

Sufficiency of Rényi divergences

Niklas Galke^{1*}, Lauritz van Luijk^{2†}, Henrik Wilming^{2‡}

¹Física Teòrica: Informació i Fenòmens Quàntics, Departament de Física,
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193 Bellaterra, Spain

²Leibniz Universität Hannover, Appelstraße 2, 30167 Hannover, Germany

December 20, 2023

Abstract

A set of classical or quantum states is equivalent to another one if there exists a pair of classical or quantum channels mapping either set to the other one. For dichotomies (pairs of states), this is closely connected to (classical or quantum) Rényi divergences (RD) and the data-processing inequality: If a RD remains unchanged when a channel is applied to the dichotomy, then there is a recovery channel mapping the image back to the initial dichotomy. Here, we prove for classical dichotomies that equality of the RDs alone is already sufficient for the existence of a channel in any of the two directions and discuss some applications. In the quantum case, all families of quantum RDs are seen to be insufficient because they cannot detect anti-unitary transformations. Thus, including anti-unitaries, we pose the problem of finding a sufficient family. It is shown that the Petz and maximal quantum RD are still insufficient in this more general sense and we provide evidence for sufficiency of the minimal quantum RD. As a side result of our techniques, we obtain an infinite list of inequalities fulfilled by the classical, the Petz quantum, and the maximal quantum RDs. These inequalities are not true for the minimal quantum RDs. Our results further imply that any sufficient set of conditions for state transitions in the resource theory of athermality must be able to detect time-reversal.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Structure of interconvertible states	7
3	Dichotomies: Sufficient families of Rényi divergences	11
3.1	The classical case	11
3.2	Quantum case: Insufficiency of known quantum Rényi divergences	14
3.3	Sufficiency and positive maps: A conjecture	16
3.4	Complete monotonicity	21
A	Interconvertibility from Rényi Divergences without absolute continuity	24

*niklas.galke@uab.cat

†lauritz.vanluijk@itp.uni-hannover.de

‡henrik.wilming@itp.uni-hannover.de

B	Convertibility and interconvertibility for probability vectors	26
C	Proof of Theorem 4 for infinite-dimensional systems	29
D	Quantum f-divergences	30
E	The insufficient zoo of divergences	32

1 Introduction

A statistical experiment is generally described by an indexed set of probability measures or quantum states $(\rho_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ (we use the notation for density matrices throughout this introduction and use the word state in both cases). The parameter θ can be discrete or continuous and may be thought of as a parameter that controls the experiment and is sought to be estimated. For example, in the special case of *binary* experiments with $\Theta = \{0, 1\}$ it may be thought of as labeling two hypotheses to be distinguished. One experiment $(\rho_\theta^{(1)})_{\theta \in \Theta}$ can be considered as at least as informative as another one $(\rho_\theta^{(2)})_{\theta \in \Theta}$ if there exists a (classical or quantum) channel T so that $T(\rho_\theta^{(1)}) = \rho_\theta^{(2)}$. In this case we write $(\rho_\theta^{(1)})_{\theta \in \Theta} \rightarrow (\rho_\theta^{(2)})_{\theta \in \Theta}$. The channel T may be viewed as a randomization or coarse-graining operation. It is a classic problem in statistics to provide necessary and sufficient conditions that characterize when one experiment is more informative than another one [1].

In this paper, we consider a much simpler problem: When is it the case that two experiments are *equivalent*, meaning that either experiment is at least as informative as the other? In other words, we ask when there exist (classical or quantum) channels T and R such that¹

$$T(\rho_\theta^{(1)}) = \rho_\theta^{(2)}, \quad R(\rho_\theta^{(2)}) = \rho_\theta^{(1)} \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta. \quad (1)$$

If this is the case, we will also say that the two sets are *interconvertible* and write

$$(\rho_\theta^{(1)})_{\theta \in \Theta} \longleftrightarrow (\rho_\theta^{(2)})_{\theta \in \Theta}. \quad (2)$$

In the language of statistics, interconvertible sets of states describe experiments that are *sufficient* with respect to each other [1–5]. Our aim is to understand the structure of such states and relate interconvertibility of binary experiments with equality of Rényi divergences. We will see that in the classical case, the Rényi divergences precisely contain the information that is needed to determine interconvertibility and conjecture that the same holds for suitable quantum Rényi divergences.

