3.** For a given domain  $\mathcal{D}$  of an SRT with free sections  $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}} = \{\mathcal{F}_j\}_{j=1}^M$ , a channel  $\Theta \in \mathcal{D}$ , and a coalition  $S = \{\operatorname{Bob}(j)\}_{j=1}^M$  and sub-coalitions  $T \subseteq S$ , playing games  $\mathfrak{G}_{\mathsf{D}}[|T|]$  with utility function  $\mathbf{u}$  given by (29), we have:

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{u}}\left(\Theta \mid S\right) = \prod_{k=1}^{M} \mathcal{R}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{k}\right) = \left[\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}\left(\Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}\right)\right]^{M} \quad (31)$$

where  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}(\Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}})$  is the geometric average of the generalised robustness  $\mathcal{R}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_k)$  of  $\Theta$  with respect to the free section  $\mathcal{F}_k$ .

Similarly as in the previous task, by playing the same kind of game for every domain  $\mathcal{D}^{(x)}$  including  $\Theta$  and finding the domain with the maximum dividend for the players, we have:

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}) = \max_{\mathcal{D}^{(x)}:\Theta \in \mathcal{D}^{(x)}} [\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{u}} (\Theta \mid S_x)]^{1/M_x}$$
(32)

where  $S_x$  is now the corresponding coalition of Bob's holding free sections  $\{\mathcal{F}_j^{(x)}\}_{j=1}^{M_x}$ . Additionally, as in the distance-based monotone interpretation, we include state or measurement theories by replacing the general channels for channels with a constant output state or a measure-and-prepare channel, measuring on a POVM and preparing the classical pointer state as output, respectively.

Theorem 3 introduces another universal interpretation for SRTs, recovering the results for convex RTs in the same limit as Theorem 1 ,  $M_x = 1$  and  $\mathcal{F}_1^{(x)} = \mathcal{F}$  for all x, using the same previous arguments. Nevertheless,  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F})$ 's interpretation implies a different aspect of the resource, specifically, its superadditivity when used consecutively in testing the ensemble  $\{p_j, \Xi_j\}_{j=1}^N$ . Theorem 3's insight into the advantage provided by  $\Theta$  also opens new avenues for connecting resource theory and game theory, echoing the path established in [74].

# **IV. APPLICATIONS**

Assessing the quantum resourcefulness through operational witnesses is a crucial step in quantum information processing [8], as it gives us a reliable way to judge the resource levels of various objects. This section will employ our framework in four distinct scenarios. We start characterizing quantum discord and total correlations, then detecting non-unistochastic maps, and finally identifying the non-Markovianity in a mixture of three Pauli channels.

# A. Quantum discord as a star resource theory.

Quantum phenomena are unequivocally distinguished from classical physics by the powerful correlations they generate, most prominently quantum entanglement. However, there are other quantum properties with the capacity to generate non-classical correlations, such as quantum discord [75], widely exploited in computation and communication scenarios [76–79]. The quantum discord corresponds to the difference between fully quantum and measurement-induced mutual information being ubiquitous among quantum states. Nevertheless, discord is a property that proves to be elusive, as computing it, involves minimization over all possible measurements of one out of two subsystems. Furthermore, it does not admit a linear witnesses similar to the celebrated Bell inequalities, to detect entanglement, an absence that stems from the non-convex structure of states with zero quantum discord.

In the face of this limitation, our approach proves fruitful, revealing that the set of states with zero discord constitutes a star domain. Precisely, the geometry of the set enables us to assign a simple polyhedric fortress, facilitating the application of our general results to quantum discord. This results in the derivation of a non-linear operational quantifier and the identification of nontrivial free operations. Furthermore, we demonstrate how to analytically calculate our discord quantifier for relevant cases of the literature.

Consequently, to develop a resource theory of discord, it is crucial to identify the set of zero-discord states. Fortunately, in the literature the following form for twoqubit zero-discord states (on Alice's subsystem) is well characterized [78]:

$$\chi = \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} p_i \left| \vartheta_i \right\rangle \left\langle \vartheta_i \right| \otimes \varrho_i \tag{33}$$

where  $\{|\vartheta_1\rangle, |\vartheta_2\rangle\}$  is a single-qubit orthonormal basis,  $\rho_1, \rho_2$  are qubit states and  $p_1, p_2$  are non-negative numbers such that  $p_1 + p_2 = 1$ . At this point, we can already distinguish crucial geometric features in the structure of the states with zero-discord  $\Omega_0$ . First, the convex combination of any state  $\chi$  with the maximally mixed state  $I \otimes I/4$  preserves the form (33), and therefore,  $\Omega_0$  is a star domain with  $I \otimes I/4$  in Ker ( $\Omega_0$ ). Second, it is immediately possible to distinguish that the convex components of  $\Omega_0$  are precisely the states described in (33) but associated with the same basis,  $\{|\vartheta_1\rangle, |\vartheta_2\rangle$  since these are all the convex and maximal subsets under inclusion. From this, it turns out that operations (14) preserve the base  $\{|\vartheta_1\rangle, |\vartheta_2\rangle\}$  in (33), like  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}$ , which represents a mixture with  $I \otimes I/4$ , or physically, a white noise. Likewise, the sufficient condition (16) for RNGs is equivalent to preserving commutativity since if two  $\chi_1, \chi_2 \in \Omega_0$  are described in (33) by the same basis, the same must be true after an operation which satisfies (16) and the converse follows from the fact that commuting states span by the same basis in (33). Thus, our general framework allows us to recover the sufficiency part of previous results directly [78].

However, to continue exploiting our techniques and general results, we must characterize zero-discord states in a bounded linear real representation of two-qubit states. Along the above direction, we choose the so-called Fano representation [80, 81]:

$$\rho = \frac{1}{4} \left\{ I \otimes I + \sum_{i \in \{1,2,3\}} \{ x_i \sigma_i \otimes I + y_i I \otimes \sigma_i \} + \sum_{i,j \in \{1,2,3\}} T_{ij} \sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j \right\}$$
(34)

where  $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^3$  represent Pauli matrices,  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  denote components of the local Bloch vectors of the reduced states, while the matrix  $T_{ij}$  is known as the correlation matrix. We apply the Fano parametrization to characterize analytically the zero-discord set for a large class of two-qubit states, some of them beyond the currently known in the literature.



FIG. 9. The figures show a tetrahedron representing twoqubit states with maximally mixed marginals (44), in coordinates  $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2, t_3)$ . The upper figure presents in light blue a surface of states with equal resource as quantified by (45). The lower figure highlights in light red the octahedron formed by the subset of separable states, and in solid red the zero discord set  $\Omega_0$  comprised by the axes in *t*-coordinates.

Firstly, to characterize the zero-discord set we show the following theorem (Appendix VC):

**Theorem 4.** Consider the set of two-qubit states with the Bloch matrix parametrization as in (34), but with the following correlation matrix:

$$T_{ij} = t_i \delta_{ij} \tag{35}$$

and satisfying the positivity constraints from section IV.D in [81]. Then, zero discord states are such that only one of the coordinate pairs  $\{(x_i, t_i)\}_{i=1}^3$  could be different from (0,0).

The above condition includes the case when the correlation matrix is symmetric, since in this situation the Pauli matrices could be re-defined using the orthogonal matrix  $O_{ij}$  that diagonalizes  $T_{ij}$ , with  $t_i$  being the corresponding eigenvalues. Similarly, in that case the  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  are the re-defined parameters after a rotation by  $O_{ij}$ .

Later, to further characterize the geometry of  $\Omega_0$  we include the constraint that  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, y_3)$  must have the same support as  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ , i.e. if a coordinate  $x_i$  is zero this implies that a coordinate  $y_i$  is also zero, but the converse is not necessarily true. Then also in Appendix V C we show,

**Theorem 5.** Consider the set of two-qubit states  $\Omega$  with the Bloch matrix parametrization (34), correlation matrix (35) and **y** of equal support as **x**. Then, the set of zerodiscord  $\Omega_0$  states has only one triple  $\{(x_i, y_i, t_i)\}$  which could be different from  $\{(0, 0, 0)\}$  and must satisfy:

$$|x_i + t_i| \le 1 + y_i \text{ and } |x_i - t_i| \le 1 - y_i$$
 (36)

which for a given  $y_i$  determines the region of possible  $\{(x_i, t_i)\}$  of a state in  $\Omega_0$ .

While the constraint on supports, may seem arbitrary, it actually contributes to include important cases such as the well known X states ( $x_1 = x_2 = y_1 = y_3 = 0$ ) [79] or the symmetric states ( $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}$ ) and expand the set of states studied analytically.

Taking advantage of the previous results we can develop a star resource theory of Alice's discord (for Bob's discord, exchange **x** and **y**). Precisely, Theorem 5 shows that  $\Omega_0$  is constituted by three rectangular regions in the planes of coordinates  $\{(x_i, t_i)\}$ , with axes of symmetry  $x_i = t_i$  and  $x_i = -t_i$ . This suggests that rotating the coordinates by  $\pi/4$  in each plane provides a simpler description, therefore we define:

$$u_i = \frac{x_i + t_i}{\sqrt{2}} \quad v_i = \frac{x_i - t_i}{\sqrt{2}} \tag{37}$$

Coordinates  $\{(u_i, v_i)\}$  align with the symmetry axes of  $\Omega_0$  providing a suitable reference frame for our geometrical descriptions. Indeed, in the corresponding coordinate system  $\{\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\}_{i=1}^3$  for  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^6$  the set of quadrants  $\mathcal{C}_{\hat{u}\hat{v}}$  form an appropriate fortress  $\mathfrak{T}_{\Omega_0}$ :

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathring{u}\mathring{v}}: \left\{ \mathbf{r} \mid \mathbf{r} = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \left\{ \alpha_{i} \left(-1\right)^{\mathring{u}_{i}} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{i} + \beta_{i} \left(-1\right)^{\mathring{v}_{i}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{i} \right\}, \alpha_{i}, \beta_{i} \ge 0 \right\}$$
(38)

where  $\mathring{u}$  and  $\mathring{v}$  are the bit strings  $(\mathring{u}_1 \mathring{u}_2 \mathring{u}_3)$ , and  $(\mathring{v}_1 \mathring{v}_2 \mathring{v}_3)$ respectively. Despite  $C_{\mathring{u}\mathring{v}}$  not being support cones, it is straightforward to verify they satisfy the i)-iv) fortress conditions. Moreover, every  $C_{\mathring{u}\mathring{v}}$  defines exactly three free sections:

$$\Omega_{0,i}^{(\hat{u}_{i}\hat{v}_{i})} : \left\{ \mathbf{r} \mid \mathbf{r} = \alpha_{i} (-1)^{\hat{u}_{i}} \, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{i} + \beta_{i} (-1)^{\hat{v}_{i}} \, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{i}, \\ 0 \le \alpha_{i} \le \frac{(1+y_{i})}{\sqrt{2}}, 0 \le \beta_{i} \le \frac{(1-y_{i})}{\sqrt{2}} \right\} (39)$$

with  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . Hence, it is very simple to compute the distance based quantifier for any two-qubit state  $\rho$ with representation:

$$\mathbf{r}_{\rho} = \sum_{j=1}^{3} \left\{ |u_{\rho,j}| \left(-1\right)^{\mathring{u}_{\rho,j}} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{j} + |v_{\rho,j}| \left(-1\right)^{\mathring{v}_{\rho,j}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{j} \right\}$$
(40)

where  $|u_{\rho,j}| \leq \frac{(1+y_{\rho,j})}{\sqrt{2}}, |v_{\rho,j}| \leq \frac{(1-y_{\rho,j})}{\sqrt{2}}, \text{ and } (-1)^{\hat{u}_{\rho,j}} = \operatorname{sgn}(u_{\rho,j}), (-1)^{\hat{v}_{\rho,j}} = \operatorname{sgn}(v_{\rho,j}) \text{ for every } j \in \{1,2,3\}.$ 

Evidently,  $\mathbf{r}_{\rho} \in C_{\hat{u}_{\rho}\hat{v}_{\rho}}$  and consequently we need to compute (8) the trace distance  $\mathcal{L}$  to the free sections  $\mathfrak{C}_{\Omega_{0}}^{(\hat{u}_{\rho}\hat{v}_{\rho})} = \{\Omega_{0,i}^{(\hat{u}_{\rho,i}\hat{v}_{\rho,i})}\}_{i=1}^{3}$ :

$$\mathcal{L}\left(\rho \mid \Omega_{0,i}^{(\hat{u}_{\rho,i},\hat{v}_{\rho,i})}\right) = \sqrt{\sum_{j \neq i} \left\{ \left|u_{\rho,j}\right|^{2} + \left|v_{\rho,j}\right|^{2} \right\}}$$
(41)

and the corresponding geometrical average (8):

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}\left(\rho \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\Omega_{0}}^{(\mathring{u}_{\rho}\mathring{v}_{\rho})}\right) = \sqrt[3]{\prod_{i=1}^{3} \left(\sqrt{\sum_{j \neq i} \left\{\left|u_{\rho,j}\right|^{2} + \left|v_{\rho,j}\right|^{2}\right\}}\right)}$$
(42)

Note, that for every intersection  $C_{\hat{u}_1\hat{v}_1} \cap C_{\hat{u}_2\hat{v}_2} = \partial C_{\hat{u}_1\hat{v}_1} \cap \partial C_{\hat{u}_2\hat{v}_2}$ , by construction corresponds to a symmetry hyperplane of  $\Omega_0$ , thus for any  $\mathbf{r}_{\rho} \in C_{\hat{u}_1\hat{v}_1} \cap C_{\hat{u}_2\hat{v}_2}$  we have:

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}\left(\rho \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\Omega_{0}}^{(\mathring{u}_{1}\mathring{v}_{1})}\right) = \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}\left(\rho \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\Omega_{0}}^{(\mathring{u}_{2}\mathring{v}_{2})}\right) = \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}\left(\rho \mid \Omega_{0}\right) \quad (43)$$

leading to a simple analytical computation of our quantifier. To illustrate further, consider the important case of two-qubit states with local marginals,  $\text{Tr}_A \rho = \text{Tr}_B \rho = I/2$  which are, up to local unitaries  $U_1 \otimes U_2$ , equivalent to states of the form:

$$\rho(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{1}{4} \left\{ I \otimes I + \sum_{i} t_i \sigma_i \otimes \sigma_i \right\}$$
(44)

where  $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2, t_3)$ . The state  $\rho(\mathbf{t})$  has a positive matrix if  $\mathbf{t}$  belongs to the tetrahedron  $\Omega$  defined by the set of

vertices (-1, -1, -1), (-1, 1, 1), (1, -1, 1) and (1, 1, -1)as shown in Fig. 9. In this particular case  $u_{\rho,j} = t_j/\sqrt{2}$ and  $v_{\rho,j} = -t_j/\sqrt{2}$ . Then, from (42) we obtain:

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}\left(\rho \mid \Omega_{0}\right) = \sqrt[3]{\prod_{i=1}^{3} \left(\sqrt{\sum_{j \neq i} \left|t_{j}\right|^{2}}\right)}.$$
(45)

Moving on to the free operations, we notice that section preserving operations are unital since Ker  $(\Omega_0) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$  in the basis  $\{\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\}_{i=1}^3$ , thus in particular operations  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}$ act over  $\mathbf{r}_{\rho}$  as full contractions  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}(\mathbf{r}_{\rho}) = \lambda \mathbf{r}_{\rho}$  constituting white noise. RNGs satisfying (15) include reflections with respect to the origin, axes and planes spanned by a pair  $\{\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\}$  or perpendicular to it, which are positive but not completely positive operators [82]. Also, RNGs include rotations  $U \otimes U$  swapping simultaneously every pair  $\{\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\}$  into another  $\{\hat{\mathbf{u}}_j, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_j\}$ . Because (40) immediately write  $\mathbf{r}_{\rho} \in C_{\hat{u}\hat{v}}$  in terms of the frames  $\mathcal{T}^{(\hat{u}\hat{v})} = \{(-1)^{\hat{u}_j}\hat{\mathbf{u}}_j, (-1)^{\hat{v}_j}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_j\}_{j=1}^3$  we denote  $\lambda_j^{u,\hat{u}_j}$  and  $\lambda_j^{v,\hat{v}_j}$  to the constants of an operation (18) associated with the elements of their frame  $(-1)^{\hat{u}_j}\hat{\mathbf{u}}_j$  and  $(-1)^{\hat{v}_j}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_j$ respectively.

