

General quantum correlation from nonreal values of Kirkwood-Dirac quasiprobability over orthonormal product bases

Agung Budiyo^{1,2,3,*}, Bobby E. Gunara⁴, Bagus
E. B. Nurhandoko⁴, and Hermawan K. Dipojono^{2,3}

¹*Research Center for Quantum Physics,
National Research and Innovation Agency, South Tangerang 15314, Indonesia*

²*Research Center for Nanoscience and Nanotechnology,
Bandung Institute of Technology, Bandung, 40132, Indonesia*

³*Department of Engineering Physics,
Bandung Institute of Technology, Bandung, 40132, Indonesia and*

⁴*Department of Physics, Bandung Institute of Technology, Bandung, 40132, Indonesia*

(Dated: May 15, 2024)

Abstract

We propose a characterization and a quantification of general quantum correlation which is exhibited even by a separable (unentangled) mixed bipartite state in terms of the nonclassical values of the associated Kirkwood-Dirac (KD) quasiprobability. Such a general quantum correlation, wherein entanglement is a subset, is not only intriguing from a fundamental point of view, but it has also been recognized as a resource in a variety of schemes of quantum information processing and quantum technology. Given a bipartite state, we construct a quantity based on the imaginary part the associated KD quasiprobability defined over a pair of orthonormal product bases and an optimization procedure over all pairs of such bases. We show that it satisfies certain requirements expected for a quantifier of general quantum correlations. It gives a lower bound to the total sum of the quantum standard deviation of all the elements of the product (local) basis, minimized over all such bases. It suggests an interpretation as the minimum genuine quantum share of uncertainty in all possible local von-Neumann projective measurement. Moreover, it is a faithful witness for entanglement and measurement-induced nonlocality of pure bipartite states. We then discuss a variational scheme for its estimation, and based on this, we offer information theoretical meanings of the general quantum correlation. Our results suggest a deep connection between the general quantum correlation and the nonclassical values of the KD quasiprobability and the associated strange weak values.

PACS numbers:

Keywords: general quantum correlation, local noncommutativity, nonreal Kirkwood-Dirac quasiprobability, orthonormal product bases, strange weak value

*Electronic address: agungbymlati@gmail.com

I. INTRODUCTION

Nonclassical correlation in multipartite quantum systems was originally associated with entangled states, namely states that cannot be prepared by any set of local operation and classical communication (LOCC) [1]. Studies in the last couple of decades however showed that most unentangled (i.e., separable) but mixed states are somewhat nonclassically correlated, manifested in the various forms of discord-like quantum correlations [2–21]. The nonclassical correlations beyond entanglement have received a growing attention both from a fundamental view point and also practically to better understand the physical origin of the quantum advantages in certain information processing tasks and schemes of quantum technology which consume very little or no entanglement [22–29]. Different approaches have been proposed to characterize and quantify the general quantum correlation, adopting ideas from quantum information theory within the framework of quantum resource theory. See Refs. [30–32] for recent reviews. Conceptually, these general quantum correlations arise from the noncommutativity between the multipartite quantum state and some set of local quantum observables, rather than from the nonseparability of the state.

On the other hand, there is an informationally equivalent representation of quantum state based on quasiprobability distributions where quantum noncommutativity appears as a different form of nonclassicality. Quasiprobability distributions are the quantum analogs of phase space probability distribution in classical statistical mechanics. Because of the quantum noncommutativity, they necessarily do not satisfy all the Kolmogorov axioms for probability. In particular, in a specific quasiprobability distribution called Kirkwood-Dirac (KD) quasiprobability [33–36], the failure of commutativity manifests in the nonvanishing imaginary part and/or negative values of its real part. Remarkably, the nonreality and/or the negativity of the KD quasiprobability is tighter than noncommutativity [37, 38]. Significant works over the past decade showed that KD quasiprobability and its nonclassical values play crucial roles in quantum tomography [39–42], quantum metrology [43–45], quantum thermodynamics [45–47], a wide spectrum of quantum fluctuations in condensed matter physics [48], information scrambling in many body quantum chaos [49, 50], in quantum foundation to prove quantum contextuality [51, 52], and recently in the characterization and quantification of coherence and asymmetry [53–55].

In this paper, we attempt to develop a relation between the above two notions of nonclassi-

cality which both arise directly from noncommutativity, i.e., the general quantum correlation in a multipartite state and the nonclassical values of the associated KD quasiprobability. Namely, we ask: can we use the nonclassical values of the KD quasiprobability to characterize and quantify the general quantum correlation? First, given a multipartite quantum state, we construct a quantity from the imaginary part of the KD quasiprobability defined over a pair of orthonormal product bases of the relevant Hilbert space, and optimized over all possible choices of such bases. We argue that it satisfies certain plausible requirements expected for a quantifier of quantum correlation beyond entanglement, and thus refer to it as KD nonclassical correlation. KD nonclassical correlation sets a lower bound to the uncertainty arising in von-Neumann local projective measurement, quantified by the total sum of the quantum standard deviation of all the elements of the associated local PVM (projection-valued measure), minimized over all such possible projective measurements. It may be interpreted as the minimum genuine quantum share out of the total uncertainty arising in any measurement described by local PVM over the multipartite state. For arbitrary pure bipartite states, it is a faithful witness for the linear entropy of entanglement and measurement-induced nonlocality [12]. We then discuss a scheme to estimate the KD nonclassical correlation directly without recouring to quantum state tomography, via a hybrid quantum-classical variational circuit by combining a reconstruction of the KD quasiprobability or the associated weak value [39–42, 48, 56–66] and a classical optimization procedure. The scheme suggests new information theoretical meanings of the general quantum correlation.

The article is organized as follows. In Section II A, we summarize the notion of nonclassical multipartite states based on the noncommutativity between the multipartite state and some local basis. In Section II B, we define a specific class of KD quasiprobability over a pair of orthonormal product bases, and discuss its properties. In Section III, we define KD nonclassical correlation in a bipartite quantum state based on the imaginary part of the associated KD quasiprobability over a pair of orthonormal product bases and optimization over all pairs of such bases. We show that it satisfies certain plausible requirements for a quantifier of general quantum correlation, and discuss its relation with negativity of quantumness. We also give numerical calculations of the KD nonclassical correlation in a maximally entangled two-qubit state and a 2×2 Werner state. We proceed in Section IV A to study the relation between the KD nonclassical correlation with the uncertainty arising

in the measurement described by local PVM, and the linear entropy of entanglement and measurement-induced nonlocality for pure states. In Section IV B, we discuss a variational scheme for a direct estimation of the KD nonclassical correlation and suggest its information theoretical meaning. Section V ends with a summary and a remark.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Nonclassical state and noncommutativity

Consider a composite of two subsystems AB with a quantum state that is represented by a density operator ϱ_{AB} acting on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{AB} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, where $\mathcal{H}_{A(B)}$ is the Hilbert space of the subsystem $A(B)$. In a general multipartite setting, a separable state is intuitively defined as a state that can be prepared by LOCC [1]. For a bipartite system, a separable state can thus be in general expressed as a classical statistical mixture of the product states, i.e., $\varrho_{AB}^S = \sum_k p_k \varrho_A^k \otimes \varrho_B^k$, where $\{\varrho_{A(B)}^k\}$ is a set of density operators of the subsystem $A(B)$ on $\mathcal{H}_{A(B)}$, and $\{p_k\}$ are mixing probabilities: $p_k \geq 0$, $\sum_k p_k = 1$. All other states, i.e., nonseparable states, are entangled. For pure states, separability is equivalent to the absence of nonclassical correlation. Remarkably, allowing impurity to the bipartite state may lead to nonclassical correlations even when it is separable. That is, various different schemes have been revealed over the past couple of decades which show that mixed separable states may nevertheless exhibit correlation that cannot be accessed by any classical object [2–20, 30–32]. For instance, any local measurement to a separable but mixed multipartite state may yield a disturbance to the global state which cannot be locally accounted for [2, 3, 12].

By contrast, classical intuition suggests that for a genuine classical multipartite state, there is at least a local measurement which does not lead to a modification to the global state. For a bipartite system AB , there are two classes of states which conform with the above intuition [6, 25]. One is the class of classical-quantum (or, A -classically correlated) states, which are those that can be expressed as

$$\varrho_{AB}^{CQ} := \sum_k p_k |k\rangle \langle k|_A \otimes \varrho_B^k, \quad (1)$$

where $\{|k\rangle_A\}$ is an orthonormal basis of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_A of subsystem A , $\{\varrho_B^k\}$ is a

set of states of subsystem B , and $\{p_k\}$ are probabilities: $p_k \geq 0$, $\sum_k p_k = 1$. The quantum-classical (or, B -classically correlated) state is defined analogously by exchanging the role of the parties A and B . The other class consists of bipartite states having the following form:

$$\varrho_{AB}^{CC} := \sum_{k,l} p_{kl} |k\rangle \langle k|_A \otimes |l\rangle \langle l|_B, \quad (2)$$

where $\{|k\rangle_A\}$ and $\{|l\rangle_B\}$ are orthonormal bases of subsystem A and B , respectively, and $\{p_{kl}\}$ are joint probabilities: $p_{kl} \geq 0$, $\sum_{k,l} p_{kl} = 1$. Such states are called classical-classical (or, totally classically correlated) states. One can see that applying local projective measurements described by PVMs $\{\Pi_A^k \otimes \mathbb{I}_B\}$ and $\{\Pi_A^k \otimes \Pi_B^l\}$, where $\Pi^x := |x\rangle \langle x|$, respectively, to the classical-quantum states and classical-classical states, without learning the outcomes (non-selective measurement), leave them unmodified, i.e., $\sum_k (\Pi_A^k \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB}^{CQ} (\Pi_A^k \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) = \varrho_{AB}^{CQ}$ and $\sum_{k,l} (\Pi_A^k \otimes \Pi_B^l) \varrho_{AB}^{CC} (\Pi_A^k \otimes \Pi_B^l) = \varrho_{AB}^{CC}$. This can also be seen as due to the fact that the local measurement bases (i.e., the PVMs) and the bipartite state commute: $[(\Pi_A^k \otimes \mathbb{I}_B), \varrho_{AB}^{CQ}] = 0$ and $[(\Pi_A^k \otimes \Pi_B^l), \varrho_{AB}^{CC}] = 0$, for all k, l . Any bipartite state that cannot be represented either in the forms of Eqs. (1) or (2) has been shown to contain some kinds of nonclassical correlation arising from the noncommutativity between the bipartite state and the local measurement basis, even if it is separable [31].