We first consider the case of density matrices $\rho_\theta^{(j)}$ (finite or infinite-dimensional) and discuss a minimal normal form for two interconvertible sets of density matrices and the associated quantum channels T, R (Section 2). The normal form is based on the Koashi-Imoto theorem [6] and its infinite-dimensional generalizations [4, 7]. From the normal form it follows that (Proposition 6):

1. Non-commuting sets of density matrices cannot be interconverted with commuting sets of density matrices, a result closely connected to the “no-teleportation theorem”.

¹In the classical case, a channel is a stochastic map. In the quantum case, it is a completely positive trace-preserving map.

2. The set of fixed points of any entanglement-breaking channel is commutative.

Having established the normal form for interconvertible density matrices, we then specialize to the case of binary experiments in Section 3. This case simply corresponds to pairs of states also known as *dichotomies* (ρ, σ) . We also say that a dichotomy (ρ_1, σ_1) is *convertible to* or that it *(quantum) relatively majorizes* (ρ_2, σ_2) if $(\rho_1, \sigma_1) \rightarrow (\rho_2, \sigma_2)$ [8–18]. (To ease notation, we index different dichotomies by subscripts instead of superscripts.) The study of dichotomies and their convertibility is closely related to the study of *divergences* of states, which are functions on dichotomies that characterize how distinguishable the two states are. The central properties of a general divergence \mathbb{D} are:

1. Positivity: $\mathbb{D}(\rho, \sigma) \geq 0$ with equality if and only if $\rho = \sigma$,
2. Data-processing: $\mathbb{D}(T(\rho), T(\sigma)) \leq \mathbb{D}(\rho, \sigma)$.

Many divergences, in particular the Rényi divergences we will see later, also satisfy the additional property of being additive over tensor-products:

$$\mathbb{D}(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2, \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2) = \mathbb{D}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) + \mathbb{D}(\rho_2, \sigma_2). \quad (3)$$

The prototypical example of an additive divergence is the quantum relative entropy

$$D(\rho, \sigma) = \text{tr}[\rho(\log(\rho) - \log(\sigma))], \quad (4)$$

with $D(\rho, \sigma) = \infty$ if the support of ρ is not contained in that of σ . However, divergences come in many flavors, and we will see a variety below. One way to give operational meaning to them is in asymptotic settings, where one asks for the maximum rate $R = m/n$ to convert $(\rho_1, \sigma_1)^{\otimes n}$ into $(\rho_2, \sigma_2)^{\otimes m}$ (possibly up to a small error). It follows immediately from these properties that if $(\rho_1, \sigma_1)^{\otimes n}$ can be converted into $(\rho_2, \sigma_2)^{\otimes n}$, then $R \leq \mathbb{D}(\rho_1, \sigma_1)/\mathbb{D}(\rho_2, \sigma_2)$ for any valid additive divergence. In fact asymptotic conversion rates can often be expressed exactly as ratios of suitable divergences of the dichotomies [17–21].

Here, we study the role of divergences for the interconvertibility of dichotomies without taking an asymptotic limit. It is clear from the data-processing inequality that any valid divergence must be invariant among interconvertible dichotomies:

$$(\rho_1, \sigma_1) \longleftrightarrow (\rho_2, \sigma_2) \Rightarrow \mathbb{D}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = \mathbb{D}(\rho_2, \sigma_2). \quad (5)$$

Moreover, it was shown in [2–4] that if $(\rho_1, \sigma_1) \rightarrow (\rho_2, \sigma_2)$ and it is true that $D(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = D(\rho_2, \sigma_2)$, then the two dichotomies are automatically also interconvertible. The same statement holds true for classical probability measures when D is replaced by the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence [22]. It also holds when the relative entropy (or KL divergence) is replaced by a suitable *f-divergence* [23] (which we discuss in detail in Appendix D).