Therefore, by studying Eq. (42) we identify three cone non-increasing order operations (18), first  $\lambda_3^{u,\hat{u}_3} = \lambda_3^{v,\hat{v}_3} = \lambda_3 \leq 1$  determining a class of stochastic transition between populations, second  $\lambda_1^{u,\hat{u}_1} = \lambda_1^{v,\hat{v}_1} = \lambda_2^{u,\hat{u}_2} = \lambda_2^{v,\hat{v}_2} = \lambda_{1,2} \leq 1$  representing a local qubit dephasing channel on Alice's side [83–85], and third a depolarising noise  $\lambda_j^{u,\hat{u}_j} = \lambda_j^{v,\hat{v}_j} = \lambda \leq 1$  for all j, equivalent to  $\hat{\Delta}_{\lambda}$ . In fact all previous hyperbolic contractions constitute operations satisfying (14), precisely because the free sections are spanned by a pair of vectors in some frame  $\mathcal{T}^{(\hat{u}\hat{v})}$ , being part of  $\partial \mathcal{C}_{\hat{u}\hat{v}}$  and reaching the boundary of the two-qubit states  $\Omega$ .

#### B. Witness of total correlations

Consider two parties, Alice and Bob, located far apart. They draw outcomes from their respective alphabets, which have  $n_A$  and  $n_B$  letters, based on the local probability distributions,  $p_A$  and  $p_B$ , respectively. Sharing a common source of randomness  $\lambda$  with a probability distribution  $q(\lambda)$  allows two remote parties to establish classical correlations between their local devices, which they could exploit to solve distributed computational problems [86]. In such setting a conditional probability  $p_{\rm SR}(a, b|x, y)$  of getting outcome a from Alice and b from Bob given inputs x and y, respectively, is given by

$$p_{\rm SR}(a,b|x,y) = \int \mathrm{d}\xi \, q(\xi) p_A(a|x;\xi) p_B(b|y;\xi). \tag{46}$$

where  $q(\xi)$  is the probability distribution of the shared random variable, and  $p_A(a|x;\xi)$ ,  $p_B(b|y;\xi)$  are local conditional probability distributions for Alice and Bob, respectively, conditioned on the separate inputs x, y and the shared variable  $\xi$ . It is well known that the classical correlations achievable in this way give what is called the Bell polytope [87], faces of which define the Bell inequalities, allowing to distinguish classical correlations from the quantum correlations stemming from shared nonlocal quantum states.

When disconnected from their classical or quantum source of shared randomness, Alice and Bob's accessible, but uncorrelated distributions are limited to the product of local distributions,  $p_{NC}(a, b) = p_A(a)p_B(b)$ , which represent a limited subset of the more general bipartite distribution. Investigating classical and quantum sources of correlation relative to this reference distribution provides a theory of *total correlations* [8]. However, such a theory cannot be convex, hindering its development until now. A simple example would be two deterministic scenarios, with the outcomes being 0 for Alice and Bob in the first scenario and 1 for both in the second scenario. A convex combination between the two scenarios clearly cannot be written as a product of two local distributions.

By applying our framework, we can put forward witnesses of total correlations, which certify that a given distribution could not have been achieved without the use of shared random variables.



FIG. 10. Free set for the total correlations, described by Eq. (47) with  $n_A = n_B = 2$ , depicted in the simplex  $\Delta_3$  of 4-dimensional probabilites, with the vertices defined by the deterministic distributions, top two corresponding to 00 and 11 outcomes, and bottom ones to 01 and 10. Note that the shaded gray set is indeed a star domain with centre the orthocenter of the simplex. As can be observed in the two selected cross-sections (blue and red), the set is not convex.

In the context of the total correlation model between Alice and Bob, we incorporate a third party, Charlie, who receives the messages sent by Alice and Bob. Assuming the communication channel is affected by depolarising noise of unknown level  $\epsilon$ , the probability distribution for messages received by Charlie is:

$$p_C(a,b) = (1-\epsilon)p_A(a)p_B(b) + \epsilon\eta \tag{47}$$

where  $\eta \equiv 1/n_A n_B$  is the flat distribution. Furthermore, for later convenience we introduce notation for deterministic probability distributions  $p_{ij}(a,b) \equiv \delta_{ij}^{ab} = \delta_{ia}\delta_{jb}$ . Already at this stage we can identify two simple families of free operations, namely shrinking towards the kernel of the free set, the flat distribution,  $\phi_{\delta}(p(a,b)) = (1 - b)$   $\delta$ ) $p(a, b) + \delta\eta$ , and independent local output relabelings by arbitrary permutations,  $i_A \leftrightarrow \sigma_A(i_A), j_B \leftrightarrow \sigma_B(j_B)$ .

Although  $\mathcal{F}$  is a star domain with the flat distribution  $\eta$  as its kernel, its canonical fortress is neither polyhedric nor finite, requiring extra effort to apply our SRT framework being more costly to compute quantifiers and describe free operations.

However, a strategy to make the problem tractable is to identify a subset  $\mathcal{F}' \subset \mathcal{F}$  which is a star domain, but with a finite polyhedric fortress. The auxiliary free set  $\mathcal{F}'$  should intuitively depict more restrictive physical situations than those accounted for by  $\mathcal{F}$  to serve as a resourceless reference for  $\mathcal{F}$  itself. To fulfil these requirements, a natural suggestion is to build an  $\mathcal{F}'$  made up of device pairs for Alice and Bob, in which one device can access the entire set of local probabilities, and the other can only generate a deterministic output. A natural choice is to fix Alice's (Bob's) output, making the distribution fully deterministic, while allowing Bob's (Alice's) local distribution to vary arbitrarily. This produces two families of subsets of the probability simplex  $\Delta_{n_A n_B}$ ,

$$\mathcal{F}'_{Ai} = \{ p_C(a,b) = (1-\epsilon)p_B(b)\delta_{ai} + \epsilon\eta \}$$
  
$$\mathcal{F}'_{Bj} = \{ p_C(a,b) = (1-\epsilon)p_A(a)\delta_{bj} + \epsilon\eta \}$$
(48)

Union of the above families gives us the subset  $\mathcal{F}'\subset \mathcal{F}$  :

$$\mathcal{F}' = \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n_A} \mathcal{F}'_{Ai}\right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{n_B} \mathcal{F}'_{Bj}\right).$$
(49)

The auxiliary free set  $\mathcal{F}'$  forms, by construction, a polyhedral star domain with kernel equal to the uniform probability  $\eta$ , and free sections equal to the hyperfaces (48). Furthermore,  $\mathcal{F}'$  provides a natural polyhedral fortress  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{F}'} = \{\mathcal{C}_{ij}\}$ , comprised of cones with adjacent pairs of hyperfaces  $\{\mathcal{F}'_{Ai}, \mathcal{F}'_{Bj}\}$ :

$$C_{ij} : \left\{ p_C(a,b) = \eta + \gamma \left[ \delta_{ij}^{ab} - \eta \right] + \dots \right.$$
$$\left. \sum_{k=0}^{n_B-1} \alpha_{ik} \left[ \delta_{ik}^{ab} - \eta \right] + \sum_{l=0}^{n_A-1} \beta_{lj} \left[ \delta_{lj}^{ab} - \eta \right] | \alpha_{ik}, \beta_{lj}, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \right\}$$



FIG. 11. Four faces  $\mathcal{F}'_{Ai}$  (red and blue) and  $\mathcal{F}'_{Bj}$  (green and yellow) of the auxiliary polyhedral free set  $\mathcal{F}'$ , as defined in (48). Note that  $\mathcal{F}'$  is a lower-dimensional subset of the proper free set  $\mathcal{F} \subset \Delta_3$  of the theory of total correlations.

To visualize a concrete case, we fix  $n_A = n_B = 2$ , and represent all joint probabilities p(a, b) in a 3-dimensional simplex  $\Delta_3$ , where each vertex represents a deterministic distribution, with the set  $\mathcal{F} \subset \Delta_3$  taking approximately 30% of the full simplex, as depicted in Fig. 10. In this case there are just four faces, as shown in Fig. 11, with each cone lying between two adjacent faces, eg. red-yellow or blue-green, but not yellow-green. Consequently, in the above case the domains  $\mathcal{D}^{(ij)}$ , each corresponding to the cone  $C_{ij}$ , have a simple form:

$$\mathcal{D}^{(ij)} = \operatorname{Conv}\left[\delta^{ab}_{ij}, \delta^{ab}_{i(j\oplus 1)}, \delta^{ab}_{(i\oplus 1)j}, \eta\right]$$
(50)

In our exemplary case it is easy to identify the regions where two cones meet as:

$$\mathcal{C}_{00} \cap \mathcal{C}_{11} = \partial \mathcal{C}_{00} \cap \partial \mathcal{C}_{11} = \operatorname{Conv} \left[ \delta_{00}^{ab}, \delta_{11}^{ab}, \eta \right]$$
$$\mathcal{C}_{01} \cap \mathcal{C}_{10} = \partial \mathcal{C}_{01} \cap \partial \mathcal{C}_{10} = \operatorname{Conv} \left[ \delta_{01}^{ab}, \delta_{10}^{ab}, \eta \right]$$

with similar boundary regions for arbitrary numbers of outcomes  $n_A$  and  $n_B$ . Since, the overlapping regions consist in symmetry planes of  $\mathcal{F}'$ , the value of the quantifier (8) for a probability distribution inside the plane, will be the same for both overlapping domains. Noteworthy is that the supporting cones of  $\mathcal{F}$  intersect in multiple ways, requiring a more involved analysis to evaluate (9) compared to  $\mathcal{F}'$ -based quantifiers.

Furthermore, every support cone of  $\mathcal{F}$  with an apex in one of the domains  $\mathcal{D}^{(ij)}$  described in (50) intersects the edges  $\operatorname{Conv}[\delta^{ab}_{ij}, \delta^{ab}_{i(j\oplus 1)}]$  and  $\operatorname{Conv}[\delta^{ab}_{ij}, \delta^{ab}_{(i\oplus 1)j}]$ , therefore involving three free sections: one that intersects the apex, and the other two are  $\{\mathcal{F}'_{Ai}, \mathcal{F}'_{Bj}\}$ . This attribute reveals that  $\mathcal{F}'$ -based quantifiers include two out of the three free sections involved in  $\mathcal{F}$ -based quantifiers.



FIG. 12. Four separating hyperbolic surfaces, based on the witnesses  $W_{TC}$ . The surfaces separate the set  $\mathcal{F}$  of uncorrelated distributions from a significant portion of those with total correlations.

Besides, using the free sections and domains defined above we find a set of hyperbolic contracting (18) type of free operations for the theory based on the auxiliary free set  $\mathcal{F}'$ . Concretely, the frames  $\mathcal{T}^{(ij)}$  of cones  $C_{ij}$  are:

$$\mathcal{T}^{(ij)} \equiv \{\delta^{ab}_{ij} - \eta, \delta^{ab}_{ik} - \eta, \delta^{ab}_{lj} - \eta\}_{k \neq j, l \neq i} \qquad (51)$$

then, we present the set of free operations (18) with constants  $\lambda_{rq}^{(ij)}$  associated with vector  $\delta_{rq}^{ab} - \eta \in \mathcal{T}^{(ij)}$  in Appendix V D 1. Nevertheless, here we note that cone order-preserving operations with  $\lambda_{rq}^{(ij)} \leq 1$ , and  $\lambda_{ij}^{(ij)} = 1$ consist in stochastic processes over  $p_C$  projecting it to distributions in  $\mathcal{F}'_{Ai}, \mathcal{F}'_{Bj}$  along a cross section like those shown in Fig. 10. Indeed, the operations described previously represent the possibility of degrading Alice or Bob's resources for a given output, forming a set of RNG operations with respect to  $\mathcal{F}$  in our exemplary case (See Appendix V D 1 for details). This fact reflects that the choice of  $\mathcal{F}'$  not only has practical benefits but also is physically meaningful.

Now we have full construction of the theory based on the auxiliary free set  $\mathcal{F}' \subset \mathcal{F}$  and we are ready to formulate a hyperbolic witness of total correlation steam from the monotones defined for  $\mathcal{F}'$ . In order to obtain the tightest witness, we consider the maximal value of monotone  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}$  achievable by any uncorrelated probability distribution  $p(a, b) \in \mathcal{F}$ ,

$$\mathcal{G}_{\text{crit}} = \max_{p(a,b)\in\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}\left(p(a,b) \mid \mathcal{F}'\right).$$
(52)

In Appendix VD we provide explicit calculations of the critical value, finding  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{crit}} = \frac{1}{16}$ . Using the above we can define the hyperbolic witness of total correlations as

$$\mathcal{W}_{TC}[p(a,b)] = \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}\left(p(a,b) \mid \mathcal{F}'\right) - \frac{1}{16}.$$
 (53)

We can tell that if  $\mathcal{W}_{TC}[p(a,b)] > 0$ , then  $p(a,b) \notin \mathcal{F}$ ; It is not, however, a tight witness, i.e.  $\mathcal{W}_{TC}[p(a,b)] \leq 0$ does not certify absence of total correlations. Thus, it is the first resource theory up to date that allows to distinguish potentially local distributions from ones that must have used either classical or quantum shared randomness.

# C. Witness of non-unistochasticity

Classical stochastic processes require conservation of probability, which, on the level of transition matrices, translates into the normalization of columns – the sum of (non-negative) elements in each of them is equal to one. When, additionally, the rows of a matrix are normalized such matrix B is called *bistochastic*; for all i we have  $\sum_{j} B_{ij} = \sum_{j} B_{ji} = 1$ . A ubiquitous notion in the quantum domain is a *uni*-

A ubiquitous notion in the quantum domain is a *uni*tary matrix U. Such matrices have orthonormal rows and columns; thus, the sum of squared absolute values of elements in rows/columns are equal to one, for all i we have  $\sum_{j} |U_{ij}|^2 = \sum_{j} |U_{ji}|^2 = 1$ . Therefore, it is straightforward to construct a bistochastic matrix out of a unitary one

$$B_{ij} \coloneqq |U_{ij}|^2. \tag{54}$$

Alternatively, one may ask if it is possible to create a unitary matrix through some reverse operation for unspecified phases  $\phi_{ij}$ , defined as  $U_{ij} := e^{i\phi_{ij}} \sqrt{B_{ij}}$ . However, since the unitarity requires not only the normalization but the orthogonality of the rows/columns, then there are additional constraints on the phases. More specifically, in every dimension d > 2 there are bistochastic matrices without unitary counterparts. The problem of determining whether a given bistochastic matrix is *unistochastic* (has a unitary counterpart) is solved fully for d = 3 [88, 89], for d = 4 several important sets were characterized [90, 91] together with a numerical algorithm determining the unistochasticity of a given matrix [92, 93], while for d > 5 only the unistochasticity of certain small-dimensional subsets was classified [93, 94].

The unistochasticity problem is important from the perspective of particle physics [95–97], quantum walks [98], and classical to quantum transition [99, 100], to mention only a few of the applications. The geometry of the set of bistochastic matrices is given by a Birkhoff polytope, whose vertices are permutation matrices. It is conjectured that the set of unistochastic matrices is starshaped – in fact, its superset was shown to be star-shaped with respect to the central, van der Waerden matrix [91].



FIG. 13. The set of bistochastic circulant matrices of dimension 4 forms a regular tetrahedron. (a) Inside the tetrahedron, one can distinguish a non-convex set  $\mathcal{F}$  of unistochastic matrices, depicted as a blue set. (b) The auxiliary free set  $\mathcal{F}'$ of our theory is given by a union of two equilateral triangles contained inside the unistochastic set.