Various mathematical characterizations of the classical bipartite states of the types of Eqs. (1) and (2) have led researchers to develop different quantifiers and measures of quantum correlation beyond entanglement in a bipartite state, by applying quantum information theoretical concepts: quantum mutual information, von-Neumann entropy, distance and infidelity between two density operators, Wigner-Yanase skew information and quantum Fisher information [31]. All these quantifiers essentially quantify the difference between the bipartite state under scrutiny and the class of classical bipartite states of Eqs. (1) and (2). They therefore directly or indirectly capture the failure of commutativity between the bipartite state and some set of local observables. In order to better understand the operational and statistical meaning of the quantum correlation beyond entanglement, it is desirable to have a quantifier of general quantum correlation whose definition directly and transparently translates into laboratory operations. Moreover, it is also important to study general quantum correlation from as many angles as possible to reveal its rich facets. For these reasons, we shall add to the above list with a characterization and a quantification of the general quantum correlation based on the nonclassical values of KD quasiprobability

which admits direct interpretation in terms of laboratory operations.

B. Kirkwood-Dirac quasiprobability over orthonormal product bases

KD quasiprobability is an equivalent representation of quantum state suited for finite dimensional Hilbert space, in which quantum noncommutativity implies that its value is not necessarily real and nonnegative [33–36]. Consider again a bipartite quantum system AB . We first construct a pair of orthonormal bases of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{AB} of the bipartite system by taking the tensor product of the orthonormal basis of each subsystem as: $\{|a_1, b_1\rangle_{AB} := |a_1\rangle_A \otimes |b_1\rangle_B\}$ and $\{|a_2, b_2\rangle_{AB} := |a_2\rangle_A \otimes |b_2\rangle_B\}$, where $\{|a_1\rangle_A\}$ and $\{|a_2\rangle_A\}$ are two orthonormal bases of \mathcal{H}_A of subsystem A , and $\{|b_1\rangle_B\}$ and $\{|b_2\rangle_B\}$ are two orthonormal bases of \mathcal{H}_B of subsystem B . From here on, the Roman letter in the element of the basis denotes which subsystem (i.e., subsystem A , subsystem B , etc.), while the Arabic number denotes which basis (i.e., the first basis, the second basis, etc.) of the Hilbert space of each subsystem. For example, $\{|a_1\rangle\}$ is the first orthonormal basis of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_A of subsystem A , etc.

Definition 1. The KD quasiprobability associated with a bipartite density operator ϱ_{AB} on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{AB} over a pair of orthonormal product bases $\{|a_1, b_1\rangle\}$ and $\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}$ of \mathcal{H}_{AB} is defined as

$$\text{Pr}_{\text{KD}}(a_1, b_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB}) := \text{Tr}((\Pi_A^{a_2} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_2})(\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1})\varrho_{AB}). \quad (3)$$

The (marginal) KD quasiprobability associated with a subsystem is obtained by summing over the variables corresponding to the other subsystem. For example, summing over b_1, b_2 of subsystem B , one gets the KD quasiprobability associated with subsystem A : $\sum_{b_1, b_2} \text{Pr}_{\text{KD}}(a_1, b_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB}) = \text{Tr}((\Pi_A^{a_2} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)(\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)\varrho_{AB}) = \text{Tr}_A(\Pi_A^{a_1} \Pi_A^{a_2} \varrho_A) := \text{Pr}_{\text{KD}}(a_1, a_2 | \varrho_A)$, where $\varrho_A = \text{Tr}_B \varrho_{AB}$, and we have used the completeness relation: $\sum_{b_1} \Pi_B^{b_1} = \sum_{b_2} \Pi_B^{b_2} = \mathbb{I}_B$. Similarly, we have $\sum_{a_1, a_2} \text{Pr}_{\text{KD}}(a_1, b_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB}) = \text{Tr}_B(\Pi_B^{b_1} \Pi_B^{b_2} \varrho_B) := \text{Pr}_{\text{KD}}(b_1, b_2 | \varrho_B)$, $\varrho_B = \text{Tr}_A \varrho_{AB}$. The above definition extends naturally to more than two parties. For example, for a tripartite quantum state ϱ_{ABC} on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{ABC} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C$, and a pair of orthonormal product bases $\{|a_1, b_1, c_1\rangle_{ABC}\}$ and $\{|a_2, b_2, c_2\rangle_{ABC}\}$ of \mathcal{H}_{ABC} , where $\{|x_i\rangle\}$, $i = 1, 2$, is the i th orthonormal basis of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_X of subsystem X , $X = A, B, C$, we define the associated KD quasiprobability over

the pair of the orthonormal product bases as

$$\Pr_{\text{KD}}(a_1, b_1, c_1; a_2, b_2, c_2 | \varrho_{ABC}) := \text{Tr}((\Pi_A^{a_2} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_2} \otimes \Pi_C^{c_2})(\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1} \otimes \Pi_C^{c_1})\varrho_{ABC}). \quad (4)$$

One can see that the KD quasiprobability gives correct marginal probabilities in the following sense: $\sum_{a_1, b_1} \Pr_{\text{KD}}(a_1, b_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB}) = \text{Tr}((\Pi_A^{a_2} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_2})\varrho_{AB}) = \Pr(a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB})$, and $\sum_{a_2, b_2} \Pr_{\text{KD}}(a_1, b_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB}) = \text{Tr}((\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1})\varrho_{AB}) = \Pr(a_1, b_1 | \varrho_{AB})$, where $\Pr(\cdot)$ denotes the usual real and non-negative classical probability. One also has single variable marginal probabilities, $\sum_{b_1, a_2, b_2} \Pr_{\text{KD}}(a_1, b_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB}) = \text{Tr}_A(\Pi_A^{a_1}\varrho_A) = \Pr(a_1 | \varrho_A)$, and $\sum_{a_1, a_2, b_2} \Pr_{\text{KD}}(a_1, b_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB}) = \text{Tr}_B(\Pi_B^{b_1}\varrho_B) = \Pr(b_1 | \varrho_B)$, etc. Hence, KD quasiprobability is normalized, i.e., $\sum_{a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2} \Pr_{\text{KD}}(a_1, b_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB}) = 1$. However and importantly, despite all of the above classically desirable properties, the KD quasiprobability $\Pr_{\text{KD}}(a_1, b_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB})$ may take nonreal values and its real part may be negative.

We also define the KD quasiprobability over three variables as follows which will play a central role in our characterization of general quantum correlation later.

Definition 2. Summing the KD quasiprobability $\Pr_{\text{KD}}(a_1, b_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB})$ over one of the variables we get KD quasiprobability over the three remaining variables. For example, let us sum over b_1 to get

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{\text{KD}}(a_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB}) &:= \sum_{b_1} \Pr_{\text{KD}}(a_1, b_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB}) \\ &= \text{Tr}((\Pi_A^{a_2} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_2})(\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)\varrho_{AB}). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$\Pr_{\text{KD}}(a_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB})$ too has correct marginal probabilities, thus normalized, but may assume nonreal values and its real part may be negative.

In this sense, the nonreality and/or the negativity of the KD quasiprobability associated with a quantum state, indicates a form of quantumness or nonclassicality, known as KD nonclassicality. It arises from the failure of commutativity among the state and the pair of defining bases. To see this within the KD quasiprobability over orthonormal product bases introduced above, consider for example the KD quasiprobability of Eq. (3) and assume that the first basis and the bipartite state commute, i.e., $[\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1}, \varrho_{AB}] = 0$, for all a_1 and b_1 . Then, noting that $(\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1})^2 = \Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1}$, Eq. (3) can be written as $\Pr_{\text{KD}}(a_1, b_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB}) = \text{Tr}((\Pi_A^{a_2} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_2}) \frac{(\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1})\varrho_{AB}(\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1})}{\text{Tr}((\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1})\varrho_{AB})}) \text{Tr}((\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1})\varrho_{AB})$, which is just the probability to get (a_1, b_1) and then subsequently (a_2, b_2) in a sequence of measurements, so that it is real and nonnegative. Note in particular that the noncommutativity between the state and the

orthonormal bases is formally directly captured by the imaginary part of the KD quasiprobability: $\text{Im}(\text{Pr}_{\text{KD}}(a_1, b_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB})) = (1/2i) \langle a_2, b_2 | [(\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1}), \varrho_{AB}] | a_2, b_2 \rangle$. As an example of KD quasiprobability with nonreal values, consider the following maximally entangled two-qubit state:

$$|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{me}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |00\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |11\rangle, \quad (6)$$

where $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ is the computational basis, i.e., the eigenstates of Pauli operator σ_z . Let us choose the following orthonormal product bases for the first and the second bases: $\{|a_1, b_1\rangle\} = \{|0, 0\rangle, |0, 1\rangle, |1, 0\rangle, |1, 1\rangle\}$ and $\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\} = \{|x_+, y_+\rangle, |x_+, y_-\rangle, |x_-, y_+\rangle, |x_-, y_-\rangle\}$, where $|x_{\pm}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)$ and $|y_{\pm}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle \pm i|1\rangle)$. Then, the associated KD quasiprobability in matrix expression with the first basis taking the row index and the second basis taking the column index, has the form:

$$\{\text{Pr}_{\text{KD}}(\varrho)\}_{(a_1 b_1, a_2 b_2)} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{8}i & \frac{1}{8} - \frac{1}{8}i & \frac{1}{8} - \frac{1}{8}i & \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{8}i \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{8} - \frac{1}{8}i & \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{8}i & \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{8}i & \frac{1}{8} - \frac{1}{8}i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

One can check that it has correct marginal probabilities, and normalized to unity. Moreover, the real parts are all nonnegative. Hence, the noncommutativity among the bipartite state and the pair of defining bases manifests entirely in the nonvanishing imaginary part. The above observation naturally raises the question on how the KD nonclassicality, and in particular, the imaginary part of the KD quasiprobabilities, are related to the general quantum correlation which also captures noncommutativity between the multipartite state and some local measurements.

III. GENERAL QUANTUM CORRELATION FROM THE NONREALITY OF KIRKWOOD-DIRAC QUASIPROBABILITY OVER ORTHONORMAL PRODUCT BASES

We wish to establish a quantitative link between the nonclassicality encoded in a bipartite quantum state ϱ_{AB} captured by the concept of general quantum correlation and the nonclassical values in the associated KD quasiprobability $\text{Pr}_{\text{KD}}(a_1, b_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB})$ over a pair of orthonormal product bases. To this end, we will devise a quantifier of general quantum

correlation in a bipartite state from the imaginary part of the KD quasiprobability.