Our rationale can be understood as a complementary effort to the certification of the unistochasticity of a given matrix. The validity of this approach lies in the disproving of unitary-evolution theories. Although we believe that the microscopic description of the world is given by quantum mechanics, the actual experiments conducted in a laboratory result in a set of real numbers, not complex as would be suggested by the unitary evolution. For example, any unitary transition between a set of quantum states, such as CKM (Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa) and PMNS (Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata) matrices [101–104], is probed by transition probabilities, which are squared absolute values of complex entries of the unitary matrix, forming a bistochastic one via Eq. (54). However, bistochastic matrices without unitary counterparts cannot be modeled by an underlying unitary, quantum evolution. Thus, suppose that the bistochastic matrix of neutrinos mixing, obtained in the experiment, is not unistochastic. This would show that there does not exist a PMNS matrix explaining their evolution, indicating a necessity of a new theory.

We illustrate how to apply our techniques to address the problem of unistochasticity by focusing on the circulant bistochastic matrices of dimension d = 4 studied in depth in [91] and shown in Fig. 13. In this case, a natural free set consists of a set of unistochastic circulating matrices, which forms a star domain in its real representation within the tetrahedron of circulant bistochastic matrices. Using the operational task associated with a support cone, we can use the canonical fortress related to such a free set to detect each non-unistochastic circulating matrix. However, due to the presence of locally non-convex points along the boundary of unistochastic matrices, employing an auxiliary free set, similar to our strategy with total correlations, proves computationally more efficient.

In this example, as an auxiliary free set  $\mathcal{F}'$ , we choose the union of two triangles,  $\mathcal{F}_1$  and  $\mathcal{F}_2$ , entirely included in the unistochastic set, described in terms of the identity  $\Pi_4^0$  and permutations  $\Pi_4$ ,  $\Pi_4^2$ ,  $\Pi_4^3$  [91], yielding:

$$\mathcal{F}_{1}: \left\{ B = a \,\Pi_{4}^{0} + b \,\Pi_{4}^{2} + (1 - a - b) \,\frac{\Pi_{4} + \Pi_{4}^{3}}{2} \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{2}: \left\{ B = a \,\Pi_{4} + b \,\Pi_{4}^{3} + (1 - a - b) \,\frac{\Pi_{4}^{0} + \Pi_{4}^{2}}{2} \right\},$$
(55)

with  $0 \le a, b \le 1$ . Joining them we compose the auxiliary free set,

$$\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2. \tag{56}$$

Evidently  $\mathcal{F}'$  is a star domain with kernel  $\operatorname{Ker}(\mathcal{F}')$ :  $\{B = W_4 + \alpha (\frac{\Pi_4 + \Pi_4^3}{2} - W_4)\}$ , where  $\alpha \in [-1, 1]$  and  $W_4$  is the van der Waerden matrix at the center of the tetrahedron. Also,  $\mathcal{F}_1$  and  $\mathcal{F}_2$  constitute the only convex components of  $\mathcal{F}'$ , while the canonical fortress include the four cones:

$$\mathcal{C}_{ij} : \left\{ B = W_4 + \alpha_+ \left( \frac{\Pi_4 + \Pi_4^3}{2} - W_4 \right) + \beta_i \left( \Pi_4^i - W_4 \right) + \alpha_- \left( \frac{\Pi_4^0 + \Pi_4^2}{2} - W_4 \right) + \beta_j \left( \Pi_4^j - W_4 \right) \right\}$$
(57)

where  $\alpha_+, \alpha_-, \beta_i, \beta_j \geq 0$ ,  $i \in \{0, 2\}$  and  $j \in \{1, 3\}$ . Crucially, all four cones  $C_{ij}$  determine as free sections the sets  $\mathcal{F}_1$  and  $\mathcal{F}_2$ , making irrelevant to determine in which cone the target bistochastic matrix B lies. The above fact paves the way for Bob certifying non-unistochasticity of B by means of a sequence of operational tests, without complete knowledge of B.



FIG. 14. The blue surface divides the circulant bistochastic matrices of dimension d = 4 into a subset containing only the non-unistochastic matrices. The figure emphasizes one quadrant of the full tetrahedron, while the behaviour in the others is analogous. The maximal geometric mean of distances to the yellow planes for unistochastic matrices reads  $\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \approx 0.353$ , and this value was chosen in order to construct the optimal dividing hyperbolic surface.

The certification protocol requires two steps. Firstly, we exploit the convexity bistochastic circulant processes, to check that B belongs to that set, by means of the discrimination protocols like those in [15]. Later, if B pass the previous test, we proceed with the operational task of Theorem 1, to distinguish B from both  $\mathcal{F}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_2$ , and compute the quantifier using (23). Finally if the quantifier is greater than  $\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}$  then the matrix is not unistochastic (for a proof of the critical value see Appendix V F). Therefore, we have the following witness of non-unistochasticity:

$$\mathcal{W}_{NU}[B] = \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}\left(B \mid \mathcal{F}'\right) - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}.$$
 (58)

and if the analyzed matrix B satisfies  $\mathcal{W}_{NU}[B] > 0$ , then it does not correspond to any unitary transformation. The separation surface is depicted in Fig. 14.

Such reasoning can be extended to various setups in which we consider a transition between quantum and classical evolution, as well as to classical walks without quantum counterparts. To sum up, our setup allow us to disprove *operationally* the validity of a theory attempting to explain quantum to classical transition, demonstrating the need for additional degrees of freedom.

# D. Witness of non-Markovianity

When considering evolution with certain degree of randomness, it is common to resort to what is called a stochastic process. Moreover, oftentimes it is assumed that the process depends only on the most recent state of the system as opposed to the entire prior trajectory. These short-memory processes are called Markovian, forming an important non-convex subset of all possible stochastic processes as they find use in wide variety of settings, spanning statistical physics [105], chemistry [106], biology [107], and economics [108], to name a few.

In quantum mechanics one way of defining the distinction between Markovian and non-Markovian processes is through the CP divisibility as described in [109]. The analogy between the classical and quantum Markovianity is understood immediately when we consider that at every infinitesimal time interval  $\tau$  the only input to the channel is the prior state of the system,  $\rho_{t+\tau} = \Lambda_{\tau}(\rho_t)$ .

In this application, we show a practical and effective approach to construct a witness of non-Markovianity for the set of channels obtained as convex combinations of three Pauli channels [110]. Within this context, Pauli channels and their mixtures serve as a concrete demonstration of the non-convex structure of the space of Markovian quantum operations [111, 112]. A Pauli channel is defined as:

$$\Gamma_i^p(\rho) = p\rho + (1-p)\sigma_i\rho\sigma_i,\tag{59}$$

with  $\sigma_i \in \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3\}$  being the standard Pauli matrices and p being the probability of finding the input state  $\rho$  unperturbed. A previous study [110] demonstrated that a nontrivial convex combination of two distinct Pauli channels exhibits non-Markovian behavior despite the individual channels being Markovian. Precisely, for a convex combination of three Pauli channels,

$$\Theta = a\Gamma_1^p + b\Gamma_2^p + c\Gamma_3^p,\tag{60}$$

with non-negative a, b, c such that a + b + c = 1, the subset of Markovian channels is non-convex. Indeed, [110] describes analytically the form of the set of Markovian Pauli-channels, which forms a star domain with a kernel composed solely of the maximally depolarizing channel, p = 0, a = b = c = 1/3. Furthermore, the boundary of Markovian Pauli-channels contains only locally nonconvex points, leading to a canonical fortress of infinite support cones. Although, in this case, we could directly apply our methods, it is more practical to define an auxiliary free set to certify resources, as in the previous applications. Furthermore, in this section, we propose to delve into the benefits of this technique by reducing the study space (60) to the cross-section p = 1/2, a vital case analyzed in [110].

Precisely, we can visualize all sets involved at the crosssection p = 1/2 within the triangle depicted in Fig.15. The triangle represents the channels of the cross-section employing (a, b, c) as barycentric coordinates, where the blue region  $\mathcal{F}$  determines all Markovian channels with p = 1/2. The boundary  $\partial \mathcal{F}$  of the blue region form a triangle with parabolic arc edges, usually denoted as parabolic horn triangle. In barycentric coordinates we obtain one of such arc edges by selecting a given  $\bar{b} \leq \sqrt{5} - 2$ , an *a* coordinate:

$$\bar{a}_{\pm} = \frac{1-\bar{b}}{2} \left( 1 \pm \sqrt{\frac{5-(\bar{b}+2)^2}{1-\bar{b}^2}} \right)$$
(61)

and then  $\bar{c}_{\pm} = 1 - \bar{a}_{\pm} - \bar{b} = \bar{a}_{\mp}$ , leading to points  $(\bar{a}_{\pm}, \bar{b}, \bar{a}_{\mp})$ . Similarly, we obtain the other two arc edges by replacing the starting coordinate *b* either by *a*, or *c* in the above construction. Inside  $\mathcal{F}$  we distinguish three segments:

$$\mathcal{F}_j : \{ \Phi_j \mid \Phi_j = q \Gamma_j^{1/2} + (1-q) \Gamma_d^{1/2} \}, \qquad (62)$$

with  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}, 0 \leq q \leq 1$ , and  $\Gamma_d^{1/2}$  stands for the channel with barycentric coordinates (1/3, 1/3, 1/3). Since segments  $\mathcal{F}_j$  are tangent to  $\partial \mathcal{F}$  at the vertices of the triangle, the kernel of  $\mathcal{F}$  has a single element  $\Gamma_d^{1/2}$ , at the intersection of segments  $\mathcal{F}_j$ .

To better understand the relevance of the sets  $\mathcal{F}_j$ , let us observe that we could construct each parabolic arc  $\Delta_{ij}\mathcal{F} \in \partial \mathcal{F}$  that joins  $\Gamma_i^{1/2}$  with  $\Gamma_j^{1/2}$  using De Casteljau's algorithm [113]:

$$\Delta_{ij} \mathcal{F} : \{ \Theta_s \,|\, \Theta_s \,= \, (1 - s)^2 \, \Gamma_i^{1/2} + 2s \, (1 - s) \, \Gamma_d^{1/2} + s^2 \Gamma_j^{1/2} \}$$
(63)

with parameter  $s \in [0, 1]$ , forming a Bézier curve with control points  $\Gamma_i^{1/2}$ ,  $\Gamma_d^{1/2}$ ,  $\Gamma_j^{1/2}$ . A direct consequence of (63) is that every support cone of  $\mathcal{F}$  intersects the boundary at most at three points: an apex  $\Theta_s \in \Delta_{ij}\mathcal{F}$  with the corresponding vertices  $\Gamma_i^{1/2}$  and  $\Gamma_j^{1/2}$ . Hence, by computing our quantifier using an auxiliary free set  $\mathcal{F}'$  containing the segments  $\mathcal{F}_j$ , the loss of information will be negligible while the complexity of the calculations is reduced. The simplest of such auxiliary free sets corresponds to:

$$\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2 \cup \mathcal{F}_3 \tag{64}$$

It is clear that the set  $\mathcal{F}'$  forms a star domain with its kernel being the depolarizing channel  $\Gamma_d^{1/2}$  introduced before. Moreover, the convex components coincide with segments  $\mathcal{F}_j$ , and the canonical fortress  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{F}'}$  has a simple finite set of support cones:

$$C_k : \{ \Gamma_d^{1/2} + \sum_{i \neq k} \alpha_i (\Gamma_i^{1/2} - \Gamma_d^{1/2}) | \quad \alpha_i \ge 0 \}, \qquad (65)$$

It is direct to verify that every cone has two free sections forming its boundary inside the study region, e.g.  $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(1)} = \{\mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{F}_3\}$ . In consequence the domains  $\mathcal{D}^{(k)}$  coincide with the support cones  $\mathcal{C}_k$ , lack overlapping interiors, and allow simple computation of (8) and (9).



FIG. 15. The theory of non-Markovian channels provides a rich area of phenomena where we could apply our framework. A concrete example are convex combinations of Pauli channels  $\Gamma_i^p$ , with a particular section portrayed in the figure (p = 1/2). The blue region corresponds to the Markovian subset of channels  $\mathcal{F}$ , while the external regions, correspond to the non-Markovian channels. The figure also highlights some relevant geometric elements such as the auxiliary free set  $\mathcal{F}' \subset \mathcal{F}$  (grey lines), support cone  $C_1$  (opaque region) and the boundary arc  $\Delta_{12}\mathcal{F}$  (dotted curve).

As in the previous applications, our goal is to find a tight upper bound in the value of our quantifier (8) that Markovian channels can achieve. Geometrically, the tightest upper bound happens when the hyperbolic surfaces of equally resourceful channels are tangent to parabolic arcs  $\Delta_{ij}\mathcal{F}$ . The parabolic arcs include, at their extremes, Pauli channels to which the hyperbolas of equal resources are asymptotic; in consequence both curves must coincide at a different point between the vertex and the parabola's focus. Because the above applies to both ends of the parabola, the tangent hyperbola can only include the focus. The channel at the focus of the parabolic arc inside  $C_k$  is given by,

$$\Theta_k^* = (\sqrt{5} - 2)\Gamma_k^{1/2} + \frac{1}{2}(3 - \sqrt{5})\sum_{i \neq k} \Gamma_i^{1/2}$$
(66)

Since our goal is to illustrate the application of our techniques clearly, we will simplify channel discrimination by setting the input state to a part of the maximally entangled state. This allows us to exploit the Choi-Jamiołkowski isomorphism [30, 31] to express all the combinations of Pauli channels as states. Thus, for a channel satisfying (60), with p = 1/2 we have:

$$J_{\Theta} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1+c}{4} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1-c}{4} \\ 0 & \frac{a+b}{4} & \frac{a-b}{4} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{a-b}{4} & \frac{a+b}{4} & 0 \\ \frac{1-c}{4} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1+c}{4} \end{pmatrix},$$
(67)

With the explicit Jamiołkowski states of  $J_{\Phi_j}$  for an arbitrary  $\Phi_j \in \mathcal{F}_j$ , presented in Appendix (V E 1). Now, since computing the bound induced by a channel  $\Theta_k^*$  in  $\mathcal{D}^{(k)} = \mathcal{C}_k$  is symmetrical for every domain, it is enough to compute it for  $\Theta_1^* \in \mathcal{D}^{(1)}$ . In this case the distance quantifier gave us (see Appendix (V E 1)):

$$\mathcal{L}\left(J_{\Theta_{1}^{*}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{1}\right) = \min_{\Phi_{1} \in \mathcal{F}_{1}} \frac{1}{2} ||J_{\Theta_{1}^{*}} - J_{\Phi_{1}}||_{1}$$
$$= \frac{1}{8} \left(7 - 3\sqrt{5}\right) \approx 0.0364745 \qquad (68)$$

with the same value for  $\mathcal{L}(J_{\Theta_1^*} | \mathcal{F}_2)$ , since from the definition of focus, the point is equidistant to  $\mathcal{F}_1$  and  $\mathcal{F}_2$ . Then, the corresponding geometric average (8):

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}\left(J_{\Theta_{1}^{*}} \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(1)}\right) = \mathbb{G}_{j}\left[\mathcal{L}\left(J_{\Theta_{1}^{*}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}^{(1)}\right)\right]$$
$$= \sqrt{\mathcal{L}\left(J_{\Theta_{1}^{*}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{1}\right)\mathcal{L}\left(J_{\Theta_{1}^{*}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{2}\right)}$$
$$= \mathcal{L}\left(J_{\Theta_{1}^{*}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{1}\right) = \frac{1}{8}\left(7 - 3\sqrt{5}\right). \quad (69)$$

because the only domain that enters in the maximization is  $\mathcal{D}^{(1)}$ , (69) also provides the value of  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}\left(J_{\Theta_{1}^{*}} \mid \mathcal{F}\right)$ . As we pointed out before, this is an upper bound to the set of Markovian channels, since due to the symmetry of the problem, every  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{crit}} = \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}\left(J_{\Theta_{k}^{*}} \mid \mathcal{F}\right)$  has the same value. In conclusion for any  $J_{\Theta}$  satisfying  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}\left(J_{\Theta} \mid \mathcal{F}\right) > \mathcal{G}_{\text{crit}}$  we can assure that the convex combination of Pauli channels  $\Theta$  is non-Markovian, as portrayed in Fig. 16.