Definition 3. Given an arbitrary bipartite quantum state ϱ_{AB} on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{AB} , we define the following quantity which maps the state to a nonnegative real number:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB}) \\
& := \inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, b_2} |\text{ImPr}_{\text{KD}}(a_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB})| \\
& = \inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, b_2} |\text{Im} \langle a_2, b_2 | (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB} | a_2, b_2 \rangle| \\
& = \inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, b_2} \frac{1}{2} |\langle a_2, b_2 | [(\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B), \varrho_{AB}] | a_2, b_2 \rangle|, \tag{8}
\end{aligned}$$

where the supremum is taken over the set $\mathcal{B}_{\text{op}}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ of all orthonormal product bases of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{AB} , and the infimum is taken over the set $\mathcal{B}_o(\mathcal{H}_A)$ of all orthonormal bases of \mathcal{H}_A .

Hence, $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB})$ is the total sum of the absolute imaginary part of the KD quasiprobability $\text{Pr}_{\text{KD}}(a_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB})$ defined in Eq. (5), first maximized over all orthonormal product bases $\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\} \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{op}}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ of \mathcal{H}_{AB} , and then minimized over all local orthonormal bases $\{|a_1\rangle\} \in \mathcal{B}_o(\mathcal{H}_A)$ of \mathcal{H}_A . $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB})$ defined in Eq. (8) is intended to quantify the general quantum correlation in the bipartite state ϱ_{AB} arising from the noncommutativity between the bipartite state and any PVM $\{\Pi_A^a \otimes \mathbb{I}_B\}$ describing local projective measurement over the subsystem A .

Similarly, to quantify the general quantum correlation in the bipartite state ϱ_{AB} stemming from the noncommutativity between the bipartite state and any product PVM $\{\Pi_A^a \otimes \Pi_B^b\}$ describing local projective measurement on A and B , we define the following quantity.

Definition 4. Given a bipartite state ϱ_{AB} on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{AB} , we define a quantity which maps the bipartite state to a nonnegative real number as:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB}) \\
& := \inf_{\{|a_1, b_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2} |\text{ImPr}_{\text{KD}}(a_1, b_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB})| \\
& = \inf_{\{|a_1, b_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2} |\text{Im} \langle a_2, b_2 | (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1}) \varrho_{AB} | a_2, b_2 \rangle| \\
& = \inf_{\{|a_1, b_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2} \frac{1}{2} |\langle a_2, b_2 | [(\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1}), \varrho_{AB}] | a_2, b_2 \rangle|, \tag{9}
\end{aligned}$$

where the supremum and the infimum are taken over the set $\mathcal{B}_{\text{op}}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ of all orthonormal product bases of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{AB} .

$\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB})$ is thus the total sum of the absolute imaginary part of the KD quasiprobability $\text{Pr}_{\text{KD}}(a_1, b_1; a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB})$ defined in Eq. (3), first maximized over all orthonormal product bases $\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\} \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{op}}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$, and then minimized over all orthonormal product bases $\{|a_1, b_1\rangle\} \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{op}}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$.

Note that the first and the second bases in the definition of the KD quasiprobability are not treated symmetrically in the definitions of $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB})$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB})$. Moreover, we stress that the search for the minimum over the first bases is performed after the maximization over the second bases is done. Conceptually, for a given first orthonormal basis $\{|a_1\rangle\}$ for $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB})$ in Eq. (8) (respectively, $\{|a_1, b_1\rangle\}$ for $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB})$ in Eq. (9)), maximizing over all second bases $\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\} \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{op}}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ means that we are seeking for the largest noncommutativity between $\{(\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)\}$ (respectively, $\{(\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1})\}$) and ϱ_{AB} under the l_1 norm. On the other hand, the minimization over the first local bases $\{|a_1\rangle\} \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{o}}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ for $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB})$ (respectively, over $\{|a_1, b_1\rangle\} \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{op}}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ for $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB})$) means that we search for those classical-quantum state of Eq. (1) (respectively, classical-classical state of Eq. (2)) that is least incompatible with, or in some sense closest to, the bipartite state ϱ_{AB} . This goes along with the spirit of the distance-based measure of general quantum correlation in which one computes the minimum distance between the bipartite state and the set of all classical-quantum (respectively, classical-classical) states [31].

Finally, the above definition can be extended to more than two parties straightforwardly. For example, given a tripartite quantum state ϱ_{ABC} on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{ABC} , we can define the following nonnegative quantity:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{ABC}) \\ := & \inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2, c_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, b_2, c_2} |\text{ImPr}_{\text{KD}}(a_1; a_2, b_2, c_2 | \varrho_{ABC})| \\ = & \inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2, c_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, b_2, c_2} |\text{Im} \langle a_2, b_2, c_2 | (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B \otimes \mathbb{I}_C) \varrho_{ABC} | a_2, b_2, c_2 \rangle|. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Here, the generalized KD quasiprobability is defined as $\text{Pr}_{\text{KD}}(a_1; a_2, b_2, c_2) = \sum_{b_1, c_1} \text{Pr}_{\text{KD}}(a_1, b_1, c_1; a_2, b_2, c_2 | \varrho_{ABC}) := \text{Tr}((\Pi_A^{a_2} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_2} \otimes \Pi_C^{c_2})(\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B \otimes \mathbb{I}_C) \varrho_{ABC})$, the supremum is taken over the set $\mathcal{B}_{\text{op}}(\mathcal{H}_{ABC})$ of all orthonormal product bases $\{|a_2, b_2, c_2\rangle\}$ of \mathcal{H}_{ABC} and the infimum is taken over the set $\mathcal{B}_{\text{o}}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ of all orthonormal bases $\{|a_1\rangle\}$ of \mathcal{H}_A .

Consider first $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB})$ defined in Eq. (8). We argue that it satisfies the following plausible requirements for a quantifier of general quantum correlation [31].

Proposition 1. *Faithfulness*, i.e., $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB})$ is vanishing if and only if the bipartite state ϱ_{AB} belongs to the class of classical-quantum state of Eq. (1).

Proof. Let us first suppose that the bipartite state ϱ_{AB} belongs to the class of classical-quantum state, namely there exists an orthonormal basis $\{|k\rangle_A\}$ of \mathcal{H}_A of the subsystem A so that ϱ_{AB} can be expressed as in Eq. (1). Then, we can choose $\{\Pi_A^k = |k\rangle\langle k|_A\}$ as $\{\Pi_A^{a_1}\}$ in the definition of $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB})$ in Eq. (8). In this case, since $[(\Pi_A^k \otimes \mathbb{I}_B), \varrho_{AB}] = 0$ for all k , we have $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB}) = 0$ as per definition. Conversely, suppose $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB}) = 0$. Then, from the definition of $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB})$ in Eq. (8), there must be an orthonormal basis $\{\Pi_A^k\}$ of the subsystem A so that $\langle a_2, b_2 | [(\Pi_A^k \otimes \mathbb{I}_B), \varrho_{AB}] | a_2, b_2 \rangle = 0$ for all k and for all possible choices of the second bases $\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\} \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{op}}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$. This can only be true if $[(\Pi_A^k \otimes \mathbb{I}_B), \varrho_{AB}] = 0$ for all k . It first implies that ϱ_{AB} is separable. Moreover, taking the trace over B , we also get $[\Pi_A^k, \varrho_A] = 0$ for all k , where $\varrho_A = \text{Tr}_B \varrho_{AB}$, which means that $\{\Pi_A^k\}$ is the complete set of eigenprojectors of ϱ_A . Hence, we have $\varrho_A = \sum_k p_k \Pi_A^k$ for some $\{p_k\}$, $p_k \geq 0$, $\sum_k p_k = 1$. Finally, any separable state ϱ_{AB} with the reduced density operator $\varrho_A = \sum_k p_k \Pi_A^k$ must take the form of classical-quantum state of Eq. (1). \square

Proposition 2. *Invariant under local unitary transformation*, i.e., $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A((U_A \otimes U_B) \varrho_{AB} (U_A^\dagger \otimes U_B^\dagger)) = \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB})$, where $U_{A(B)}$ is any unitary operator applying locally on subsystem $A(B)$.

Proof. This comes directly from the definition of $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB})$ in Eq. (8) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A((U_A \otimes U_B) \varrho_{AB} (U_A^\dagger \otimes U_B^\dagger)) \\
&= \inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, b_2} |\text{Im}(\langle a_2, b_2 | (U_A \otimes U_B) (U_A^\dagger \otimes U_B^\dagger) \\
&\quad \cdot (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) (U_A \otimes U_B) \varrho_{AB} (U_A^\dagger \otimes U_B^\dagger) | a_2, b_2 \rangle)| \\
&= \inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a'_2, b'_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, a'_2, b'_2} |\text{Im} \langle a'_2, b'_2 | (U_A^\dagger \Pi_A^{a_1} U_A \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB} | a'_2, b'_2 \rangle| \\
&= \inf_{\{|a'\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a'_2, b'_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a'_1, a'_2, b'_2} |\text{Im} \langle a'_2, b'_2 | (\Pi_A^{a'_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB} | a'_2, b'_2 \rangle| \\
&= \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB}). \tag{11}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have inserted an identity $(U_A \otimes U_B) (U_A^\dagger \otimes U_B^\dagger) = \mathbb{I}$ in the first equality. To get the second equality, we have defined a new orthonormal second product basis: $\{|a'_2\rangle \otimes |b'_2\rangle = (U_A^\dagger \otimes U_B^\dagger) |a_2\rangle \otimes |b_2\rangle\}$. Moreover, the third equality is obtained by identifying a new set of first

local orthonormal basis as $\{|a'_1\rangle\} = \{U_A^\dagger |a_1\rangle\}$. Noting that the above local transformations of bases do not change the set of orthonormal product bases $\mathcal{B}_{\text{op}}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ and the set of local orthonormal basis $\mathcal{B}_o(\mathcal{H}_A)$ over which we respectively perform the maximization and the minimization in Eq. (8), we thus have $\sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}}(\cdot) = \sup_{\{|a'_2, b'_2\rangle\}}(\cdot)$ and $\inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}}(\cdot) = \inf_{\{|a'_1\rangle\}}(\cdot)$. This observation gives the last equality in Eq. (11). We emphasize that the use of product bases for the first and second bases to define the KD quasiprobability, and the maximization and the minimization over these bases, are indispensable to get a quantity which is invariant under any local unitary operation. \square

Proposition 3. *Monotonicity:* nonincreasing under any local completely positive trace-preserving (CPTP) operation or quantum channel Φ_B on subsystem B , i.e., $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A((\text{id}_A \otimes \Phi_B)\varrho_{AB}) \leq \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB})$, where id_A denotes an identity superoperator acting on subsystem A .