The section preserving operations include any mixing with  $\Gamma_d^{1/2}$ , representing a depolarizing noise. Also, every domain  $\mathcal{D}^{(k)}$  admits all types of hyperbolic contracting operations (18) with respect to the auxiliary free set  $\mathcal{F}'$ , but only the conic non-increasing order are RNG with respect to  $\mathcal{F}$  (See Appendix V E 2 for details). Additionally, we remark that for every domain the conic non-increasing operations have different physical meaning, for instance in  $\mathcal{D}^{(3)}$  they essentially involve an additional dephasing, while for  $\mathcal{D}^{(1)}$ , and  $\mathcal{D}^{(2)}$ , the dephasing is restricted to imaginary or real parts, together with an extra stochastic classical action.



FIG. 16. The red hyperbolas indicate the channels for which the  $\mathcal{F}'$ -based monotone provides the maximal value for Markovian channels  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{crit}} = \frac{1}{8}(7 - 3\sqrt{5})^2$ . Every channel beyond the red curve is detected as non-Markovian. Notably, the set of non-Markovian channels undetected is confined to the small region between the grey parabolic arcs and the red curve.

Summary 5

# **Applications of Quantum SRTs:**

- 1) **Quantum Discord:** We provide a novel operational interpretation, extending the set of two-qubit states with known analytical close formulas to quantify discord.
- 2) **Total correlations:** We completely characterize the bipartite case, introduce an easy to compute witness of total correlations, and outline further generalizations to networks.
- 3) **Non-Unistochasticity:** We obtain a fully operational test for quantum to classical transition theories in particle physics.
- 4) **Non-Markovianity:** We illustrate how to use our results to develop operational tests to detect and quantify non-Markovianity in a simple case.

#### V. DISCUSSION

The Star Resource Theories (SRTs) represent a distinctive advancement in the quantum information resource theories landscape. By focusing on the unique geometric attributes of star domains, SRTs provide a comprehensive framework encompassing both convex and crucial non-

23

convex resource theories. This novel classification introduces a paradigm shift in the understanding and manipulation of quantum resources. The operational quantifiers presented within the SRTs open new avenues for assessing resources in non-convex domains and determining advantages in correlated and cooperative discrimination tasks. The significance of SRTs is further underscored by introducing a class of nontrivial free operations, shedding light on the manipulability of resources within this framework. These operations offer practical insights and contribute to a deeper understanding of the internal structure of star domains.

While recent works [21, 22] present quantifiers that allow us to evaluate non-convex resources operationally, we must emphasize that they still need to consider a specific class of resource theories with free operations, in addition to quantifiers, that is, a dynamic for resource interconvertibility. Our work allows us to significantly advance the state of the art in this field, presenting a unique geometric condition that enables us to complete the puzzle and elaborate on its consequences.

Furthermore, our quantifiers, designed explicitly for star resource theories, introduce concrete improvements. First, they have desirable properties, such as faithfulness and being a convex function when appropriate. Second, they are also better at suppressing relative error (computational or from measurements) than previous methodologies. Third, the operational interpretations of our quantifiers are unprecedented, evaluating new practical advantages, which simultaneously combine discrimination tasks and correlations, opening the possibility of novel applications.

We also describe the application of our formalism and its techniques in four different research areas. Firstly, our applications in quantum discord and non-Markovianity show how our theoretical framework allows us to deepen our knowledge of solidly established fields, generating new analytical results with operational relevance. Secondly, our applications in certifying total correlations and non-unistochasticity are foundational to extending the resource theory to hitherto unattainable fields. Indeed, we envision the generalization of our results in total correlations to classical and quantum networks as a promising area with multiple repercussions.

Some potential future research directions are adapting our methods to the computation of covariance matrices and their subsequent application to Bell nonlocality in networks [114, 115] or extending Buscemi nonlocality resource analysis [116, 117] to networks of more than two parties. In classical networks, our approach could contribute to the classification of weighted networks [118] or to determine the reducibility of multilayer networks [119], with consequences ranging from biology to economics.

On top of that, extending these results to particle physics, verification of the unistochasticity of a transition matrix between neutrino eigenbasis is a test of both the correctness of the measurement as well as the theory of PMNS (Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata) mixing matrix [103, 104]. In this process, the quantum unitary evolution underlays the real, bistochastic matrices observed in experiments. Thus, a very similar setup could test the quark families' mixing while testing the unistochasticity of CKM (Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa) matrix [101, 102].

The broader implications of this work extend beyond the realm of quantum information theory. The capacity of our setup to exclude a particular point from a specific set finds relevance in various settings outside quantum information, providing a valuable tool for validating models or experimental tests. Moreover, introducing SRTs hints at a broader mathematical generalization, transcending convex analysis and paving the way for a *star analysis*. This mathematical leap aligns with recent developments in non-linear witnesses [24–26], and supports further applications of non-convex optimization, for instance, in support vector machine learning [120, 121].

In summary, this article advances a novel paradigm in resource theory and establishes a foundation for future explorations. The implications of SRTs reach far beyond quantum properties, offering the physical motivation to forge ahead into a new era of non-convex analysis. The wide-ranging nature of this work holds promise for diverse applications, pushing forward the frontiers of quantum information and mathematical analysis.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work realized within the DQUANT QuantERA II Programme was supported by the National Science Centre, Poland, under the contract number 2021/03/Y/ST2/00193, which received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 101017733. RS acknowledge the financial support of the Foundation for Polish Science through the TEAM-NET project (contract no. POIR.04.04.00-00-17C1/18-00). JCz acknowledges financial support by NCN PRELUDIUM BIS no. DEC-2019/35/O/ST2/01049. RRR is financially supported by the Ministry for Digital Transformation and of Civil Service of the Spanish Government through the QUANTUM ENIA project call - Quantum Spain project, and by the EU through the RTRP - NextGenerationEU within the framework of the Digital Spain 2026 Agenda. PH acknowledge partial support by the Foundation for Polish Science (IRAP project, ICTQT, contract no. MAB/2018/5, co-financed by EU within Smart Growth Operational Programme). G.R.-M. acknowledges support from ERC AdG NOQIA; MICIN/AEI (PGC2018-0910.13039/501100011033, CEX2019-000910-S/10.13039/501100011033, Plan National FIDEUA PID2019-106901GB-I00, FPI; MICIIN with NextGenerationEU (PRTR-C17.I1): QUANTERA MAQS PCI2019-111828-2); MCIN/AEI/ 10.13039/501100011033 and by QUANTERA DYNAMITE PCI2022-132919 within the

QuantERA II Programme under Grant Agreement No

101017733 – "Retos Colaboración" QUSPIN RTC2019-007196-7).

# APPENDIX

#### A. Geometrical relations

#### 1. Redundancy deletion of support cones satisfies the covering condition

Here we demonstrate that the fortress condition i) is still satisfied for the support cones, after redundancy deletion relative to  $\mathcal{F}$ .

We start by recalling that for any point  $z \notin \mathcal{F}$ , we can select a  $w \in \text{Ker}(\mathcal{F})$  to obtain  $z_w = \lambda z + (1 - \lambda)w$  at the boundary  $\partial \mathcal{F}$ , leading to a support cone  $\mathcal{C}'_{z_w} \ni z$ . Next, for every  $\mathcal{C}'_{z_w} \ni z$ , two scenarios unfold: either  $\mathcal{C}'_{z_w} = \mathcal{C}_{x^*}$  or there exist a  $\mathcal{C}_{x^*}$  such that

$$\mathcal{C}_{x^*} \cap \mathcal{F} \supset \mathcal{C}'_{z_m} \cap \mathcal{F}$$

In both instances,  $z_w \in \mathcal{C}'_{z_w} \cap \mathcal{F}$  holds, showing that  $z_w \in \mathcal{C}_{x^*}$ . Next, we define a cone

$$\mathcal{Q}_w: \{w + \alpha_1 \left(z - w\right) + \alpha_2 \left(x^* - w\right) \mid \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}\}$$

then by construction we have  $(\mathcal{Q}_w + z_w - w) \ni z$ , simply taking  $\alpha_1 = 1 - \lambda, \alpha_2 = 0$ . However, this means

$$(\mathcal{Q}_w - w + x^*) \ni z - z_w + x^*,$$

but  $(\mathcal{Q}_w - w + x^*)$  shifts the apex of  $\mathcal{Q}_w$  to  $x^*$  where the support cone is  $\mathcal{C}_{x^*}$ , implying that

$$\mathcal{C}_{x^*} \ni z - z_w + x^*$$

or equivalently  $(\mathcal{C}_{x^*} + z_w - x^*) \ni z$ . Thus, since  $z_w \in \mathcal{C}_{x^*}$ , shifting the apex of  $\mathcal{C}_{x^*}$  to  $z_w$  generates a subset of  $\mathcal{C}_{x^*}$ , and in consequence

$$\mathcal{C}_{x^*} \supseteq (\mathcal{C}_{x^*} + z_w - x^*) \ni z,$$

demonstrating the satisfaction of the fortress condition i) after redundancy deletion.

Lastly, we would like to remark an interesting particular case. Whenever  $\operatorname{Int}(\operatorname{Ker}(\mathcal{F})) \neq \emptyset$ , we could choose  $w \in \operatorname{Int}(\operatorname{Ker}(\mathcal{F}))$  then we must have  $\operatorname{Int}(\mathcal{C}'_{z_w}) \ni z$ , and following a reasoning among the same lines as before we would conclude that there exist a  $\mathcal{C}_{x^*}$  such that  $z \in \operatorname{Int}(\mathcal{C}_{x^*})$ . In the last case, we have:

$$\mathcal{F} \supseteq \bigcup_{x} \operatorname{Int}(\mathcal{C}_{x}) \equiv \bigcap_{x} \operatorname{Ext}(\mathcal{C}_{x})$$

and because the converse inclusion is straightforward from ii), we obtain:

$$\mathcal{F} = \bigcap_{x} \operatorname{Ext}(\mathcal{C}_{x}).$$
(70)

The above shows, that all fortress conditions could be reduced to the single condition (70) for the special case  $Int(Ker(\mathcal{F})) \neq \emptyset$ . However, to keep the theory general and include several applications where the kernel has no interior, we must keep the definition of fortress based on conditions i)-iv).

# B. Proofs for general theory

#### 1. Proof of relative error suppression

To estimate a relative error we must assume  $\mathcal{M}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}) > 0$ , which also implies  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}) > 0$  due to faithfulness of both quantifiers. Then, for  $\mathcal{F}$  a star domain the monotones  $\mathcal{M}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F})$  based on decomposition into sub-convex sets can be written as [22, 54]:

$$\mathcal{M}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}\right) = \inf_{\mathcal{F}_{\eta}^{(x)} \subseteq \mathcal{F}} \mathcal{M}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{\eta}^{(x)}\right)$$
(71)

On the other hand, when assigning the error  $\delta \mathcal{M}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F})$  to  $\mathcal{M}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F})$  the conservative approach to error theory demands that we should consider the worst-case scenario, hence we should assign the largest error found in the evaluation of (71), thus:

$$\delta \mathcal{M} \left( \Theta \mid \mathcal{F} \right) = \max_{\mathcal{F}_{\eta}^{(x)} \subseteq \mathcal{F}} \delta \mathcal{M} \left( \Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{\eta}^{(x)} \right)$$
(72)

Now, we obtain the error  $\delta \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)}\right)$  for every  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)}\right)$  with  $\Theta \in \mathcal{D}^{(x)}$ , applying the standard error propagation formula [122]:

$$\delta \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)} \right) = \sqrt{\int_{\Sigma_{x}} d\xi \left( \delta \mathcal{M} \left( \Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{\xi}^{(x)} \right) \frac{\partial \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)} \right)}{\partial \mathcal{M} \left( \Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{\xi}^{(x)} \right)} \right)^{2}}$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{|\Sigma_{x}|} \sqrt{\int_{\Sigma_{x}} d\xi \left( \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)} \right) \frac{\delta \mathcal{M} \left( \Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{\xi}^{(x)} \right)}{\mathcal{M} \left( \Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{\xi}^{(x)} \right)} \right)^{2}}$$

$$= \frac{\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)} \right)}{|\Sigma_{x}|} \sqrt{\int_{\Sigma_{x}} d\xi \left( \frac{\delta \mathcal{M} \left( \Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{\xi}^{(x)} \right)}{\mathcal{M} \left( \Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{\xi}^{(x)} \right)} \right)^{2}}$$
(73)

where in (a) we used the most general form of the geometric average:

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)}\right) = \exp\left\{\frac{1}{|\Sigma_x|} \int_{\Sigma_x} d\eta \ln\left(\mathcal{M}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{\eta}^{(x)}\right)\right)\right\}$$

and  $|\Sigma_x| = \int d\xi$  indicates the integration over the whole collection of free sections  $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)}$ . Using the above we can bound the relative error:

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)}\right)}{\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)}\right)} = \frac{1}{|\Sigma_{x}|} \sqrt{\int_{\Sigma_{x}} d\xi \left(\frac{\delta \mathcal{M}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{\xi}^{(x)}\right)}{\mathcal{M}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{\xi}^{(x)}\right)}\right)^{2}}$$
$$\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{1}{|\Sigma_{x}|} \sqrt{\int_{\Sigma_{x}} d\xi \left(\frac{\delta \mathcal{M}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}\right)}{\mathcal{M}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}\right)}\right)^{2}}$$
$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\Sigma_{x}|}} \frac{\delta \mathcal{M}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}\right)}{\mathcal{M}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}\right)}$$
(74)

where in (b) we combined both (71) and (72) methodological requirements to bound the relative error of each free section  $\mathcal{F}_{\eta}^{(x)} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ . Since, (74) holds for every  $\mathcal{D}^{(x)} \ni \Theta$ , and defining  $\Sigma = |\Sigma_x| \ge 1$  we arrive at the corresponding relative error bound:

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}\right)}{\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}\right)} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Sigma}} \frac{\delta \mathcal{M}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}\right)}{\mathcal{M}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}\right)}$$
(75)

which shows the suppression of relative errors, when computing  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F})$ .

# 2. Proof of monotonicity

We consider a monotone  $\mathcal{M}(\cdot|\mathcal{X}): \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  faithful for a convex free set  $\mathcal{X}$  and which satisfies the identity:

$$\mathcal{M}\left(\lambda\Theta + (1-\lambda)\Lambda \mid \mathcal{X}\right) \le \lambda \mathcal{M}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{X}\right) + (1-\lambda)\mathcal{M}\left(\Lambda \mid \mathcal{X}\right) \quad \forall \lambda \in [0,1]$$
(76)

which is true for typical monotones, such as trace distance or generalised robustness. In such case the monotone  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\cdot \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)})$  applied on a domain  $\mathcal{D}^{(x)}$  is given by the geometric average over the monotones  $\mathcal{M}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}^{(x)})$ , determined by each free section  $\mathcal{F}_{j}^{(x)} \in \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)}$ :

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)}\right) = \mathbb{G}_{j}\left[\mathcal{M}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}^{(x)}\right)\right]$$
(77)

where  $\mathbb{G}_j[x_j] := \sqrt[N]{\prod_{j=1}^N x_j}$  is the geometric average of variables  $x_j$ , here understood as every  $\mathcal{M}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_j^{(x)})$ . Before continue we need to show the following lemma:

**Lemma 1:** Given the free set  $\mathcal{F}$  of an SRT with centre  $\Delta \in \text{Ker}(\mathcal{F})$ , and a fortress  $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathcal{F}} = {\mathcal{C}_x}_{x \in X}$ , we have that if  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}[\Theta] \in \mathcal{C}^{(x)}$  with  $\lambda > 0$ , then also  $\Theta \in \mathcal{C}^{(x)}$ .