Proof. First, according to the Stinespring's theorem, any CPTP operation or quantum channel can be implemented by a dilation on a larger Hilbert space, wherein the system is made contact with an ancilla in a state ϱ_E on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_E , let them interact via some global unitary, and then followed by partial tracing over the ancilla as: $(\text{id}_A \otimes \Phi_B)(\varrho_{AB}) = \text{Tr}_E((\mathbb{I}_A \otimes U_{BE})(\varrho_{AB} \otimes \varrho_E)(\mathbb{I}_A \otimes U_{BE})^\dagger)$, where U_{BE} is the unitary interaction applying on the subsystem B and the ancilla E . Using this expression, we then have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A((\text{id}_A \otimes \Phi_B)\varrho_{AB}) \\
&= \inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, b_2} |\text{Im}(\langle a_2, b_2 | (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \\
&\quad \cdot \text{Tr}_E((\mathbb{I}_A \otimes U_{BE})(\varrho_{AB} \otimes \varrho_E)(\mathbb{I}_A \otimes U_{BE})^\dagger) |a_2, b_2\rangle)| \\
&= \inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, b_2} |\text{Im}(\sum_{e_2} \langle a_2, b_2, e_2 | (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B \otimes \mathbb{I}_E) \\
&\quad \cdot (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes U_{BE})(\varrho_{AB} \otimes \varrho_E)(\mathbb{I}_A \otimes U_{BE})^\dagger |a_2, b_2, e_2\rangle)|, \tag{12}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have inserted the basis $\{|e_2\rangle\}$ of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_E of the ancilla in the second line. Expanding $U_{BE}^\dagger |b_2, e_2\rangle = \sum_{b'_2, e'_2} \langle b'_2, e'_2 | U_{BE}^\dagger |b_2, e_2\rangle |b'_2, e'_2\rangle$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A((\text{id}_A \otimes \Phi_B)\varrho_{AB}) \\
&= \inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, b_2} \left| \sum_{b'_2, b''_2, e_2, e'_2, e''_2} \text{Im}(\langle a_2, b''_2 | (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB} |a_2, b'_2\rangle \right. \\
&\quad \times \langle e''_2 | \varrho_E |e'_2\rangle \langle b''_2, e''_2 | U_{BE} |b_2, e_2\rangle \langle b_2, e_2 | U_{BE}^\dagger |b'_2, e'_2\rangle) \left. \right|. \tag{13}
\end{aligned}$$

One can check that for $b'_2 \neq b''_2$ and $e'_2 \neq e''_2$, each term inside the bracket $\text{Im}(\dots)$ has a partner that is its complex conjugate so that their sum are real. Hence, only the terms with

$b'_2 = b''_2$ and $e'_2 = e''_2$ give nonvanishing contribution. In this case, Eq. (13) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A((\text{id}_A \otimes \Phi_B)\varrho_{AB}) \\
& \leq \inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, b'_2} |\text{Im}(\langle a_2, b'_2 | (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB} | a_2, b'_2 \rangle)| \sum_{e'_2} \langle e'_2 | \varrho_E | e'_2 \rangle \\
& \times \sum_{b_{2*}, e_2} \langle b'_2, e'_2 | U_{BE} | b_{2*}, e_2 \rangle \langle b_{2*}, e_2 | U_{BE}^\dagger | b'_2, e'_2 \rangle \\
& \leq \inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b'_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, a_2} \sum_{b'_2} |\text{Im}(\langle a_2, b'_2 | (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB} | a_2, b'_2 \rangle)| \\
& = \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB}). \tag{14}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, $\{|b_{2*}\rangle\}$ is a second basis which achieves the supremum, and we have used the normalization $\sum_{b_{2*}, e_2} |b_{2*}, e_2\rangle \langle b_{2*}, e_2| = \mathbb{I}_{BE}$, $U_{BE} U_{BE}^\dagger = \mathbb{I}_{BE}$, and $\langle e'_2 | \varrho_E | e'_2 \rangle$ is real and nonnegative satisfying $\sum_{e'_2} \langle e'_2 | \varrho_E | e'_2 \rangle = 1$. \square

Hence, $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB})$ defined in Eq. (8) indeed satisfies the above requirements expected for a quantifier of general quantum correlation. Accordingly, we shall hereon refer to it as one-sided KD nonclassical correlation. Besides satisfying the above three plausible constraints, the one-sided KD nonclassical correlation also has the following desirable properties.

Proposition 4. Convexity, i.e., $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\sum_k p_k \varrho_{AB}^k) \leq \sum_k p_k \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB}^k)$, where $\{p_k\}$ are probabilities: $p_k \geq 0$, $\sum_k p_k = 1$.

Proof. This is due to triangle inequality and the fact that $\{p_k\}$ are real and nonnegative. \square

Proposition 5. Nonincreasing when one or more of the parties are discarded (or, traced over), i.e., $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{ABC}) \geq \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB})$, where $\varrho_{AB} = \text{Tr}_C \varrho_{ABC}$, and equality is reached when the state of C is totally uncorrelated with that of AB .

Proof. One has, from the definition of $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB})$ in Eq. (8) and $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{ABC})$ in Eq. (10),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{ABC}) \\
& := \inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2, c_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, b_2, c_2} |\text{Im} \langle a_2, b_2, c_2 | (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B \otimes \mathbb{I}_C) \varrho_{ABC} | a_2, b_2, c_2 \rangle | \\
& \geq \inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2, c_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, b_2} |\text{Im} \sum_{c_2} \langle a_2, b_2, c_2 | (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B \otimes \mathbb{I}_C) \varrho_{ABC} | a_2, b_2, c_2 \rangle | \\
& = \inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, b_2} |\text{Im} \langle a_2, b_2 | (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB} | a_2, b_2 \rangle | \\
& = \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB}). \tag{15}
\end{aligned}$$

It is clear that equality is reached when the subsystem C is totally uncorrelated with the rest, i.e., $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB} \otimes \varrho_C) = \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB})$, by virtue of the fact that $\langle c_2 | \varrho_C | c_2 \rangle$ is real and

nonnegative and $\sum_{c_2} \langle c_2 | \varrho_C | c_2 \rangle = 1$. Hence, adding or removing an (independent) ancilla does not change the one-sided KD nonclassical correlation as intuitively expected. \square

Finally, another important requirement for a quantifier to be a bonafide measure of quantum correlation is that for pure states, it should reduce to a measure of entanglement [31]. This captures the intuition that for pure states, separability is equivalent to no nonclassical correlation, so that nonclassical correlation for pure state must arise solely from quantum entanglement. We have not yet been able to clarify this important issue. However, in the next section, we prove that for general pure bipartite states of arbitrary finite dimension, the one-sided KD nonclassical correlation defined in Eq. (8) gives a lower bound to the linear entropy of entanglement in the state. Hence, for pure bipartite states, the one-sided KD nonclassical correlation can be seen as a faithful witness of entanglement.

One can check that $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB})$ defined in Eq. (9) also satisfies property (i) of faithfulness, i.e., it is vanishing if and only if the bipartite state ϱ_{AB} takes the form of classical-classical state of Eq. (2). It is also invariant under local unitary transformation satisfying property (ii). Property (iii) of monotonicity cannot be defined for $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB})$ in the bipartite setting. Instead, one can prove for a tripartite state that $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}((\text{id}_{AB} \otimes \Phi_C)\varrho_{ABC}) \leq \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{ABC})$, where Φ_C is a completely positive trace-preserving operation on C . One can also show that $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB})$ is convex. Moreover, discarding one or more parties does not increase its value, e.g., we have $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{ABC}) \geq \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB})$, $\varrho_{AB} = \text{Tr}_C \varrho_{ABC}$, with equality when $\varrho_{ABC} = \varrho_{AB} \otimes \varrho_C$. Hence, $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB})$ defined in Eq. (9) possesses desirable properties for the quantifier of two-sided general quantum correlation, and accordingly, we refer to it as two-sided KD nonclassical correlation.

Let us further show that, for any bipartite state, the one-sided and the two-sided KD nonclassical correlation sets a lower bound to the negativity of quantumness, a measure of general quantum correlation which quantifies the amount of entanglement that can be activated via a local measurement of the subsystem during the pre-measurement stage [13, 67].

Proposition 6. For any bipartite state ϱ_{AB} on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, the following ordering of quantity applies:

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB}) \leq \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB}) \leq \mathcal{Q}_{l_1}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB}), \quad (16)$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_{l_1}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB})$ is a measure of general quantum correlation based on the l_1 -norm measure

of (local) coherence [31] which is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{l_1}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB}) &:= \inf_{\{|a,b\rangle\}} \sum_{a' \neq a, b' \neq b} |\langle a, b | \varrho_{AB} | a', b' \rangle| \\ &= \inf_{\{|a,b\rangle\}} \sum_{a, a', b, b'} |\langle a, b | \varrho_{AB} | a', b' \rangle| - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

It is equal to twice of the total (two-sided) negativity of quantumness [13, 67].

Proof. We first show that the one-sided KD nonclassical correlation is always less than or equal to the two-sided KD nonclassical correlation:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB}) \\ &= \inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, b_2} |\text{Im} \langle a_2, b_2 | (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB} | a_2, b_2 \rangle| \\ &= \inf_{\{|a_1, b_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, b_2} |\text{Im} \langle a_2, b_2 | (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \sum_{b_1} \Pi_B^{b_1}) \varrho_{AB} | a_2, b_2 \rangle| \\ &\leq \inf_{\{|a_1, b_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2} |\text{Im} \langle a_2, b_2 | (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1}) \varrho_{AB} | a_2, b_2 \rangle| \\ &= \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB}), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where we have noted the fact that the choice of the first basis $\{\Pi_B^{b_1}\}$ which resolves the identity \mathbb{I}_B is arbitrary in the second line, and the last equality is just the definition of two-sided KD nonclassical correlation of Eq. (9). This relation extends to more than two parties. For example, one has $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{ABC}) \leq \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{ABC}) \leq \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{ABC}(\varrho_{ABC})$.