*Proof.* If  $\lambda = 1$  the statement is trivial, then if for  $1 > \lambda > 0$  the object  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}[\Theta]$  belongs to the convex cone  $\mathcal{C}^{(x)}$  with frame  $\mathcal{T}^{(x)}$ , we have:

$$\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}\left[\Theta\right] = v_0^{(x)} + \sum_{y \in Y_x} \alpha_y \left(v_y^{(x)} - v_0^{(x)}\right)$$
(78)

for some apex  $v_0^{(x)}$ , vectors  $v_y^{(x)} - v_0^{(x)}$  in the frame  $\mathcal{T}^{(x)}$  with label set  $Y_x$ , and constants  $\alpha_y \ge 0$ . Equation (78) directly leads to:

$$\Theta = \frac{1}{\lambda} v_0^{(x)} - \left(\frac{1-\lambda}{\lambda}\right) \Delta + \sum_{y \in Y_x} \frac{\alpha_y}{\lambda} \left(v_y^{(x)} - v_0^{(x)}\right)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} v_0^{(x)} + \left(\frac{1-\lambda}{\lambda}\right) \sum_{y \in Y_x} \gamma_y \left(v_y^{(x)} - v_0^{(x)}\right) + \sum_{y \in Y_x} \frac{\alpha_y}{\lambda} \left(v_y^{(x)} - v_0^{(x)}\right)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} v_0^{(x)} + \sum_{y \in Y_x} \beta_y \left(v_y^{(x)} - v_0^{(x)}\right)$$
(79)

where in (a) we used the fortress condition iii)  $\operatorname{Dual}(\mathcal{C}_x) \supseteq \operatorname{Ker}(\mathcal{F})$ , and in (b) we defined  $\beta_y = \left(\frac{1-\lambda}{\lambda}\right)\gamma_y + \frac{\alpha_y}{\lambda} \ge 0$ . By the definition of cone, equation (79) shows that  $\Theta \in \mathcal{C}^{(x)}$ .

Now, let's study the monotonicity of  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)})$  under  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}$ . If  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}[\Theta] \in \mathcal{F}$  then, by construction  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}[\Theta] \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)}) = 0 \leq \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)})$ . On the contrary, if  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}[\Theta] \notin \mathcal{F}$ , the object  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}[\Theta]$  must belong to one or more cones  $\mathcal{C}^{(x)}$ , and from the definition of  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)})$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Delta_{\lambda}[\Theta] \mid \mathcal{F}) &= \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{(x)}: \widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}[\Theta] \in \mathcal{D}^{(x)}} \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}[\Theta] \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)}) \\
&= \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{(x)}: \widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}[\Theta] \in \mathcal{D}^{(x)}} \mathbb{G}_{j} \left[ \mathcal{M} \left( \widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}[\Theta] \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}^{(x)} \right) \right] \\
&\leq \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{(x)}: \widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}[\Theta] \in \mathcal{D}^{(x)}} \mathbb{G}_{j} \left[ \lambda \mathcal{M} \left( \Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}^{(x)} \right) + (1 - \lambda) \mathcal{M} \left( \Delta \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}^{(x)} \right) \right] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{(x)}: \widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}[\Theta] \in \mathcal{D}^{(x)}} \mathbb{G}_{j} \left[ \lambda \mathcal{M} \left( \Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}^{(x)} \right) \right] \\
&= \lambda \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{(x)}: \widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}[\Theta] \in \mathcal{D}^{(x)}} \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)}) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} \lambda \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x^{*})}) \\
&\leq \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x^{*})}) \\
&\leq \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x^{*})}) \\
&\leq \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)}) \\
&= \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F})
\end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

where in (a) we used (76), in (b) we evaluate the domain  $\mathcal{D}^{(x^*)}$  with the maximal value such that cone  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\lambda}[\Theta] \in \mathcal{C}^{(x^*)}$ and in (c) we use lemma 1 which ensures that  $\Theta \in \mathcal{C}^{(x^*)}$  and thus  $\Theta \in \mathcal{D}^{(x^*)}$ .

# 3. Proof of operational interpretation of distance base monotone

We proceed to demonstrate the operational meaning of our monotone  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}$  when the underlying monotone  $\mathcal{M}$  is a distance  $\mathcal{L}$  which discriminates the resource from the free set. In the proof we will use the symbol  $\Theta$  for channels, but the same proof holds for states and measurements under an appropriate choice of the distance  $\mathcal{L}$ . In particular when  $\Theta$  belongs to the domain  $\mathcal{D}$  which contains the cone  $\mathcal{C}$  and free sections  $\{\mathcal{F}_1, ..., \mathcal{F}_M\}$  we would like to prove that:

$$P\left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M} [a_j \oplus 1] = 0 \mid \Theta\right) = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \prod_{j=1}^{M} \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_j\right)\right]$$
(81)

with  $\oplus$  the sum mod(2) and every  $a_j$  is the binary truth value of discrimination between  $\Theta$  and  $\mathcal{F}_j$  i.e.  $a_j = 1$  iff  $\Theta \notin \mathcal{F}_j$  and  $a_j = 0$  iff  $\Theta \in \mathcal{F}_j$ ,

$$P(a_j = 1 \mid \Theta) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \mathcal{L}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_j) \right]$$
(82)

Note, that we write (81) using the relation  $e_j = a_j \oplus 1$ .

*Proof.* Since, for M = 1 the result is trivial, let's check the M = 2 case:

$$P\left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^{2} [a_{j} \oplus 1] = 0 \mid \Theta\right) = P\left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^{2} a_{j} = 0 \mid \Theta\right)$$
  
$$= P(a_{1} = 0 \mid \Theta) P(a_{2} = 0 \mid \Theta) + P(a_{1} = 1 \mid \Theta) P(a_{2} = 1 \mid \Theta)$$
  
$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{4} [1 - \mathcal{L}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{1})] [1 - \mathcal{L}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{2})] + \frac{1}{4} [1 + \mathcal{L}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{1})] [1 + \mathcal{L}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{2})]$$
  
$$= \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \prod_{j=1}^{2} \mathcal{L}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{j})\right]$$
(83)

Let's assume now that if M is odd, by inductive hypothesis the equation (81) is true for all M' < M. Then,

$$P\left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M} [a_{j} \oplus 1] = 0 \mid \Theta\right) \stackrel{(a)}{=} P\left(\left[\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M} a_{j}\right] \oplus 1 = 0 \mid \Theta\right)$$

$$= P\left(\left[\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M-1} a_{j}\right] \oplus [a_{M} \oplus 1] = 0 \mid \Theta\right)$$

$$= P\left(\left[\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M-1} a_{j}\right] = 0 \mid \Theta\right) P\left(a_{M} \oplus 1 = 0 \mid \Theta\right) + P\left(\left[\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M-1} a_{j}\right] = 1 \mid \Theta\right) P\left(a_{M} \oplus 1 = 1 \mid \Theta\right)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} P\left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M-1} [a_{j} \oplus 1] = 0 \mid \Theta\right) P\left(a_{M} = 1 \mid \Theta\right) + P\left(\left[\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M-1} [a_{j} \oplus 1]\right] = 1 \mid \Theta\right) P\left(a_{M} = 1 \mid \Theta\right)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} \frac{1}{4} \left[1 + \prod_{j=1}^{M-1} \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}\right)\right] \left[1 + \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{M}\right)\right] + \frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \prod_{j=1}^{M-1} \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}\right)\right] \left[1 - \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{M}\right)\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \left[1 + \prod_{j=1}^{M} \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}\right)\right] \left[1 + \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{M}\right)\right] + \frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \prod_{j=1}^{M-1} \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{M}\right)\right] \left[1 - \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{M}\right)\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \left[1 + \prod_{j=1}^{M} \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}\right)\right] \left[1 + \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{M}\right)\right] \left[1 + \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{M}\right)\right] + \frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \prod_{j=1}^{M-1} \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{M}\right)\right] \left[1 - \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{M}\right)\right]$$

where in (a) we use the fact that M is odd and  $\oplus$  is the sum mod(2), in (b) we take advantage of M - 1 being even and in (c) we use the inductive hypothesis. Let's assume now that if M is even, by inductive hypothesis the equation (81) is true for all M' < M. Then,

$$P\left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M} [a_{j} \oplus 1] = 0 \mid \Theta\right) \stackrel{(a)}{=} P\left(\left[\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M} a_{j}\right] = 0 \mid \Theta\right)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} P\left(\left[\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M-1} [a_{j} \oplus 1]\right] \oplus [a_{M} \oplus 1] = 0 \mid \Theta\right)$$

$$= P\left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M-1} [a_{j} \oplus 1] = 0 \mid \Theta\right) P\left(a_{M} \oplus 1 = 0 \mid \Theta\right) + P\left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M-1} [a_{j} \oplus 1] = 1 \mid \Theta\right) P\left(a_{M} \oplus 1 = 1 \mid \Theta\right)$$

$$= P\left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M-1} [a_{j} \oplus 1] = 0 \mid \Theta\right) P\left(a_{M} = 1 \mid \Theta\right) + P\left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M-1} [a_{j} \oplus 1] = 1 \mid \Theta\right) P\left(a_{M} = 1 \mid \Theta\right)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} \frac{1}{4} \left[1 + \prod_{j=1}^{M-1} \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}\right)\right] \left[1 + \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{M}\right)\right] + \frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \prod_{j=1}^{M-1} \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}\right)\right] \left[1 - \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{M}\right)\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \left[1 + \prod_{j=1}^{M} \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}\right)\right] \left[1 + \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{M}\right)\right] + \frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \prod_{j=1}^{M-1} \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}\right)\right] \left[1 - \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{M}\right)\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \left[1 + \prod_{j=1}^{M} \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}\right)\right] \left[1 + \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{M}\right)\right] + \frac{1}{4} \left[1 + \prod_{j=1}^{M-1} \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{M}\right)\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \left[1 + \prod_{j=1}^{M} \mathcal{L}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{j}\right)\right]$$

$$(85)$$

where in (a) we use the fact that M is even and  $\oplus$  is the sum mod(2), in (b) we take advantage of M-1 being odd and in (c) we use the inductive hypothesis. Now, since we show (81) to be true for M = 1, 2 the induction in (84) shows (81) for M = 3, then (81) is true for M = 1, 2, 3 and (85) shows (81) for M = 4, and then we continue alternating (84) with (85) to show by induction (81) for any natural M. From (81) follows that:

$$P\left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M} [a_j \oplus 1] = 0 \mid \Theta\right) = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \left[\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}\left(\Theta \mid \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(x)}\right)\right]^M\right]$$
(86)

which shows the operational interpretation in terms of correlations  $\bigoplus_{j=1}^{M} [a_j \oplus 1] = 0$  induced by  $\Theta$ .

# 4. Proof of operational interpretation of robustness base monotone

Here we show the operational meaning of the robustness based quantifier in terms of the discrimination of an ensemble of quantum combs [58]. Consider the case in which  $\Theta$  belongs to the domain  $\mathcal{D}$  which contains the cone  $\mathcal{C}$  and free set sections  $\{\mathcal{F}_1, ..., \mathcal{F}_M\}$  we would like to prove that:

$$\max_{\{p_j, \Xi_j\}} \frac{P_{\text{succ}}\left(\{p_j, \Xi_j\}, \Theta, \dots, \Theta\right)}{\max_{\{\Phi_k \in \mathcal{F}_k\}_{k=1}^M} P_{\text{succ}}\left(\{p_j, \Xi_j\}, \Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_M\right)} = \prod_{k=1}^M \left(1 + \mathcal{R}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_k\right)\right)$$
(87)

where  $\{p_j, \Xi_j\}_{j=1}^N$  is an ensemble of a quantum comb's evolution branches  $\Xi_j : \text{CPTP}^M \longrightarrow q_j$ , for all j with a probability  $q_j \in [0, 1], \sum_j q_j = 1$ , as described in subsection III D 2.  $P_{\text{succ}}(\{p_j, \Xi_j\}, (\cdot), \ldots, (\cdot))$  is the success probability in the discrimination of the branches by means of the corresponding input channels and  $\mathcal{R}(\Theta | \mathcal{F}_k)$  is the generalised robustness of the channel  $\Theta$  with respect to the free section  $\mathcal{F}_k$ .

*Proof.* From the definition of generalised robustness we know that for every  $\mathcal{F}_k$  there exist a  $\Phi_k^* \in \mathcal{F}_k$  such that:

$$(1 + \mathcal{R}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_k)) \Phi_k^* \succeq \Theta \tag{88}$$

where  $\succeq$  means majorization in the semidefinite positive sense. Then by definition,

$$P_{\text{succ}}\left(\left\{p_{j},\Xi_{j}\right\},\Theta,\ldots,\Theta\right) = \sum_{j} p_{j}\Xi_{j}\left[\Theta,\ldots,\Theta\right]$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \prod_{k=1}^{M}\left(1+\mathcal{R}\left(\Theta\mid\mathcal{F}_{k}\right)\right)\sum_{j} p_{j}\Xi_{j}\left[\Phi_{1}^{*},\ldots,\Phi_{M}^{*}\right]$$

$$\leq \prod_{k=1}^{M}\left(1+\mathcal{R}\left(\Theta\mid\mathcal{F}_{k}\right)\right)\max_{\left\{\Phi_{k}\in\mathcal{F}_{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{M}} P_{\text{succ}}\left(\left\{p_{j},\Xi_{j}\right\},\Phi_{1},\ldots,\Phi_{M}\right)$$

where in (a) we used the linearity of quantum combs [58, 123] and (88). For the lower bound we remember that every  $\mathcal{R}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_k)$  is the result of an SDP program:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \max & \operatorname{Tr}\left[Y_k J_\Theta\right] - 1 \\ \text{subject to:} & Y_k \succeq 0 \\ & \operatorname{Tr}\left[Y_k J_\Phi\right] \leq 1 \ \forall J_\Phi \in \mathbb{O}_{\mathcal{F}_k} \end{array}$$

where  $J_{\Theta}$  is the Jamiłkowski state of  $\Theta$  and  $\mathbb{O}_{\mathcal{F}_k}$  is the set of all Jamiłkowski states with a  $\Phi \in \mathcal{F}_k$ . Then, we construct a an ensemble with  $p_1^* = 1$  and  $p_j^* = 0$  for all j > 1 with  $\Xi_1$  is given by:

$$\Xi_1^* [\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_M] = \prod_{k=1}^M \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \mathbb{I} \otimes \Lambda_k \left( |\Psi_+\rangle \langle \Psi_+| \right) \frac{Y_k}{\|Y_k\|_{\infty}} \right]$$
(89)

where each  $Y_k$  is a solution of the previous SDP program associated to  $\mathcal{R}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_k)$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$  is the operator norm. The other  $\Xi_j^*$  for j > 1 are all  $2^M - 1$  combs resulting from replacing the effects  $\frac{Y_k}{\|Y_k\|_{\infty}}$  for  $I - \frac{Y_k}{\|Y_k\|_{\infty}}$  in (89) in all possible combinations, representing all possible outputs from measurements  $\left\{\frac{Y_k}{\|Y_k\|_{\infty}}, I - \frac{Y_k}{\|Y_k\|_{\infty}}\right\}$ . Now, by direct computation we have:

$$\frac{P_{\text{succ}}\left(\left\{p_{j}^{*},\Xi_{j}^{*}\right\},\Theta,\ldots,\Theta\right)}{\max_{\left\{\Phi_{k}\in\mathcal{F}_{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{M}}P_{\text{succ}}\left(\left\{p_{j}^{*},\Xi_{j}^{*}\right\},\Phi_{1},\ldots,\Phi_{M}\right)} = \frac{\prod_{k=1}^{M}\text{Tr}\left[\mathbb{I}\otimes\Theta\left(|\Psi_{+}\rangle\langle\Psi_{+}|\right)\frac{Y_{k}}{\|Y_{k}\|_{\infty}}\right]}{\max_{\left\{\Phi_{k}\in\mathcal{F}_{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{M}}\prod_{k=1}^{M}\text{Tr}\left[\mathbb{I}\otimes\Phi_{k}\left(|\Psi_{+}\rangle\langle\Psi_{+}|\right)\frac{Y_{k}}{\|Y_{k}\|_{\infty}}\right]} \\ \stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{\prod_{k=1}^{M}\text{Tr}\left[Y_{k}J_{\Theta}\right]}{\max_{\left\{\Phi_{k}\in\mathcal{F}_{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{M}}\prod_{k=1}^{M}\text{Tr}\left[Y_{k}J_{\Phi}\right]} \\ \stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \prod_{k=1}^{M}\left(1+\mathcal{R}\left(\Theta\mid\mathcal{F}_{k}\right)\right)$$

where in (a) we cancel the products of  $||Y_k||_{\infty}$  and replaced by the definitions of Jamiłkowski state, while finally in (b) the inequality follows from the conditions of the SDP programs defining every  $\mathcal{R}(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_k)$ .

Now, as explained in the main text we use as utility function  $\mathbf{u}$  for a coalition T of agents as the maximum relative advantage they obtain in quantum comb discrimination tasks by using  $\Theta$ . From (87) it follows directly the following relation between  $\mathbf{u}$  and the robustness measures:

$$\mathbf{u}\left(\Theta \mid T\right) = \prod_{k \in T} \left(1 + \mathcal{R}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_k\right)\right) - 1.$$
(90)

Now, the dividend  $\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{u}}(\Theta \mid S)$  determines the surplus that is created by a coalition S of agents when using the resource  $\Theta$  in a task with utility  $\mathbf{u}$ . In cooperative game theory [73] the surplus is specified as the difference between the the coalition's utility and the surplus created by all potential subcoalitions:

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{u}}\left(\Theta \mid S\right) = \mathbf{u}\left(\Theta \mid S\right) - \sum_{T \subset S} \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{u}}\left(\Theta \mid T\right)$$
(91)

and  $\mathbf{d_u}(\Theta \mid \{i\}) = \mathbf{u}(\Theta \mid \{i\})$  for a single agent  $\{i\}$ . Applying the previous recursive definition, we will show that for a coalition of the  $\{A_k\}_{k=1}^M$  agents holding free set sections  $\{\mathcal{F}_1, ..., \mathcal{F}_M\}$ , their dividend in a quantum comb discrimination

task by using  $\Theta$  is:

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{u}}\left(\Theta \mid \{A_k\}_{k=1}^M\right) = \prod_{k=1}^M \mathcal{R}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_k\right)$$
(92)

Since M = 1 is trivial, we begin our induction with the case M = 2:

$$\mathbf{d_{u}}\left(\Theta \mid \{A_{k}\}_{k=1}^{2}\right) = \mathbf{u}\left(\Theta \mid \{A_{k}\}_{k=1}^{2}\right) - \mathbf{d_{u}}\left(\Theta \mid \{A_{1}\}\right) - \mathbf{d_{u}}\left(\Theta \mid \{A_{2}\}\right)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbf{u}\left(\Theta \mid \{A_{k}\}_{k=1}^{2}\right) - \mathbf{u}\left(\Theta \mid \{A_{1}\}\right) - \mathbf{u}\left(\Theta \mid \{A_{2}\}\right)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} \prod_{k=1}^{2} \left(1 + \mathcal{R}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{k}\right)\right) - \sum_{k=1}^{2} \left(1 + \mathcal{R}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{k}\right)\right) - 3$$

$$= \prod_{k=1}^{2} \mathcal{R}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{k}\right)$$
(93)

where in (a) we use the fact that dividend for single parties is equal to their utility and in (b) the relation (90). Now, we will assume as induction hypothesis that relation (92) is valid for all subcoalitions T such that |T| < M. Now from the definition we have:

$$\mathbf{d_{u}}\left(\Theta \mid \{A_{k}\}_{k=1}^{M}\right) = \mathbf{u}\left(\Theta \mid \{A_{k}\}_{k=1}^{M}\right) - \sum_{T \subset \{A_{k}\}_{k=1}^{M}} \mathbf{d_{u}}\left(\Theta \mid T\right)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} \prod_{k=1}^{M} \left(1 + \mathcal{R}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{k}\right)\right) - 1 - \sum_{T \subset \{A_{k}\}_{k=1}^{M}} \mathbf{d_{u}}\left(\Theta \mid T\right)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{T \subseteq \{A_{l}\}_{l=1}^{M}} \prod_{A_{k} \in T} \mathcal{R}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{k}\right) - \sum_{T \subset \{A_{k}\}_{k=1}^{M}} \prod_{A_{k} \in T} \mathcal{R}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{k}\right)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} \prod_{A_{k} \in \{A_{l}\}_{l=1}^{M}} \mathcal{R}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{k}\right)$$

$$= \prod_{k=1}^{M} \mathcal{R}\left(\Theta \mid \mathcal{F}_{k}\right)$$
(94)

where in (a) we use relation (90), in (b) we expand the first term and used the induction hypothesis on the second term. Finally, in (c) we note that the only term which doesn't cancel out in the previous step is  $T = \{A_l\}_{l=1}^M$  on the first sum. Since, the hypothesis is true for M = 1, 2 we can use (94) to show the hypothesis is true if it so for all subcoalitions T such that |T| < M, the result follows by induction.

#### C. Quantum discord

Here, to demonstrate Theorem 4 we consider the set  $\Omega$  of two-qubit states:

$$\rho\left(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{t}\right) = \frac{1}{4} \left\{ I \otimes I + \sum_{i} x_{i} \sigma_{i} \otimes I + \sum_{i} y_{i} I \otimes \sigma_{i} + \sum_{i} t_{i} \sigma_{i} \otimes \sigma_{i} \right\}.$$
(95)

Then, following [78] the zero-discord states (33) (i.e. on Alice side) of form (95) must satisfy the condition:

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|^{2} + \|\mathbf{t}\|^{2} - \kappa_{\max} = 0$$
(96)

where  $\kappa_{\max}$  is the maximum eigenvalue of a matrix K with entries  $K_{ij} = x_i x_j + t_i t_j \delta_{ij}$ . To determine the set of states with zero-discord we proceed to compute the characteristic polynomial of K:

$$q_{K}(\kappa) = \kappa^{3} - \kappa^{2} \left( \left\| \mathbf{x} \right\|^{2} + \left\| \mathbf{t} \right\|^{2} \right) + \kappa \left( \sum_{i \neq j} t_{i}^{2} t_{j}^{2} + \sum_{(i,j,k) \in \pi_{C}} t_{i}^{2} \left( x_{j}^{2} + x_{k}^{2} \right) \right) - \left( t_{1}^{2} t_{2}^{2} t_{3}^{2} + \sum_{(i,j,k) \in \pi_{C}} x_{i}^{2} t_{j}^{2} t_{k}^{2} \right)$$
(97)

where  $\pi_C$  stand for the cyclic permutations of (1, 2, 3). Applying the Decard's rule of signs we see that  $q_K(\kappa)$  has no negative roots and 3 or 1 positive roots whenever  $\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{t}\|^2 > 0$ . From the above it turns out that  $\kappa_{\max} > 0$  exist for  $\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{t}\|^2 > 0$ , while for  $\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{t}\|^2 = 0$  the result  $\kappa_{\max} = 0$  is trivial. Now, for zero-discord states, from (96) we have  $\kappa_{\max} = \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{t}\|^2$  and replacing this condition on  $q_K(\kappa_{\max}) = 0$  we have:

$$\left(\|\mathbf{x}\|^{2} + \|\mathbf{t}\|^{2}\right) \left(\sum_{i \neq j} t_{i}^{2} t_{j}^{2} + \sum_{(i,j,k) \in \pi_{C}} t_{i}^{2} \left(x_{j}^{2} + x_{k}^{2}\right)\right) - \left(t_{1}^{2} t_{2}^{2} t_{3}^{2} + \sum_{(i,j,k) \in \pi_{C}} x_{i}^{2} t_{j}^{2} t_{k}^{2}\right) = 0$$

$$(98)$$

which after some algebraic transformations reads:

$$2t_1^2 t_2^2 t_3^2 + \sum_{i \neq j} x_i^2 t_i^2 t_j^2 + \sum_{(i,j,k) \in \pi_C} t_i^4 t_j^2 t_k^2 + \left( \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{t}\|^2 \right) \sum_{(i,j,k) \in \pi_C} t_i^2 \left( x_j^2 + x_k^2 \right) = 0.$$
(99)

Since every term on the right hand side of (99) is non negative, it must be that all of them are zero, from that follows that only one of the coordinate pairs  $\{(t_i, x_i)\}_{i=1}^3$  could be non zero. Concluding the demonstration of Theorem 4. To demonstrate Theorem 5 consider  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$  and  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, y_3)$  with the additional constraint that  $\mathbf{y}$  must

To demonstrate Theorem 5 consider  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$  and  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, y_3)$  with the additional constraint that  $\mathbf{y}$  must have the same support as  $\mathbf{x}$ , i.e. if a coordinate  $x_i$  is zero this implies that a coordinate  $y_i$  is also zero, but the converse is not necessarily true. Since  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  have the same support the free set considers only states  $\chi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{t})$  with two triples  $\{x_i, y_i, t_i\}$  out of the three labeled by  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  necessarily equal to  $\{0, 0, 0\}$ . Then, from the Bloch matrix representation, the conditions for  $\chi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{t}) \in \Omega_0$  to be a trace one positive matrix are (See section IV.D in [81]):

$$3 - (x^2 + y^2 + t^2) \ge 0, \tag{100}$$

$$1 + 2xty - (x^2 + y^2 + t^2) \ge 0, \tag{101}$$

$$8xty + (x^{2} + y^{2} + t^{2} - 1)^{2} - 4y^{2}(x^{2} + t^{2}) - 4x^{2}t^{2} \ge 0$$
(102)

where x, y, t stand for the single triple  $\{x_i, y_i, t_i\}$  which of potentially non zero terms in  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{t}$ , because  $\chi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{t}) \in \Omega_0$ . Now, for every fixed value of y we describe the set in coordinates x, t. The first condition (100) requires each point (x, t) to lie inside a circle of radius  $3 - y^2$ , while to see the geometric requirement of the second condition (101) we rotate coordinates by angle of  $\pi/4$ :

$$x = \frac{u+v}{\sqrt{2}} \quad t = \frac{u-v}{\sqrt{2}}$$

After such a replacement condition (101) turns into:

$$\frac{u^2}{1+y} + \frac{v^2}{1-y} \le 1$$

which determines an ellipse with principal axes  $a = \sqrt{1+y}$  and  $b = \sqrt{1-y}$  which on coordinates x, t is always inside the unit circle, because  $|y| \le 1$ . For the third condition (102) we need to use some algebra:

$$8xty + (x^{2} + y^{2} + t^{2} - 1)^{2} - 4y^{2} (x^{2} + t^{2}) - 4x^{2}t^{2} \ge 0$$

$$8xty + (x^{2} + t^{2} - R^{2})^{2} - 4y^{2} (x^{2} + t^{2}) - 4x^{2}t^{2} \stackrel{(a)}{\ge} 0$$

$$4y (u^{2} - v^{2}) + (u^{2} + v^{2} - R^{2})^{2} - 4y^{2} (u^{2} + v^{2}) - (u^{2} - v^{2})^{2} \stackrel{(b)}{\ge} 0$$

$$4yL + (K - R^{2})^{2} - 4y^{2}K - L^{2} \stackrel{(c)}{\ge} 0$$

$$K^{2} - L^{2} - 2 (R^{2} + 2y^{2}) K + 4yL + R^{4} \ge 0$$

$$(K - h)^{2} - (L - g)^{2} + R^{4} + (g^{2} - h^{2}) \ge 0$$

$$(K - h)^{2} - (L - g)^{2} + 2y^{2} (1 - y^{2} - R^{2}) \ge 0$$

$$(K - h)^{2} - (L - g)^{2} + 2y^{2} (1 - y^{2} - R^{2}) \ge 0$$

$$(K - h)^{2} - (L - g)^{2} + (L - g)^{2} = 0$$

$$(K - h)^{2} = (L - g)^{2}$$

$$|K - h| \ge |L - g| \qquad (103)$$

where in (a) we define  $R = \sqrt{1 - y^2}$ , in (b) we use the same change of coordinates to u, v as for (101) and in (c) we define the auxiliary variables:

$$K = u^{2} + v^{2},$$
  

$$L = u^{2} - v^{2},$$
  

$$h = R^{2} + 2y^{2},$$
  

$$g = 2y.$$

But,  $K = u^2 + v^2 = x^2 + t^2 \le 1 \le 1 + y^2 = R^2 + 2y^2 = h$ , where we use that (x, t) is inside the unit circle due to (101). Then, inequality (103) lead to only to two possibilities i)  $h - K \ge L - g$  or ii)  $h - K \ge g - L$ . If  $L \ge g$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 L - g &\leq h - K \\
 L + K &\leq h + g \\
 2u^2 &\leq 1 + y^2 + 2y \\
 2u^2 &\leq (1 + y)^2 \\
 |u| &\leq (1 + y) / \sqrt{2}
 \end{aligned}$$
(104)

and if  $L \leq g$  we have:

$$g - L \leq h - K K - L \leq h - g 2v^{2} \leq 1 + y^{2} - 2y 2v^{2} \leq (1 - y)^{2} |v| \leq (1 - y) / \sqrt{2}.$$
 (105)

Thus, conditions (104) and (105) imply that (x,t) is inside a rectangle of sides  $2(1-y)/\sqrt{2}$  and  $2(1+y)/\sqrt{2}$ . On the u, v coordinates we can see that such rectangle is inscribed in the ellipse of (101), thus concluding the proof.

Additionally, we will describe the star domain structure of Alice's zero-discord states. When the set of states is of the form (95), their description correspond to a six dimensional space  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^6$ , defined by positivity conditions [81]. The natural orthonormal basis of  $\Omega$  are the unit vectors  $\{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{t}}_i\}_{i=1}^3$ , however we will use a rotated basis of vectors  $\{\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\}_{i=1}^3$ :

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i = rac{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i + \hat{\mathbf{t}}_i}{\sqrt{2}} \quad \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i = rac{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i - \hat{\mathbf{t}}_i}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

The reason to choose the basis  $\{\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\}_{i=1}^3$  is that it aligns the unit vectors with the symmetry axis of the rectangles forming the the free set  $\Omega_0$ . Indeed, from our previous analysis the free set is given by:

$$\Omega_{0}: \left\{ \mathbf{r} \mid \mathbf{r} = \alpha \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{i} + \beta \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{i}, |\alpha| \le (1+y_{i}) / \sqrt{2}, |\beta| \le (1-y_{i}) / \sqrt{2} \text{ for some } i \in \{1, 2, 3\} \right\}$$
(106)

where Ker  $(\Omega_0) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$  representing  $I \otimes I/4$ , and there exist only three rectangular convex components  $\Omega_{0,i}$  described by an individual  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  in definition (106).