On the other hand, from the definition of the two-sided KD nonclassical correlation we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB}) \\ &= \inf_{\{|a_1, b_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2} |\text{Im} \langle a_2, b_2 | (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1}) \varrho_{AB} | a_2, b_2 \rangle| \\ &\leq \inf_{\{|a_1, b_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_2, b_2} \sum_{a'_1 \neq a_1, b'_1 \neq b_1} |\langle a_1, b_1 | \varrho_{AB} | a'_1, b'_1 \rangle| \\ &\quad \times |\langle a_2 | a_1 \rangle \langle b_2 | b_1 \rangle \langle a'_1 | a_2 \rangle \langle b'_1 | b_2 \rangle| \\ &= \inf_{\{|a_1, b_1\rangle\}} \sum_{a'_1 \neq a_1, b'_1 \neq b_1} |\langle a_1, b_1 | \varrho_{AB} | a'_1, b'_1 \rangle| \\ &\quad \times \sum_{a_{2*}} |\langle a_{2*} | a_1 \rangle \langle a'_1 | a_{2*} \rangle| \sum_{b_{2*}} |\langle b_{2*} | b_1 \rangle \langle b'_1 | b_{2*} \rangle|, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where we have inserted the completeness relations $\sum_{a'_1} |a'_1\rangle \langle a'_1| = \mathbb{I}_A$ and $\sum_{b'_1} |b'_1\rangle \langle b'_1| = \mathbb{I}_B$ for the first orthonormal bases of A and B , and $\{|a_{2*}\rangle\}$ and $\{|b_{2*}\rangle\}$ are second orthonor-

mal bases which achieve the supremum. On the other hand, using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{a_{2*}} |\langle a_{2*}|a_1\rangle| |\langle a'_1|a_{2*}\rangle| &\leq \left(\sum_{a_{2*}} |\langle a_{2*}|a_1\rangle|^2 \sum_{a'_{2*}} |\langle a'_1|a'_{2*}\rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} = 1, \\ \sum_{b_{2*}} |\langle b_{2*}|b_1\rangle| |\langle b'_1|b_{2*}\rangle| &\leq \left(\sum_{b_{2*}} |\langle b_{2*}|b_1\rangle|^2 \sum_{b'_{2*}} |\langle b'_1|b'_{2*}\rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} = 1, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where we have again used the completeness relation $\sum_{a_{2*}} |a_{2*}\rangle \langle a_{2*}| = \mathbb{I}_A$ and $\sum_{b_{2*}} |b_{2*}\rangle \langle b_{2*}| = \mathbb{I}_B$ for the second bases of A and B . Given the first basis $\{|a_1(b_1)\rangle\}$, the equalities in Eq. (20) are attained when the second basis $\{|a_{2*}(b_{2*})\rangle\}$ are (subsystem wise) mutually unbiased with the first basis so that $|\langle a_{2*}(b_{2*})|a_1(b_1)\rangle| = 1/\sqrt{d_{A(B)}}$ for all $a_1(b_1)$ and $a_{2*}(b_{2*})$, where $d_{A(B)}$ is the dimension of the Hilbert space of subsystem $A(B)$. Upon inserting Eq. (20) into Eq. (19), and noting Eqs. (17) and (18), we finally obtain Eq. (16). \square

We proceed to give an illustration of concrete computations of the KD nonclassical correlation in a simple bipartite state. We first note that the calculation of the KD nonclassical correlation defined in Eqs. (8) and (9) is in general analytically intractable. It involves optimization over all possible product bases of the Hilbert space of the multipartite system, which in general takes the form of an optimization of multivariable nonlinear function. This analytical difficulty is also suffered by many other measures of general quantum correlation whose computations typically involve optimization over certain class of measurements. Analytical results are known only for low dimensional systems with certain symmetries [68, 69].

For example, let us compute the one-sided KD nonclassical correlation of maximally entangled two-qubit state of Eq. (6). For the purpose of computation, we express the second bases for the Hilbert spaces of subsystem A and B , i.e., $\{|a_2\rangle\} = \{|a_{2+}\rangle, |a_{2-}\rangle\}$ and $\{|b_2\rangle\} = \{|b_{2+}\rangle, |b_{2-}\rangle\}$, using the following Bloch sphere parameterization:

$$\begin{aligned} |a_{2+}(b_{2+})\rangle &= \cos \frac{\alpha_{a_2(b_2)}}{2} |0\rangle_{A(B)} + \sin \frac{\alpha_{a_2(b_2)}}{2} e^{i\beta_{a_2(b_2)}} |1\rangle_{A(B)}, \\ |a_{2-}(b_{2-})\rangle &= \sin \frac{\alpha_{a_2(b_2)}}{2} |0\rangle_{A(B)} - \cos \frac{\alpha_{a_2(b_2)}}{2} e^{i\beta_{a_2(b_2)}} |1\rangle_{A(B)}, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $\alpha_{a_2(b_2)} \in [0, \pi]$, and $\beta_{a_2(b_2)} \in [0, 2\pi)$. One can scan over all the second orthonormal product bases for the qubit A and B , i.e., all the bases $\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\} \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{op}}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$, by varying the angles $(\alpha_{a_2}, \beta_{a_2})$ and $(\alpha_{b_2}, \beta_{b_2})$ over their ranges of values. Furthermore, let us parameterize all the possible first local orthonormal bases on subsystem A , i.e., $\{|a_1\rangle\} = \{|a_{1+}\rangle, |a_{1-}\rangle\}$,

as

$$\begin{aligned} |a_{1+}\rangle &= \cos \frac{\theta_{a_1}}{2} |0\rangle_A + \sin \frac{\theta_{a_1}}{2} e^{i\eta_{a_1}} |1\rangle_A, \\ |a_{1-}\rangle &= \sin \frac{\theta_{a_1}}{2} |0\rangle_A - \cos \frac{\theta_{a_1}}{2} e^{i\eta_{a_1}} |1\rangle_A, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

$\theta_{a_1} \in [0, \pi]$, $\eta_{a_1} \in [0, 2\pi)$. Inserting all the above ingredients into the one-sided nonclassical correlation of Eq. (8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{me}}\rangle \langle \Psi_{AB}^{\text{me}}|) \\ &= \inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, b_2} |\text{Im} \langle a_2, b_2 | (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) |\Psi_{AB}^{\text{me}}\rangle \langle \Psi_{AB}^{\text{me}} | a_2, b_2 \rangle| \\ &= 0.99999 \dots \sim 1. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The sign ‘ \sim ’ denotes that the result is obtained numerically. We show in the next section that the above value in fact maximizes the one-sided KD nonclassical correlation for pure two-qubit state.

Next, as an example of a separable mixed state with a nonvanishing KD nonclassical correlation, we consider the Werner state for 2×2 dimension [70]:

$$\varrho_{AB}^{\text{W}} = \frac{1-p}{4} (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) + p |\Psi_{AB}^{\text{me}}\rangle \langle \Psi_{AB}^{\text{me}}|. \quad (24)$$

It is known that the above Werner state is separable for $p < 1/3$. The one-sided nonclassical correlation can be straightforwardly computed to get, noting Eq. (23),

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB}^{\text{W}}) = p \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{me}}\rangle \langle \Psi_{AB}^{\text{me}}|) \sim p, \quad (25)$$

where the first equality is obtained directly from the definition in Eq. (8). Hence, it is nonvanishing in the regime $p < 1/3$ when the Werner state is separable. We note that the above value of the one-sided KD nonclassical correlation for the Werner state is equal to the square root of the geometric discord based on Hilbert-Schmidt distance [26]. Noting Eq. (18), for the above Werner state, the two-sided KD nonclassical correlation is thus larger than or equal to p .

Let us make further remark. We have argued in the previous work [53] that the term inside the infimum in Eqs. (8) or (9) can be used as a quantifier of coherence relative to an orthonormal basis. For example, the following quantity:

$$C_{\text{KD}}(\varrho_{AB}; \{|a_1, b_1\rangle\}) := \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2} |\text{Im} \langle a_2, b_2 | (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1}) \varrho_{AB} | a_2, b_2 \rangle|, \quad (26)$$

is a faithful quantifier of coherence of ϱ_{AB} relative to the orthonormal product basis $\{|a_1, b_1\rangle\}$, called KD coherence, satisfying certain desirable requirements. The two-sided KD nonclassical correlation of Eq. (9) can thus be expressed as

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB}) = \inf_{\{|a_1, b_1\rangle\}} C_{\text{KD}}(\varrho_{AB}; \{|a_1, b_1\rangle\}). \quad (27)$$

Namely, it is the infimum of the KD coherence of the multipartite state ϱ_{AB} relative to all orthonormal product bases $\{|a_1, b_1\rangle\} \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{op}}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{AB} .

IV. STATISTICAL AND OPERATIONAL MEANING

A. KD nonclassical correlation as a witness for local quantum uncertainty, pure state entanglement and measurement-induced nonlocality

Recall that the one-sided and the two-sided KD nonclassical correlations are defined by exploiting the failure of commutativity between the PVM associated with any local basis and the multipartite state. Such noncommutativity is one of the sources of uncertainty in quantum measurement. It is therefore instructive to discuss the relation between the KD nonclassical correlation and the uncertainty arising in the measurement described by the PVM associated with a local basis, over the multipartite state. We have the following proposition.

Proposition 7. The one-sided and two-sided KD nonclassical correlations give lower bounds to the minimum uncertainty of the outcomes of all measurements described by local (product) PVM, as follows

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB}) \leq \inf_{\{\Pi_A^a\}} \sum_a \Delta_{(\Pi_A^a \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)}(\varrho_{AB}), \quad (28)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB}) \leq \inf_{\{\Pi_A^a \otimes \Pi_B^b\}} \sum_{a,b} \Delta_{(\Pi_A^a \otimes \Pi_B^b)}(\varrho_{AB}). \quad (29)$$

where $\Delta_O^2[\varrho] := \text{Tr}(O^2\varrho) - (\text{Tr}(O\varrho))^2$ is the quantum variance of the Hermitian observable O in the state ϱ .