#### D. Total Correlations

# 1. Hyperbolic Contraction Operations for the Total Correlations restricted free set

Here we provide a survey of hyperbolic contraction operations for the theory of total correlations. The frames  $\mathcal{T}^{(ij)}$  as described in (51) contain vectors  $\mathbf{l}_{ij}^{ab} \equiv \delta_{ij}^{ab} - \eta$ , to which we associate the constants  $\lambda_{rq}^{(ij)}$  defining the action of the operations as in (18):

$$\eta + \alpha_{ij}\mathbf{l}_{ij}^{ab} + \sum_{k \neq i, j \neq l} \left( \alpha_{kj}\mathbf{l}_{kj}^{ab} + \alpha_{jl}\mathbf{l}_{jl}^{ab} \right) \mapsto \eta + \alpha_{ij}\lambda_{ij}^{(ij)}\mathbf{l}_{ij}^{ab} + \sum_{k \neq i, j \neq l} \left( \alpha_{kj}\lambda_{kj}^{(ij)}\mathbf{l}_{kj}^{ab} + \alpha_{jl}\lambda_{il}^{(ij)}\mathbf{l}_{il}^{ab} \right).$$
(107)

When we consider cone order-preserving operations, i.e. all  $\lambda_{rq}^{(ij)} \leq 1$ , the physical interpretation of the operation is a stochastic process over  $p_C$  taking it closer to distributions in  $\mathcal{F}'$ . Notably, in general cone order-preserving operations are also RNG operations of the star resource theory based on  $\mathcal{F}$ . Concretely, we can write the uncorrelated probability distributions in the following way:

$$1 - \epsilon) p_A(a) p_B(b) + \epsilon \eta = \eta + (1 - \epsilon) (p_A(a) p_B(b) - \eta)$$

$$= \eta + (1 - \epsilon) \left( \sum_{k,l} p_A^k p_B^l \delta_{kl}^{ab} - \eta \right)$$

$$\stackrel{(t)}{=} \eta + (1 - \epsilon) \sum_{k,l} p_A^k p_B^l \left[ \delta_{kl}^{ab} - \eta \right]$$

$$= \eta + \sum_{k,l} (1 - \epsilon) p_A^k p_B^l \left[ \delta_{kl}^{ab} - \eta \right]$$

where in (t) we used the normalization of distributions  $p_A^k$  and  $p_B^l$ . Consequently it follows the condition  $\alpha_{kl} = (1-\epsilon)p_A^k p_B^l$  for the conic span. Thus, after a conic non-increasing operation with parameters  $\lambda_{kl}$  we have:

$$\alpha'_{kl} = (1 - \epsilon)\lambda_{kl}p^k_A p^l_B. \tag{108}$$

Then a sufficient condition for the new distribution to be uncorrelated is:

(

$$\lambda_{kl} = \bar{\lambda}_k \tilde{\lambda}_l \tag{109}$$

with  $\bar{\lambda}_k, \tilde{\lambda}_l \in [0, 1]$  for every k, l. Indeed, if the operation satisfies (109) we have:

$$p_{C}'(a,b) = \eta + \sum_{k,l} (1-\epsilon) \lambda_{kl} p_{A}^{k} p_{B}^{l} [\delta_{kl}^{ab} - \eta]$$

$$= \eta + \sum_{k,l} (1-\epsilon) \bar{\lambda}_{k} \tilde{\lambda}_{l} p_{A}^{k} p_{B}^{l} [\delta_{kl}^{ab} - \eta]$$

$$\stackrel{(r)}{=} \eta + \sum_{k,l} (1-\epsilon) \bar{\lambda}_{A} \tilde{\lambda}_{B} \bar{p}_{A}^{k} \tilde{p}_{B}^{l} [\delta_{kl}^{ab} - \eta]$$

$$\stackrel{(s)}{=} \eta + \sum_{k,l} (1-\epsilon') \bar{p}_{A}^{k} \tilde{p}_{B}^{l} [\delta_{kl}^{ab} - \eta]$$
(110)

where in (r) we defined the probability distributions:

$$\bar{p}_A^k = \frac{\bar{\lambda}_k p_A^k}{\bar{\lambda}_A} \quad \tilde{p}_B^l = \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_l p_B^l}{\tilde{\lambda}_B}$$

with  $\bar{\lambda}_A$ ,  $\tilde{\lambda}_B$  the corresponding normalization factors. Lastly, in (s) we define  $\epsilon'$  such that:

$$(1 - \epsilon') = (1 - \epsilon) \,\bar{\lambda}_A \tilde{\lambda}_B \tag{111}$$

is straightforward to note that  $\epsilon \leq \epsilon' \leq 1$ , and then (110) shows that the operation is resource non-generating. Finally, in our exemplary case  $n_A = n_B = 2$ , when  $\lambda_{ij} = 1$  in  $\mathcal{D}^{(ij)}$ , condition (109) is automatically satisfied by constants  $\bar{\lambda}_i = \tilde{\lambda}_j = 1$ ,  $\bar{\lambda}_{i\oplus 1} = \lambda_{i\oplus 1,j}$ , and  $\tilde{\lambda}_{j\oplus 1} = \lambda_{i,j\oplus 1}$ . Note that  $\lambda_{i\oplus 1,j\oplus 1}$  could take any value because in  $\mathcal{D}^{(ij)}$  the component  $\alpha_{ij}$  is always zero.

Another free operations in this class arise when  $n_A = n_B = n$  by taking a every pair  $\lambda_{ik}^{(ij)}, \lambda_{lj}^{(ij)}$  with  $k \neq j, l \neq i$ to define an hyperbolic rotation  $\lambda_{ik}^{(ij)} = e^{\varphi}, \lambda_{lj}^{(ij)} = e^{-\varphi}$ . The above is also a squeeze map where we consider the product of all  $\lambda_{rq}^{(ij)}$ , but with  $\lambda_{ij}^{(ij)} = 1$ . When  $n_A \neq n_B$ , the squeeze map is not simulable as hyperbolic rotations, nevertheless we still can construct one: without loss of generality consider  $n_A < n_B$ , first make all  $\lambda_{ik}^{(ij)}$  with  $k \neq j$ equal to a constant  $\lambda_A \leq 1$ , second take all  $\lambda_{lj}^{(ij)}$  equal to  $\lambda_B = \lambda_A^{-n_A/n_B}$ , and here also  $\lambda_{ij}^{(ij)} = 1$ , obtaining a squeeze map which generalize the previous map. However, while the hyperbolic rotations, and squeeze maps also correspond to specific post-processing of outputs they are not RNG operations for the theory with the full free set  $\mathcal{F}$ .

# 2. Computing critical value

Here, we compute the critical value of our  $\mathcal{F}'$  based quantifier, beyond which there can be only correlated distributions. To achieve this objective, we must parameterize the free set  $\mathcal{F}$  writing explicitly any distribution  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  as:

$$\mathbf{f} = (1-\epsilon) \left( xy, \ (1-x)y, \ x(1-y), \ (1-x)(1-y) \right) + \frac{\epsilon}{4}$$
(112)

in particular any  $f \in \mathcal{C}_{00}$  satisfies  $x, y \geq \frac{1}{2}$ . It is also straightforward to project arbitrary f onto the faces as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}'_{A0} \ni \mathbf{f}_{A} = (1-\epsilon) \left( xy, \ (1-x)y, \ \frac{1-y}{2}, \ \frac{1-y}{2} \right) + \frac{\epsilon}{4} \mathcal{F}'_{B0} \ni \mathbf{f}_{B} = (1-\epsilon) \left( xy, \ \frac{1-x}{2}, \ x(1-y), \ \frac{1-x}{2} \right) + \frac{\epsilon}{4}$$
(113)

from which it is simple to calculate the product of the 1-norms, serving as a proxy to the monotone

$$\sqrt{\|\boldsymbol{f} - \boldsymbol{f}_A\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{f} - \boldsymbol{f}_B\|_1} = \sqrt{(1-\epsilon)^2 \left| (1-y) \left(\frac{1}{2} - x\right) \right| \left| (1-x) \left(\frac{1}{2} - y\right) \right|}.$$
(114)

A typical optimization provides maximum of this function is:  $\frac{1}{16}$ . This bound yields the maximum resource achievable by uncorrelated distributions, thus any larger value of our  $\mathcal{F}'$  based quantifier, witness total correlations in the evaluated distribution.

#### 3. Extension to network total correlations

A straightforward extension of the SRT of total correlations considers an arbitrary number N of parties  $A_1, \ldots, A_N$ with an alphabet of  $n_{A_i}$  letters for outputs  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_N)$  with correlations:

$$\mathcal{F} \ni p_C(a_1, \dots, a_N) = \left\{ (1 - \epsilon) \left( \prod_{i=1}^N p_{A_i}(a_i) \right) + \epsilon \left( \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{n_{A_i}} \right) : p_{A_i}(a_i) \in \Delta_{n_{A_i}} \right\},\tag{115}$$

which evidently form a star with the flat distribution at its kernel. Moreover, we can also extend the free sections of the auxiliary free set:

$$\mathcal{F}'_{A_i,\mathbf{k}} \ni p_C(\mathbf{a}) = \left\{ (1-\epsilon)p_{A_i}(a_i) \left(\prod_{j \neq i} \delta_{a_j,k_j}\right) + \epsilon \left(\prod_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{n_{A_i}}\right) : p_{A_i}(a_i) \in \Delta_{n_{A_i}} \right\},\tag{116}$$

and then considering all possible values for the vector  $\mathbf{k}$ . Then, it is possible to carry on the analysis and construction of witnesses in complete analogy as with two parties.

However, we can apply this simple extension to the important field of network correlations by identifying each party with a node of a weighted graph or hyper-graph and the weight of an edge/hyper-edge with the marginal distribution of  $p_C(a_1, \ldots, a_N)$  including only the parties connected by the edge/hyper-edge.

The development of resource theories for weighted networks with concrete topologies it is a promising area due to its multiple applications, yet unexplored to date. Crucially, we can apply our techniques to any network topology. Since the weights can be continuously reduced regardless of the graph until obtaining a network with independent nodes, such a network must belong to the free set's kernel. Consequently, we can use star domains to characterize their properties and possible transformations for any network topology.

#### E. Non-Markovianity

# 1. Explicit calculation of the minimization problem in Eq. (68).

For an arbitrary  $\Phi_j$  in the free section  $\mathcal{F}_j$ , the respective Jamiołkowski states representing single-qubit operations read:

$$J_{\Phi_1} = \frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \frac{q}{2} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1-q}{2} \\ 0 & \frac{1-q}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1-q}{2} & 0 \\ \frac{1-q}{2} & 0 & 0 & 1+\frac{q}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad J_{\Phi_2} = \frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \frac{q}{4} & 0 & 0 & \frac{2+q}{4} \\ 0 & \frac{2+q}{4} & -\frac{q}{4} & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{q}{4} & \frac{2+q}{4} & 0 \\ \frac{2+q}{4} & 0 & 0 & 1-\frac{q}{4} \end{pmatrix}, \quad J_{\Phi_3} = \frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \frac{q}{4} & 0 & 0 & \frac{2+q}{4} \\ 0 & \frac{2+q}{4} & q & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{q}{4} & \frac{2+q}{4} & 0 \\ \frac{2+q}{4} & 0 & 0 & 1-\frac{q}{4} \end{pmatrix}.$$

$$(117)$$

Using the above expressions for  $J_{\Phi_j}$ , the minimization problem (68) takes the following form:

$$\min_{q} \frac{1}{12} \left( \frac{1}{2} |7 - 3\sqrt{5} - 4q| + |-7 + 3\sqrt{5} + q| + \frac{1}{2} |7 - 3\sqrt{5} + 2q| \right) 
\text{s.t. } 0 \le q \le 1.$$
(118)

As we are dealing with inequality constraints, we will make use of slack variables  $s^2$  and  $t^2$  that will convert our problem to the form

$$\min_{\substack{q \\ s.t. \\ q + t^2 - 1 = 0.}} \frac{\frac{1}{12} \left( \frac{1}{2} |7 - 3\sqrt{5} - 4q| + |-7 + 3\sqrt{5} + q| + \frac{1}{2} |7 - 3\sqrt{5} + 2q| \right)}{(119)}$$

Now, we are able to construct our Lagrangian

$$\mathscr{L} = \frac{1}{12} \left( \frac{1}{2} |7 - 3\sqrt{5} - 4q| + |-7 + 3\sqrt{5} + q| + \frac{1}{2} |7 - 3\sqrt{5} + 2q| \right) - \mu(q - s^2) + \lambda(q + t^2 - 1), \tag{120}$$

and the equations that need to be fulfilled for this Lagrangian are the following

$$\frac{\partial \mathscr{L}}{\partial q} = \mp \frac{1}{6} \pm \frac{1}{12} + \frac{1}{12} + \lambda - \mu = 0$$
(121)

$$\frac{\partial \mathscr{L}}{\partial \lambda} = q + t^2 - 1 = 0 \tag{122}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathscr{L}}{\partial \mu} = -(q - s^2) = 0 \tag{123}$$

where  $\mp$  and  $\pm$  denote the two possibilities when taking the derivative of each absolute value, the first one when the expression inside the absolute value is positive and the second one when is negative.

Now, using KKT conditions (see [124, 125]) we know that at the optimal solution of this problem,  $q^*$ , either the Lagrange multiplier corresponding to the inequality constraint is zero or the corresponding inequality constraint is active, i.e. the corresponding slack variable is zero and we have an equality. Therefore there are four possibilities:

1.  $\mu = 0, \lambda = 0, s^2 \ge 0$  and  $t^2 \ge 0$ . 2.  $\mu = 0, \lambda \ne 0, s^2 \ge 0$  and  $t^2 = 0$ . 3.  $\mu \ne 0, \lambda \ne 0, s^2 = 0$  and  $t^2 = 0$ . 4.  $\mu \ne 0, \lambda = 0, s^2 = 0$  and  $t^2 \ge 0$ .

If we investigate the equation (121), the only way for this equation to be zero the cases in which  $\mu = 0$  and  $\lambda = 0$  is when the expression inside the first absolute value is positive and also the one inside the second one. Inspecting at the expressions we see that this is never possible and therefore we must rule out the first possibility.

Regarding the other three possibilities, we see that the result is the same regardless of the signs in (121) because (121) does not give us information regarding q. So, the second case give us  $q^* = 1$  and the corresponding objective function,  $f = \frac{1}{4}(\sqrt{5} - 1)$ . The third one is not feasible, because it gives us that  $q^* = 0$  and also  $q^* = 1$  at the same time and the last one  $q^* = 0$  and  $f = \frac{1}{6}(7 - 3\sqrt{5})$ .

The remaining cases to try are those in which the expression inside the two first absolute values are equal to 0. This is the case for  $q^* = \frac{7-3\sqrt{5}}{4}$  and  $f = \frac{1}{8}(7-3\sqrt{5})$ , and  $q^* = 7-3\sqrt{5}$  and  $f = \frac{1}{4}(7-3\sqrt{5})$  respectively.

Finally, comparing all the cases we find the minimum equal to  $\frac{1}{8}(7-3\sqrt{5})$ , and achieved when  $q = \frac{7-3\sqrt{5}}{4}$ .

# 2. Conic non-increasing operations are RNG

Using the De Casteljau's form of  $\Delta_{ij}\mathcal{F}$  we can write elements of the section of  $\mathcal{F}$  inside  $\mathcal{D}^{(k)}$  with  $k \neq i, k \neq j$  by,

$$\Phi = (1-\epsilon) \left[ (1-s)^2 \Gamma_i^{1/2} + 2s (1-s) \Gamma_d^{1/2} + s^2 \Gamma_j^{1/2} \right] + \epsilon \Gamma_d^{1/2}$$
  
$$= \Gamma_d^{1/2} + (1-\epsilon) \left[ (1-s)^2 \Gamma_i^{1/2} + 2s (1-s) \Gamma_d^{1/2} + s^2 \Gamma_j^{1/2} - \Gamma_d^{1/2} \right]$$
  
$$\stackrel{(r)}{=} \Gamma_d^{1/2} + (1-\epsilon) \left[ (1-s)^2 \left( \Gamma_i^{1/2} - \Gamma_d^{1/2} \right) + s^2 \left( \Gamma_j^{1/2} - \Gamma_d^{1/2} \right) \right]$$
(124)

where in (r) we use the fact that  $(1-s)^2 + 2s(1-s) + s^2 = 1$ . Now, from (124) follows that  $\alpha_i = (1-\epsilon)(1-s)^2$ and  $\alpha_j = (1-\epsilon)s^2$ . In consequence, after a conic non-increasing operation with parameters  $\lambda_i, \lambda_j \in [0, 1]$ , we have a channel  $\Phi'$  with conic components:

$$\alpha'_{i} = \lambda_{i} \left(1 - \epsilon\right) \left(1 - s\right)^{2} \quad \alpha'_{j} = \lambda_{j} \left(1 - \epsilon\right) s^{2} \tag{125}$$

Now, we define the parameters:

$$\bar{s} = \frac{\sqrt{\lambda_j s}}{\sqrt{\lambda_j s} + \sqrt{\lambda_i} (1-s)} \quad (1-\epsilon') = (1-\epsilon) \left[\sqrt{\lambda_j s} + \sqrt{\lambda_i} (1-s)\right]^2 \tag{126}$$

Then, replacing  $\bar{s}$  and  $\epsilon'$  in (125) we get:

$$\alpha'_{i} = (1 - \epsilon') (1 - \bar{s})^{2} \quad \alpha'_{j} = (1 - \epsilon') \bar{s}^{2}$$
(127)

demonstrating that any conic non-increasing operation is RNG.

# F. Non-Unistochasticity

We explain here how to obtain the optimal value of the witness of non-unistochasticity, Eq. (58). We analyze the tetrahedron of circulant bistochastic matrices shown in Fig. 13. Without loss of generality, let us fix the analyzed quadrant to the one defined in Eq. (55). First observation comes from the symmetry of the problem – the closest non-unistochastic matrix to the central van der Waerden matrix lies on the line  $W_4 \leftrightarrow \frac{1}{2}(\Pi_4^0 + \Pi_4)$ .

It is straightforward to find the matrix, given via  $(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})W_4 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\Pi_4^0 + \Pi_4)$ , together with the geometric mean of the distances to the triangles that define the quadrant, being  $\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}$ . What is left is a simple algebraic check that this is indeed optimal; i.e., the hyperboloid with the above parameter has only one common point with the set of the unistochastic matrices, proving its suitability for the task of witnessing non-unistochasticity.

- [1] C. H. Bennett, Quantum Inf. Comput. 4, 460 (2004).
- [2] I. Devetak, A. W. Harrow, and A. J. Winter, IEEE Trans. Inf. 54, 4587 (2008).
- [3] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. 81, 865 (2009).
- [4] M. Horodecki, K. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, A. Sen(De), and U. Sen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 100402 (2003).
- [5] G. Vidal and R. Tarrach, Phys. Rev. A 59, 141 (1999).
- [6] A. Streltsov, G. Adesso, and M. B. Plenio, Rev. Mod. Phys. 89, 041003 (2017).
- [7] M. Lostaglio, Rep. Prog. Phys. 82, 114001 (2019).
- [8] E. Chitambar and G. Gour, Rev. Mod. Phys. 91, 025001 (2019).

- [9] P. Skrzypczyk, I. Supic, and D. Cavalcanti, Phys. Rev. Lett. 122, 130403 (2019).
- [10] V. Veitch, S. A. H. Mousavian, D. Gottesman, and J. Emerson, New J. Phys. 16, 013009 (2014).
- [11] J. I. de Vicente, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 47, 424017 (2014).
- [12] P. Lipka-Bartosik, A. F. Ducuara, T. Purves, and P. Skrzypczyk, PRX Quantum 2, 020301 (2021).
- [13] R. Takagi, K. Wang, and M. Hayashi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 124, 120502 (2020).
- [14] R. Takagi and Q. Zhuang, Phys. Rev. A 97, 062337 (2018).
- [15] R. Takagi and B. Regula, Phys. Rev. X 9, 031053 (2019).
- [16] V. Jagadish, R. Srikanth, and F. Petruccione, Phys.

Lett. A 384, 126907 (2020).

- [17] H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, J. Piilo, and B. Vacchini, Rev. Mod. Phys. 88, 021002 (2016).
- [18] B. Vacchini, A. Smirne, E.-M. Laine, J. Piilo, and H.-P. Breuer, New J. Phys. 13, 093004 (2011).
- [19] M. Alshowkan, B. P. Williams, P. G. Evans, N. S. Rao, E. M. Simmerman, H.-H. Lu, N. B. Lingaraju, A. M. Weiner, C. E. Marvinney, Y.-Y. Pai, B. J. Lawrie, N. A. Peters, and J. M. Lukens, PRX Quantum 2, 040304 (2021).
- [20] S. Wehner, D. Elkouss, and R. Hanson, Science 362 (2018).
- [21] J. Schluck, G. Murta, H. Kampermann, D. Bruß, and N. Wyderka, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. (2022).
- [22] K. Kuroiwa, R. Takagi, G. Adesso, and H. Yamasaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **132**, 150201 (2024).
- [23] H. S. M. Coxeter, *Introduction to Geometry*, Wiley Classics Library (Wiley, 1989).
- [24] O. Gühne and N. Lütkenhaus, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 170502 (2006).
- [25] S.-Q. Shen, J.-M. Liang, M. Li, J. Yu, and S.-M. Fei, Phys. Rev. A 101, 012312 (2020).
- [26] K. Sen, C. Srivastava, and U. Sen, J. Phys. A 56, 315301 (2023).
- [27] J. Watrous, Theory Comput. 5, 217 (2009).
- [28] J. Watrous, Theor. Comput. Sci. 292, 575 (2003).
- [29] B. Rosgen, in 25th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), Vol. 1, edited by S. Albers and P. Weil (Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2008) pp. 597–608.
- [30] M.-D. Choi, Linear Algebra Its Appl. 10, 285 (1975).
- [31] A. Jamiołkowski, Reports on Mathematical Physics 3, 275 (1972).
- [32] J. Munkres, *Topology*, Featured Titles for Topology (Prentice Hall, Incorporated, 2000).
- [33] H. Coxeter, P. Du-Val, H. Flather, and J. Petrie, *The Fifty-nine Icosahedra*, University of Toronto Studies. Mathematical Series. 6 (University of Toronto Press, 1951).
- [34] E. Moreale and M. Emmer, *Mathematics and Culture I*, Mathematics and Culture (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2003).
- [35] N. Magnenat-Thalmann and D. Thalmann, New Trends in Computer Graphics: Proceedings of CG International '88 (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012).
- [36] G. Hansen, I. Herburt, H. Martini, and M. Moszyńska, Aequationes Mathematicae 94 (2020).
- [37] F. P. Preparata and M. I. Shamos, Computational geometry: an introduction (Springer Science & Business Media, 2012).
- [38] G. P. Crespi, I. Ginchev, and M. Rocca, J. Glob. Optim. 32, 485 (2005).
- [39] R. Hu, J. Appl. Math. **2014**, 1 (2014).
- [40] J. Fang, Archiv der Mathematik 108, 621 (2017).
- [41] B. L. Annesi, C. Lauditi, C. Lucibello, E. M. Malatesta, G. Perugini, F. Pittorino, and L. Saglietti, Phys. Rev. Lett. 131, 227301 (2023).
- [42] A. Schrijver, *Theory of Linear and Integer Program*ming, Wiley Series in Discrete Mathematics & Optimization (Wiley, 1998).
- [43] J. De Loera, R. Hemmecke, and M. Köppe, Algebraic and Geometric Ideas in the Theory of Discrete Opti-

*mization*, MOS-SIAM Series on Optimization (Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM, 3600 Market Street, Floor 6, Philadelphia, PA 19104), 2012).

- [44] A. W. Marshall, D. W. Walkup, and R. J.-B. Wets, Pac. J. Math. 23, 569 (1967).
- [45] L. Lovász and M. Plummer, *Matching Theory*, Annals of discrete mathematics (North-Holland, 1986).
- [46] G. Hansen and H. Martini, J. Convex Anal. 17 (2010).
- [47] R. Rockafellar, *Convex Analysis* (Princeton University Press, 1970).
- [48] W. G. Ritter, J. Math. Phys. 46, 082103 (2005).
- [49] R. A. Bertlmann and P. Krammer, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 41, 235303 (2008).
- [50] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Phys. Rev. A 81, 062348 (2010).
- [51] C. M. Scandolo, R. Salazar, J. K. Korbicz, and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Res. 3, 033148 (2021).
- [52] R. Engelking, *General Topology*, Sigma series in pure mathematics (Heldermann, 1989).
- [53] R. Takagi, B. Regula, K. Bu, Z.-W. Liu, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 140402 (2019).
- [54] K. Kuroiwa, R. Takagi, G. Adesso, and H. Yamasaki, Phys. Rev. A 109, 042403 (2024).
- [55] H. Wojewódka-Ściążko, Z. Puchała, and K. Korzekwa, Quantum 8, 1222 (2024).
- [56] C. Sparaciari, L. del Rio, C. M. Scandolo, P. Faist, and J. Oppenheim, Quantum 4, 259 (2020).
- [57] S. Goldwasser, S. Micali, and C. Rackoff, SIAM Journal on Computing 18, 186 (1989).
- [58] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 060401 (2008).
- [59] M. T. Quintino, Q. Dong, A. Shimbo, A. Soeda, and M. Murao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 210502 (2019).
- [60] S. Yoshida, A. Soeda, and M. Murao, Phys. Rev. Lett. 131, 120602 (2023).
- [61] G. Chiribella and D. Ebler, New J. Phys. 18, 093053 (2016).
- [62] A. Bisio, G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, S. Facchini, and P. Perinotti, Phys. Rev. A 81, 032324 (2010).
- [63] M. Sedlák, A. Bisio, and M. Ziman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 122, 170502 (2019).
- [64] C. Zhu, Y. Mo, Y.-A. Chen, and X. Wang, "Reversing unknown quantum processes via virtual combs: for channels with limited information," (2024), arXiv:2401.04672 [quant-ph].
- [65] Y. Mo, L. Zhang, Y.-A. Chen, Y. Liu, T. Lin, and X. Wang, "Parameterized quantum comb and simpler circuits for reversing unknown qubit-unitary operations," (2024), arXiv:2403.03761 [quant-ph].
- [66] F. Ahnefeld, T. Theurer, D. Egloff, J. M. Matera, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **129**, 120501 (2022).
- [67] B. Peleg and P. Sudhölter, *Introduction to the Theory of Cooperative Games*, Theory and decision library (Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003).
- [68] F. Muros, Cooperative Game Theory Tools in Coalitional Control Networks, Springer Theses (Springer International Publishing, 2019).
- [69] J. Friedman, Game Theory with Applications to Economics (Oxford University Press, 1986).
- [70] I. Curiel, Cooperative Game Theory and Applications: Cooperative Games Arising from Combinatorial Optimization Problems, Theory and Decision Library C (Springer US, 1997).
- [71] X. Sun, Y. Liu, J. Li, J. Zhu, X. Liu, and H. Chen,

Neurocomputing 97, 86 (2012).

- [72] S. Chakravarty, M. Mitra, and P. Sarkar, A Course on Cooperative Game Theory (Cambridge University Press, 2015).
- [73] J. Harsanyi, *Papers in Game Theory*, Theory and Decision Library (Springer Netherlands, 2010).
- [74] A. F. Ducuara and P. Skrzypczyk, PRX Quantum 3, 020366 (2022).
- [75] W. H. Zurek, Annalen der Physik 9, 855 (2000).
- [76] K. Modi, A. Brodutch, H. Cable, T. Paterek, and V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. 84, 1655 (2012).
- [77] G. Adesso, T. R. Bromley, and M. Cianciaruso, J. Phys. A 49, 473001 (2016).
- [78] B. Dakić, V. Vedral, and C. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 105, 190502 (2010).
- [79] A. A.-Q. Nicolás Quesada and D. F. James, J. Modern Optics 59, 1322 (2012).
- [80] U. Fano, Rev. Mod. Phys. **29**, 74 (1957).
- [81] O. Gamel, Phys. Rev. A 93, 062320 (2016).
- [82] C. Altafini and T. F. Havel, J. Math. Phys. 47, 032104 (2006).
- [83] C.-K. Li and H. J. Woerdeman, Linear Algebra Appl. 255, 247 (1997).
- [84] S.-H. Kye, Linear Algebra Appl. **216**, 239 (1995).
- [85] Z. Puchała, K. Korzekwa, R. Salazar, P. Horodecki, and K. Życzkowski, Phys. Rev. A 104 (2021).
- [86] H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, S. Massar, and R. de Wolf, Rev. Mod. Phys. 82, 665 (2010).
- [87] N. Brunner, D. Cavalcanti, S. Pironio, V. Scarani, and S. Wehner, Rev. Mod. Phys. 86, 419 (2014).
- [88] Y.-H. Au-Yeung and Y.-T. Poon, Theory Comput. 27, 69 (1979).
- [89] C. Jarlskog and R. Stora, Physics Letters B 208, 268 (1988).
- [90] I. Bengtsson, Å. Ericsson, M. Kuś, W. Tadej, and K. Życzkowski, Commun. Math. Phys. 259, 307 (2005).
- [91] G. Rajchel-Mieldzioć, K. Korzekwa, Z. Puchała, and K. Życzkowski, J. Math. Phys. 63, 012202 (2022).
- [92] P. Kruszynski, "A problem in quantum probability," NASA, REPT-87-06 (1987).
- [93] G. Rajchel, A. Gąsiorowski, and K. Życzkowski, Mathematics in Computer Science 12, 473 (2018).
- [94] Y.-H. Au-Yeung and C.-M. Cheng, Theory Comput. 150, 243 (1991).
- [95] I. I. Bigi and A. I. Sanda, CP Violation, 2nd Ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- [96] P. Diţă, J. Math. Phys. 47, 083510 (2006).
- [97] C. Jarlskog, Phys. Rev. Lett. 55, 1039 (1985).
- [98] Y. Aharonov, L. Davidovich, and N. Zagury, Phys. Rev. A 48, 1687 (1993).
- [99] P. Pakoński, K. Życzkowski, and M. Kuś, J. Phys. A 34, 9303 (2001).
- [100] P. Pakoński, G. Tanner, and K. Życzkowski, J. Stat. Phys. 111, 1331 (2003).
- [101] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531 (1963).
- [102] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Progress Theor. Phys. 49, 652 (1973).
- [103] B. Pontecorvo, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 34, 247 (1957).
- [104] Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa, and S. Sakata, Progress Theor. Phys. 28, 870 (1962).
- [105] H.-P. Breuer, F. Petruccione, et al., The theory of open quantum systems (Oxford University Press on Demand, 2002).
- [106] D. F. Anderson and T. G. Kurtz, in Design and anal-

ysis of biomolecular circuits: engineering approaches to systems and synthetic biology (Springer, 2011) pp. 3–42.

- [107] J. Zhang and T. Zhou, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 116, 23542 (2019).
- [108] L. J. Mirman, O. F. Morand, and K. L. Reffett, J. Econ. Theory 139, 75 (2008).
- [109] M. M. Wolf and J. I. Cirac, Communications in Mathematical Physics 279, 147 (2008).
- [110] V. Jagadish, R. Srikanth, and F. Petruccione, Phys. Rev. A 101, 062304 (2020).
- [111] D. Davalos, M. Ziman, and C. Pineda, Quantum 3, 144 (2019).
- [112] Z. Puchała, L. Rudnicki, and K. Życzkowski, Phys. Lett. A 383, 2376 (2019).
- [113] G. Farin and D. Hansford, *The Essentials of CAGD* (CRC Press, 2000).
- [114] J. Åberg, R. Nery, C. Duarte, and R. Chaves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **125**, 110505 (2020).
- [115] A. Tavakoli, A. Pozas-Kerstjens, M.-X. Luo, and M.-O. Renou, Rep. Prog. Phys. 85, 056001 (2022).
- [116] F. Buscemi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 200401 (2012).
- [117] P. Lipka-Bartosik, A. F. Ducuara, T. Purves, and P. Skrzypczyk, PRX Quantum 2, 020301 (2021).
- [118] S. Horvath, Weighted Network Analysis: Applications in Genomics and Systems Biology (Springer New York, 2011).
- [119] M. De Domenico, V. Nicosia, A. Arenas, and V. Latora, Nat. Commun. 6, 6864 (2015).
- [120] Y. Ma and G. Guo, Support Vector Machines Applications, SpringerLink : Bücher (Springer International Publishing, 2014).
- [121] P. Jain and P. Kar, Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning 10, 142 (2017).
- [122] A. Clifford, Multivariate Error Analysis: A Handbook of Error Propagation and Calculation in Many-parameter Systems, Raymond F. Boyer Library Collection (Applied Science Publishers, 1973).
- [123] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Phys. Rev. A 80, 022339 (2009).
- [124] W. Karush, M. Sc. Dissertation. Dept. of Mathematics, Univ. of Chicago (1939).
- [125] H. Kuhn and A. Tucker, Proceedings of the Second Berkeley (1951).



FIG. 17. Paper folding versions of Figures 10 and 11.



FIG. 18. Paper folding version of Figure 12.