Proof. The proof is given in the Appendix A □

Hence, the strength of the KD nonclassical correlation is limited by the total sum of the uncertainty in measurement described by the local PVM associated with the first local basis, quantified by the quantum standard deviation of all the elements of the local PVM,

minimized over all such local PVMs. As a direct corollary of Proposition 7, the nonclassical correlations captured by $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB})$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB})$ give lower bounds to the quantum uncertainties arising in the measurement described by any local PVM. Namely, from Eqs. (28) and (29), for any measurement described by local PVM $\{\Pi_A^k \otimes \mathbb{I}_B\}$ and $\{\Pi_A^k \otimes \Pi_B^l\}$, we have

$$\sum_k \Delta_{(\Pi_A^k \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)}(\varrho_{AB}) \geq \inf_{\{\Pi_A^a\}} \sum_a \Delta_{(\Pi_A^a \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)}(\varrho_{AB}) \geq \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB}), \quad (30)$$

$$\sum_{k,l} \Delta_{(\Pi_A^k \otimes \Pi_B^l)}(\varrho_{AB}) \geq \inf_{\{\Pi_A^a \otimes \Pi_B^b\}} \sum_{a,b} \Delta_{(\Pi_A^a \otimes \Pi_B^b)}(\varrho_{AB}) \geq \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB}). \quad (31)$$

Recall that the right-hand sides of Eqs. (28) and (29), i.e., the total sum of the quantum standard deviations of all elements of the local PVM over the state ϱ_{AB} , also include the uncertainty arising from the classical mixing when the state is not pure. By contrast, the (one-sided and two sided) KD nonclassical correlations quantifies the uncertainties in the measurement of the local bases which arises intrinsically from the noncommutativity between the local PVM associated with the local bases and the multipartite state [55, 71–74]. To this end, it is intriguing to compare the KD nonclassical correlations with the quantifier of nonclassical correlation beyond entanglement based on the minimum value of the Wigner-Yanase skew information [75] over certain set of local nondegenerate observables proposed in Ref. [19]. The Wigner-Yanase skew information is also defined based on the noncommutativity between the state and a Hermitian observable and has been argued to quantify the measurement uncertainty arising genuinely from quantum noncommutativity [76].

Further, evaluating the optimization on the right-hand side of Eq. (28) we obtain the following result connecting the one-sided KD nonclassical correlation to a form of quantum entropy.

Proposition 8. The one-sided KD nonclassical correlation $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB})$ of a bipartite state ϱ_{AB} is upper bounded by the linear entropy of the reduced density operator of the subsystem as

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB}) \leq \sqrt{d_A(1 - \text{Tr}\varrho_A^2)}, \quad (32)$$

where $\varrho_A = \text{Tr}_B\{\varrho_{AB}\}$ and d_A is the dimension of the subsystem A .

Proof. First, noting that $\text{Tr}((\Pi_A^a \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)^2 \varrho_{AB}) = \text{Tr}((\Pi_A^a \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB}) = \text{Pr}(a|\varrho_A)$ is just the probability to get the outcome a in the measurement described by a PVM $\{\Pi_A^a\}$ over the

state $\varrho_A = \text{Tr}_B(\varrho_{AB})$ of the subsystem A , and inserting into Eq. (28), we obtain

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB}) \leq \inf_{\{\Pi_A^a\}} \sum_a (\text{Pr}(a|\varrho_A) - \text{Pr}(a|\varrho_A)^2)^{1/2} \quad (33)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \inf_{\{\Pi_A^a\}} d_A^{1/2} (1 - \sum_a \text{Pr}(a|\varrho_A)^2)^{1/2} \\ &= \inf_{\{\Pi_A^a\}} d_A^{1/2} S_2^{1/2}(\{\text{Pr}(a|\varrho_A)\}), \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where we have used the Jensen inequality and the normalization $\sum_a \text{Pr}(a|\varrho_A) = 1$ to get the second line, and

$$S_2(\{\text{Pr}(a|\varrho_A)\}) := 1 - \sum_a \text{Pr}(a|\varrho_A)^2 \quad (35)$$

is the Tsallis entropy with the entropy index 2 of the measurement outcome a with a probability $\text{Pr}(a|\varrho_A)$.

Let us further show that the minimum of the Tsallis entropy on the right-hand side of Eq. (34) is obtained when the PVM $\{\Pi_A^a\}$ is just given by the complete set of the eigenprojectors of the reduced density operator ϱ_A . First, assume that ϱ_A has the following spectral decomposition: $\varrho_A = \sum_j \lambda_j \Pi_A^{\lambda_j}$, where $\{\Pi_A^{\lambda_j} = |\lambda_j\rangle\langle\lambda_j|_A\}$ is the set of the eigenprojectors of ϱ_A , and $\{\lambda_j\}$, $\lambda_j \geq 0$, $\sum_j \lambda_j = 1$, is the associated set of eigenvalues. We thus have $\text{Pr}(a|\varrho_A) = \text{Tr}(\Pi_A^a \varrho_A) = \sum_j \lambda_j \text{Tr}(\Pi_A^{\lambda_j} \Pi_A^a)$. Inserting this into the definition of the Tsallis entropy in Eq. (35), and noting the convexity of the quadratic function, we get, using the Jensen inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} S_2(\{\text{Pr}(a|\varrho_A)\}) &= 1 - \sum_a \left(\sum_j \lambda_j \text{Tr}(\Pi_A^{\lambda_j} \Pi_A^a) \right)^2 \\ &\geq 1 - \sum_a \sum_j \lambda_j^2 \text{Tr}(\Pi_A^{\lambda_j} \Pi_A^a) \\ &= 1 - \sum_j \lambda_j^2 = S_2(\{\lambda_j\}), \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where we have used the normalization $\sum_a \text{Tr}(\Pi_A^{\lambda_j} \Pi_A^a) = \langle\lambda_j|\lambda_j\rangle = 1$. Upon comparing Eq. (35) to Eq. (36), one finds that the equality in Eq. (36), namely, the minimum of $S_2(\{\text{Pr}(a|\varrho_A)\})$, is reached when $\text{Pr}(a|\varrho_A) = \lambda_a = \text{Tr}(\Pi_A^{\lambda_a} \varrho_A)$, i.e., when $\Pi_A^a = \Pi_A^{\lambda_a}$ for all a , as claimed:

$$\inf_{\{\Pi_A^a\}} S_2(\{\text{Pr}(a|\varrho_A)\}) = S_2(\{\lambda_j\}). \quad (37)$$

Next, inserting Eq. (37) into Eq. (34), we therefore have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB}) &\leq d_A^{1/2} S_2^{1/2}(\{\lambda_j\}) \\
&= d_A^{1/2} \left(1 - \sum_j \lambda_j^2\right)^{1/2} \\
&= d_A^{1/2} \left(1 - \text{Tr} \varrho_A^2\right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

□

Notice that the Tsallis entropy over the eigenvalues of ϱ_A , i.e., $S_2(\{\lambda_j\}) = 1 - \text{Tr}(\varrho_A^2)$, is just the quantum linear entropy associated with state $\varrho_A = \sum_j \lambda_j \Pi_A^{\lambda_j}$. It quantifies the mixedness or impurity of the reduced density operator $\varrho_A = \text{Tr}_B \varrho_{AB}$. Moreover, recall that for a pure bipartite state $|\psi_{AB}\rangle$, the linear entropy of the reduced density matrix $\varrho_A = \text{Tr}_B(|\psi_{AB}\rangle\langle\psi_{AB}|)$ or $\varrho_B = \text{Tr}_A(|\psi_{AB}\rangle\langle\psi_{AB}|)$ can be used as a measure of entanglement in $|\psi_{AB}\rangle$ [77]. In fact, the upper bound in Eq. (32), i.e., $\sqrt{d_A(1 - \text{Tr} \varrho_A^2)}$, is proportional to the concurrence for pure state which is given by $C := \sqrt{2(1 - \text{Tr} \varrho_A^2)}$, from which one can compute the entanglement of formation for two qubits. Noting this, Eq. (32) therefore shows that for general pure bipartite states $|\psi_{AB}\rangle$, the one-sided KD nonclassical correlation $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(|\psi_{AB}\rangle\langle\psi_{AB}|)$ can be seen as a witness for the quantum entanglement in $|\psi_{AB}\rangle$, namely, it gives a lower bound to the scaled square root of the linear entropy of entanglement as

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(|\psi_{AB}\rangle\langle\psi_{AB}|) \leq d_A^{1/2} (1 - \text{Tr}(\varrho_A^2))^{1/2}, \tag{39}$$

with $\varrho_A = \text{Tr}_B(|\psi_{AB}\rangle\langle\psi_{AB}|)$. Notice further that for pure bipartite states with Schmidt decomposition: $|\psi_{AB}\rangle = \sum_i \sqrt{\lambda_j} |\psi_i\rangle_A |\phi_i\rangle_B$, the measurement-induced nonlocality [12] yields

$$\begin{aligned}
N(|\psi_{AB}\rangle\langle\psi_{AB}|) &= 1 - \sum_i \lambda_i^2 \\
&\geq \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(|\psi_{AB}\rangle\langle\psi_{AB}|)^2 / d_A,
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

where the inequality is due to Eq. (39). This is also the case for the geometric discord [7]. Hence, for pure states, the KD nonclassical correlation also gives a lower bound to the measurement induced nonlocality and geometric discord as in Eq. (40).

As an example, let us evaluate the upper bound in Eq. (39) for a bipartite system AB wherein the subsystem A is a qubit, hence, $d_A = 2$. Denoting the Schmidt coefficients as $\sqrt{\lambda_+}$ and $\sqrt{\lambda_-}$, with $\lambda_+ + \lambda_- = 1$, we thus have $\varrho_A = \lambda_+ |\lambda_+\rangle\langle\lambda_+| + \lambda_- |\lambda_-\rangle\langle\lambda_-|$. In this case, the upper bound in Eq. (39) is just given by the entanglement concurrence, i.e.,

$d_A^{1/2}(1 - \text{Tr}(\varrho_A^2))^{1/2} = \sqrt{2}\sqrt{1 - (\lambda_+^2 + \lambda_-^2)} = 2\sqrt{\lambda_+\lambda_-}$. This is maximized and equal to one for a maximally entangled state, i.e., when $\lambda_+ = \lambda_- = 1/2$. On the other hand, if the subsystem B is also a qubit, as shown numerically in Eq. (23), we have for the maximally entangled state $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(|\psi_{AB}\rangle\langle\psi_{AB}|) = 1$. Hence, for maximally entangled two-qubit state, the inequality in Eq. (39) becomes equality, i.e., the KD nonclassical correlation takes its maximum value.

B. Measurement of KD nonclassical correlation and its information theoretical meaning

We show in this subsection that KD nonclassical correlation of an unknown quantum state can in principle be measured or estimated directly in experiment, i.e., without recouring to quantum state tomography. Let us discuss the estimation of the two-sided KD nonclassical correlation. The estimation of the one-sided KD nonclassical correlation follows the same general scheme. First, we write the two-sided KD nonclassical correlation of Eq. (9) as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB}) &= \inf_{\{|a_1, b_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2} \left| \text{Im} \left(\frac{\langle a_2, b_2 | (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1}) \varrho_{AB} | a_2, b_2 \rangle}{\langle a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB} | a_2, b_2 \rangle} \right) \right| \\ &\times \langle a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB} | a_2, b_2 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

One then notices that the term on the right-hand side of the first line, i.e.,

$$\pi_{a_1 b_1}^w(\varrho_{AB} | a_2, b_2) := \frac{\langle a_2, b_2 | (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1}) \varrho_{AB} | a_2, b_2 \rangle}{\langle a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB} | a_2, b_2 \rangle}, \quad (42)$$

is just the weak value of $\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1}$ with the preselected state ϱ_{AB} and a postselected state $|a_2, b_2\rangle$ [56–59]. The KD nonclassical correlation can thus be obtained by averaging the absolute imaginary part of the weak value $\pi_{a_1 b_1}^w(\varrho_{AB} | a_2, b_2)$ over the probability $\text{Pr}(a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB}) = \langle a_2, b_2 | \varrho_{AB} | a_2, b_2 \rangle$ to get (a_2, b_2) , and then followed by the maximization over all the orthonormal product basis $|a_2, b_2\rangle \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{op}}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ and minimization over the orthonormal product basis $|a_1, b_1\rangle \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{op}}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$.

We thus have the following general scheme for the measurement of the KD nonclassical correlation. First, we need to be able to scan all the orthonormal product bases of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{AB} of the bipartite system AB . Namely, we have to be able to prepare the local orthonormal basis $\{|a(\vec{\lambda}_A)\rangle\}$, where $\vec{\lambda}_A$ is a set of scalar parameters so that their variation scan all the orthonormal bases $\mathcal{B}_o(\mathcal{H}_A)$ of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_A . Similarly, we have to

be able to prepare the local orthonormal basis $\{|b(\vec{\lambda}_B)\rangle\}$, so that the variation of $\vec{\lambda}_B$ scans all the orthonormal bases $\mathcal{B}_o(\mathcal{H}_B)$ of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_B . An example of such parameterization of the local orthonormal bases for two-qubit system in Bloch sphere is given in Eqs. (21) and (22). This means that we have to be able to implement parameterized unitary circuits $U_{\vec{\lambda}_{A_j}}$ and $U_{\vec{\lambda}_{B_j}}$, $j = 1, 2$, which can transform the standard basis into any other orthonormal bases of the Hilbert space of the subsystem A and B . Here, the subscript $j = 1, 2$ refers to the fact that for each subsystem, we need to be able to prepare two orthonormal bases independently. Equipped with such parameterized unitary circuits, we first pick a value for the set of parameters $(\vec{\lambda}_{A_1}, \vec{\lambda}_{B_1}, \vec{\lambda}_{A_2}, \vec{\lambda}_{B_2})$ to estimate the imaginary part of the weak value $\pi_{a_1(\vec{\lambda}_{A_1})b_1(\vec{\lambda}_{B_1})}^w(\varrho_{AB}|a_2(\vec{\lambda}_{A_2}), b_2(\vec{\lambda}_{B_2}))$ defined in Eq. (42) via a number of methods suggested in the literatures [39–42, 48, 56, 58, 60–66]. Then, we average over the probability $\Pr(a_2(\vec{\lambda}_{A_2}), b_2(\vec{\lambda}_{B_2})|\varrho_{AB}) = \langle a_2(\vec{\lambda}_{A_2}), b_2(\vec{\lambda}_{B_2})|\varrho_{AB}|a_2(\vec{\lambda}_{A_2}), b_2(\vec{\lambda}_{B_2})\rangle$, vary the parameters $(\vec{\lambda}_{A_2}, \vec{\lambda}_{B_2})$ until we get the converging supremum over all the second orthonormal product basis $\{|a_2(\vec{\lambda}_{A_2}), b_2(\vec{\lambda}_{B_2})\rangle\} \in \mathcal{B}_{op}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$. Finally, we vary the parameters $(\vec{\lambda}_{A_1}, \vec{\lambda}_{B_1})$ for the first orthonormal product bases, and repeat the above procedure, until we get the converging infimum value over all the first orthonormal product bases $\{|a_1(\vec{\lambda}_{A_1}), b_1(\vec{\lambda}_{B_1})\rangle\} \in \mathcal{B}_{op}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$. Hence, we have a hybrid quantum-classical variational circuit [78] for computing the KD nonclassical correlation which may be implemented on the near-term quantum hardware [79]. Let us mention that a different approach of using variational quantum circuit to compute general quantum correlation is suggested in Ref. [80].

Note that, as argued in Refs. [81, 82], the variance of the imaginary part of the weak value in Eq. (42) can be seen as the mean squared error of the optimal estimation of the product basis $\{\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1}\}$ based on the outcome of measurement of product basis $\{\Pi_A^{a_2} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_2}\}$. In this sense, Eq. (41), may be interpreted as the minimum mean absolute error of such optimal estimation in the worst case scenario, i.e., the best of the worst. Moreover, the imaginary part of the weak value in Eq. (42) can also be interpreted as the disturbance of the state ϱ_{AB} due to a unitary translation generated by local Hermitian observable $\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_1}$ [83]. Noting this, Eq. (41) can also be interpreted as the minimum of average of such disturbance in the worst case scenario.

The above scheme for the observation of the two-sided KD nonclassical correlation using weak value measurement and classical optimization can be applied to estimate the one-sided KD nonclassical correlation of Eq. (8) entailing similar statistical meaning.

V. SUMMARY AND REMARKS

In this paper we discussed a fundamental question: how is the general quantum correlation in a bipartite state, wherein entanglement is a subset, encoded in the associated KD quasiprobability? More specifically, how is the nonclassicality captured by the general quantum correlation in a bipartite state related to the nonclassical values of the KD quasiprobability? We showed that the sum of the absolute imaginary part of the KD quasiprobability defined over a pair of orthonormal product bases, suitably optimized over all such bases, can be used to quantify the general quantum correlation in the associated bipartite state, satisfying certain desirable requirements. We discussed the relation between the quantifier of general quantum correlation, called KD nonclassical correlation, with the negativity of quantumness, minimum local quantum uncertainty, and entanglement and measurement-induced nonlocality for pure states. We also gave a general scheme for the estimation of the KD nonclassical correlation using a hybrid quantum-classical variational circuit implementable in the near-term quantum hardware. Our results suggest intriguing fundamental links between the quantum-classical division and contrast captured by general nonclassical correlation, and the concept of nonclassicality captured by the nonclassical values of the Kirkwood-Dirac quasiprobability and the associated strange weak values in the multipartite setting.

Acknowledgments

Appendix A: Proof of Proposition 7

First, we have, from Eq. (8),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB}) \\
&= \inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1} \sum_{a_2, b_2} \left| \text{Im} \left(\frac{\text{Tr}(\Pi_{AB}^{a_2 b_2} (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB})}{\text{Tr}(\Pi_{AB}^{a_2 b_2} \varrho_{AB})} \right) \right| \text{Tr}(\Pi_{AB}^{a_2 b_2} \varrho_{AB}) \\
&\leq \inf_{\{|a_1\rangle\}} \sup_{\{|a_2, b_2\rangle\}} \sum_{a_1} \left(\sum_{a_2, b_2} \left| \text{Im} \left(\frac{\text{Tr}(\Pi_{AB}^{a_2 b_2} (\Pi_A^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB})}{\text{Tr}(\Pi_{AB}^{a_2 b_2} \varrho_{AB})} \right) \right|^2 \text{Tr}(\Pi_{AB}^{a_2 b_2} \varrho_{AB}) \right)^{1/2} \\
&= \sum_{a_1^*} \left(\sum_{a_2^*, b_2^*} \left(\left| \frac{\text{Tr}(\Pi_{AB}^{a_2^* b_2^*} (\Pi_A^{a_1^*} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB})}{\text{Tr}(\Pi_{AB}^{a_2^* b_2^*} \varrho_{AB})} \right|^2 \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \text{Re} \left(\frac{\text{Tr}(\Pi_{AB}^{a_2^* b_2^*} (\Pi_A^{a_1^*} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB})}{\text{Tr}(\Pi_{AB}^{a_2^* b_2^*} \varrho_{AB})} \right)^2 \right) \text{Tr}(\Pi_{AB}^{a_2^* b_2^*} \varrho_{AB}) \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \sum_{a_1^*} \left(\sum_{a_2^*, b_2^*} \frac{|\text{Tr}(\Pi_{AB}^{a_2^* b_2^*} (\Pi_A^{a_1^*} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB})|^2}{\text{Tr}(\Pi_{AB}^{a_2^* b_2^*} \varrho_{AB})} - \left(\sum_{a_2^*, b_2^*} \text{Re}(\text{Tr}(\Pi_{AB}^{a_2^* b_2^*} (\Pi_A^{a_1^*} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB})) \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \tag{A1}
\end{aligned}$$

Here $\Pi_{AB}^{a_2 b_2} = \Pi_A^{a_2} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_2}$, $\{|a_2^*, b_2^*\rangle\}$ is a second orthonormal product basis which achieves the supremum, and $\{\Pi_A^{a_1^*}\}$ is a first orthonormal basis which achieves the infimum. Moreover, we have applied the Jensen inequality to get the third and fifth lines. Next, applying the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality for bounded operators, i.e., $|\text{Tr}(XY^\dagger)|^2 \leq \text{Tr}(XX^\dagger)\text{Tr}(YY^\dagger)$, to the numerator in the first term on the right-hand side of Eq. (A1), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\text{Tr}(\Pi_{AB}^{a_2^* b_2^*} (\Pi_A^{a_1^*} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB})|^2 &= |\text{Tr}(((\Pi_{AB}^{a_2^* b_2^*})^{1/2} (\Pi_A^{a_1^*} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB})^{1/2} (\varrho_{AB}^{1/2} (\Pi_{AB}^{a_2^* b_2^*})^{1/2}))|^2 \\
&\leq \text{Tr}(\Pi_{AB}^{a_2^* b_2^*} (\Pi_A^{a_1^*} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB} (\Pi_A^{a_1^*} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)) \text{Tr}(\varrho_{AB} \Pi_{AB}^{a_2^* b_2^*}) \tag{A2}
\end{aligned}$$

and using the completeness relation $\sum_{a_2^*, b_2^*} \Pi_{AB}^{a_2^* b_2^*} = \mathbb{I}$, we finally obtain Eq. (28), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^A(\varrho_{AB}) &\leq \sum_{a^*} \left(\text{Tr}((\Pi_A^{a^*} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)^2 \varrho_{AB}) - \text{Tr}((\Pi_A^{a^*} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \varrho_{AB})^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&= \inf_{\{\Pi_A^a\}} \sum_a \Delta_{(\Pi_A^a \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)}(\varrho_{AB}). \tag{A3}
\end{aligned}$$

By following exactly the same steps as above, we also obtain the inequality of Eq. (29) for the two-sided KD nonclassical correlation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}_{\text{KD}}^{AB}(\varrho_{AB}) &\leq \sum_{a^*, b^*} \left(\text{Tr}((\Pi_A^{a^*} \otimes \Pi_B^{b^*})^2 \varrho_{AB}) - \text{Tr}((\Pi_A^{a^*} \otimes \Pi_B^{b^*}) \varrho_{AB})^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&= \inf_{\{\Pi_A^a \otimes \Pi_B^b\}} \sum_{a, b} \Delta_{(\Pi_A^a \otimes \Pi_B^b)}(\varrho_{AB}), \tag{A4}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Pi_A^{a_*} \otimes \Pi_B^{b_*} = |a_*, b_*\rangle \langle a_*, b_*|$, with $\{|a_*, b_*\rangle\}$ is a first orthonormal product basis of \mathcal{H}_{AB} which achieves the infimum in Eq. (9). \square

-
- [1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki and K. Horodecki, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 81, 865 (2009).
 - [2] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 88, 017901 (2001).
 - [3] L. Henderson and V. Vedral, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 34, 6899 (2001).
 - [4] J. Oppenheim, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 89, 180402 (2002).
 - [5] M. Horodecki, K. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, A. Sen(De) and U. Sen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 90, 100402 (2003).
 - [6] S. Luo, *Phys. Rev. A* 77, 022301 (2008).
 - [7] B. Dakić, V. Vedral, and C. Brukner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 105, 190502 (2010).
 - [8] K. Modi, T. Paterek, W. Son, V. Vedral, and M. Williamson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 104, 080501 (2010).
 - [9] S. Luo and S. Fu, *Phys. Rev. A* 82, 034302 (2010).
 - [10] A. Monras, G. Adesso, S. M. Giampaolo, G. Gualdi, G. B. Davies, and F. Illuminati, *Phys. Rev. A* 84, 012301 (2011).
 - [11] M. Piani, *Phys. Rev. A* 86, 034101 (2012).
 - [12] S. Luo and S. Fu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 106, 120401 (2011).
 - [13] M. Piani, S. Gharibian, G. Adesso, J. Calsamiglia, P. Horodecki and A. Winter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 106, 220403 (2011).
 - [14] A. Streltsov, H. Kampermann, and D. Bruss, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 106, 160401 (2011).
 - [15] S. Gharibian, M. Piani, G. Adesso, J. Calsamiglia, and P. Horodecki, *Int. J. Quantum Inf.* 9, 1701 (2011).
 - [16] S. Giampaolo, A. Streltsov, W. Roga, D. Brus and F. Illuminati, *Phys. Rev. A* 87, 012313 (2013).
 - [17] S. Gharibian, *Phys. Rev. A* 86, 042106 (2012).
 - [18] K. P. Seshadreesan and M. M. Wilde, *Phys. Rev. A* 92, 042321 (2015)
 - [19] D. Girolami, T. Tufarelli and G. Adesso, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 110, 240402 (2013).
 - [20] D. Girolami, A. M. Souza, V. Giovannetti, T. Tufarelli, J. G. Filgueiras, R. S. Sarthour, D.

- O. Soares-Pinto, I. S. Oliveira and G. Adesso, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 112, 210401 (2014).
- [21] M. Mahdian, R. Yousefjani and S. Salimi, *The European Physical Journal D* 66, 133 (2012).
- [22] A. Datta, A. Shaji, and C. M. Caves, *Phys. Rev. Lett* 100, 050502 (2008).
- [23] B. P. Lanyon, M. Barbieri, M. P. Almeida, and A. G. White, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 101, 200501 (2008).
- [24] G. Passante, O. Moussa, D. A. Trottier, and R. Laflamme, *Phys. Rev. A* 84, 044302 (2011).
- [25] M. Piani, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 100, 090502 (2008).
- [26] B. Dakić et. al., *Nature Phys.* 8, 666 (2012).
- [27] D. Cavalcanti, L. Aolita, S. Boixo, K. Modi, M. Piani, and A. Winter, *Phys. Rev. A* 83, 032324 (2011).
- [28] M. Gu et. al., *Nature Phys.* 8, 671 (2012).
- [29] K. Modi, H. Cable, M. Williamson, and V. Vedral, *Phys. Rev. X* 1, 021022 (2011).
- [30] K. Modi, A. Brodutch, H. Cable, T. Paterek, and V. Vedral, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 84, 1655 (2012).
- [31] G. Adesso, T. R. Bromley, and M. Cianciaruso, *J. Phys. A* 49 (47), 473001 (2016).
- [32] A. Bera, T. Das, D. Sadhukhan, S. S. Roy, A. Sen(De) and U. Sen, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* 81, 024001 (2018).
- [33] J. G. Kirkwood, *Phys. Rev.* 44, 31 (1933).
- [34] P. A. M. Dirac, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 17, 195 (1945).
- [35] O. Barut, *Phys. Rev.* 108, 565 (1957).
- [36] S. Chaturvedi, E. Ercolessi, G. Marmo, G. Morandi, N. Mukunda, and R. Simon, *J. Phys. A* 39, 1405 (2006).
- [37] D. R. M. Arvidsson-Shukur, J. C. Drori and N. Y. Halpern, *J. Phys. A: Math. and Theor.* 54, 284001 (2021).
- [38] S. deBièvre, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 127, 190404 (2021).
- [39] J. S. Lundeen and C. Bamber, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 108, 070402 (2012).
- [40] J. Z. Salvail, M. Agnew, A. S. Johnson, E. Bolduc, J. Leach and R. W. Boyd, *Nat. Photonics* 1 (2013).
- [41] C. Bamber and J. S. Lundeen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 112, 070405 (2014).
- [42] G. S. Thekkadath, L. Giner, Y. Chalich, M. J. Horton, J. Banker, and J. S. Lundeen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 117, 120401 (2016).
- [43] D. Arvidsson-Shukur, N. YungerHalpern, H. Lepage, A. Lasek, C. Barnes, and S. Lloyd, *Nat.*

- Comm. 11, 3775 (2020).
- [44] N. B. Lupu-Gladstein, B. Y. Yilmaz, D. R. M. Arvidsson-Shukur, A. Brodutch, A. O. T. Pang, A. M. Steinberg, N. Y. Halpern, Phys. Rev. Lett. 128, 220504 (2022).
 - [45] M. Lostaglio, Phys. Rev. Lett. 125, 230603 (2020).
 - [46] A. Allahverdyan, Phys. Rev. E 90, 032137 (2014).
 - [47] M. Lostaglio Phys. Rev. Lett. 120, 040602 (2018).
 - [48] M. Lostaglio, A. Belenchia, A. Levy, S. Hernandez-Gomez, N. Fabbri, and S Gherardini, arXiv:2206.11783v2 (2022).
 - [49] J. R. G. Alonso, N. Y. Halpern, and J. Dressel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 122, 040404 (2019).
 - [50] N. Y. Halpern, B. Swingle, and J. Dressel, Phys. Rev. A 97, 042105 (2018).
 - [51] M. F. Pusey, Phys. Rev. Lett. 113, 200401 (2014).
 - [52] R. Kunjwal, M. Lostaglio, and M. F. Pusey, Phys. Rev. A 100, 042116 (2019).
 - [53] A. Budiyono and H. K. Dipojono, Phys. Rev. A 107, 022408 (2023).
 - [54] A. Budiyono, M. K. Agusta, B. E. B. Nurhandoko, H. K. Dipojono, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 56, 235304 (2023).
 - [55] A. Budiyono, Phys. Rev. A 108, 012431 (2023).
 - [56] Y. Aharonov, D. Z. Albert and L. Vaidman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60 (14), 1351 (1988).
 - [57] Y. Aharonov and D. Rohrlich, *Quantum paradoxes: quantum theory for the perplexed* (Wiley-vCH, 2005).
 - [58] H. M. Wiseman, Phys. Rev. A 65, 032111 (2002).
 - [59] B. Tamir and E. Cohen, Quanta 2, 7 (2013).
 - [60] L. M. Johansen, Phys. Lett. A 366, 374 (2007).
 - [61] L. M. Johansen, Phys. Rev. A 76, 012119 (2007).
 - [62] R. Jozsa, Phys. Rev. A 76, 044103 (2007).
 - [63] E. Haapasalo, P. Lahti, and J. Schultz, Phys. Rev. A 84, 052107 (2011).
 - [64] G. Vallone and D. Dequal, Phys. Rev. Lett. 116, 040502 (2016).
 - [65] E. Cohen and E. Pollak, Phys. Rev. A 98, 042112 (2018).
 - [66] R. Wagner, Z. Schwartzman-Nowik, I. L. Paiva, A Te'eni, A. Ruiz-Molero, R. S. Barbosa, E. Cohen, and E. F. Galvão, Quantum circuits measuring weak values and Kirkwood-Dirac quasiprobability distributions, with applications, arXiv:2302.00705v1 (2023).
 - [67] T. Nakano, M. Piani and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. A 88, 012117 (2013).

- [68] S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A 77, 042303 (2008).
- [69] M. Ali, A. R. P. Rau, and G. Alber, Phys. Rev. A 81, 042105 (2010).
- [70] R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A 40, 4277 (1989).
- [71] S. Luo, Theor. Math. Phys. 143, 681 (2005).
- [72] S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A 72, 042110 (2005).
- [73] K. Korzekwa, M. Lostaglio, D. Jennings, and T. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. A 89, 042122 (2014).
- [74] M. J. Hall, Phys. Rev. A 107, 062215 (2023).
- [75] E. P. Wigner and M. M. Yanase, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 49, 910 (1963).
- [76] S. Luo, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 180403 (2003).
- [77] G. Vidal, J. Mod. Opt. 47, 355 (2000).
- [78] M. Cerezo, A. Arrasmith, R. Babbush, S. C. Benjamin, S. Endo, K. Fujii, J. R. McClean, K. Mitarai, X. Yuan, L. Cincio, P. J. Coles, Nature Reviews Physics 3, 625 (2021).
- [79] J. Preskill, Quantum 2, 79 (2018).
- [80] M. Mahdian and H. D. Yeganeh, Quant. Inf. Processing 20, 393 (2021).
- [81] L. M. Johansen, Physics Letters A 322, 298 (2004).
- [82] M. J. W. Hall, Phys. Rev. A 69, 052113 (2004).
- [83] J. Dressel and A. N. Jordan, Phys. Rev. A 85, 012107 (2012).