But what happens if we do not know whether one of two divergences is convertible to the other one? Could it be true that equality of a family of divergences alone already implies that two dichotomies are interconvertible? Let $\{\mathbb{D}_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ be a family of divergences labelled by a parameter λ . We define such a family to be *sufficient* if

$$\mathbb{D}_\lambda(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = \mathbb{D}_\lambda(\rho_2, \sigma_2) \quad \forall \lambda \in \Lambda \Rightarrow (\rho_1, \sigma_1) \longleftrightarrow (\rho_2, \sigma_2). \quad (6)$$

Thus equality of a sufficient family of divergence is equivalent to interconvertibility. It is at first not clear that a sufficient family of divergences, in fact, exists, neither in the classical nor in the quantum case. As a first result, we prove that the classical Rényi divergences D_α constitute a sufficient family of divergences (Section 3.1):

Theorem A (Sufficiency of Rényi divergences). *Let (X_i, μ_i) , $i = 1, 2$, be measure spaces and $p_i \ll q_i$ probability measures in $L^1(X_i, \mu_i)$. If there is an open interval $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$, $a < b$, such that*

$$D_\alpha(p_1, q_1) = D_\alpha(p_2, q_2) < \infty \quad \forall \alpha \in (a, b), \quad (7)$$

there are stochastic maps between $L^1(X_1, \mu_1)$ and $L^1(X_2, \mu_2)$ interconverting the dichotomies (p_1, q_1) and (p_2, q_2) .

This theorem follows from the existence of a “normal form” for classical dichotomies, which can be determined from the Rényi divergences alone:

Theorem B. *Let $p \ll q$ be probability distributions on a measurable space X . Then there is a probability measure \tilde{q} on $(-\infty, \infty]$ such that*

$$D_\alpha(p, q) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \int_{(-\infty, \infty]} e^{-t\alpha} d\tilde{q}(t) \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (8)$$

$\tilde{p} := e^{-t\tilde{q}} \ll \tilde{q}$ is a probability measure and $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) \leftrightarrow (p, q)$. If the Rényi divergences $D_\alpha(p, q)$ exist for an open set of $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, then \tilde{q} and, hence, \tilde{p} are uniquely determined by (8).

Since Rényi divergences are additive, one immediate consequence of Theorem A is that there is no non-trivial (*strict*) catalysis for interconversion of dichotomies (see Refs. [24, 25] for reviews on catalysis): If $(p_1 \otimes r, q_1 \otimes s) \leftrightarrow (p_2 \otimes r, q_2 \otimes s)$ with $r \ll s$ and the Rényi divergences for both are finite on an open set, then also $(p_1, q_1) \leftrightarrow (p_2, q_2)$. This is noteworthy, because non-trivial cases of strict catalysis exist for one-sided conversion of dichotomies [26–28]: $(p_1 \otimes r, q_1 \otimes s) \rightarrow (p_2 \otimes r, q_2 \otimes r)$ does *not* imply $(p_1, q_1) \rightarrow (p_2, q_2)$. In the context of resource theories, a family of divergences \mathbb{D}_λ is called a *complete set of monotones* if

$$\mathbb{D}_\lambda(\rho_1, \sigma_1) \geq \mathbb{D}_\lambda(\rho_2, \sigma_2) \quad \forall \lambda \in \Lambda \Rightarrow (\rho_1, \sigma_1) \rightarrow (\rho_2, \sigma_2). \quad (9)$$

The existence of non-trivial examples of catalysis alone implies that no family of additive divergences (such as the Rényi divergences) can constitute a complete set of monotones [29]. This may lead to the impression that the Rényi divergences with $\alpha > 0$ do not contain sufficient information to decide whether a classical dichotomy (p_1, q_1) can be converted to another one (p_2, q_2) . Our results imply that this is false. Consider the dichotomies $(\tilde{p}_1, \tilde{q}_1)$ and $(\tilde{p}_2, \tilde{q}_2)$ whose existence is implied by Theorem B and which are completely determined by the Rényi divergences with $\alpha > 0$. We have $(p_1, q_1) \rightarrow (p_2, q_2)$ *if and only if* $(\tilde{p}_1, \tilde{q}_1) \rightarrow (\tilde{p}_2, \tilde{q}_2)$. Since the latter dichotomies are determined by the Rényi divergences, it follows that the divergences, in principle, contain sufficient information to decide convertibility:

Corollary C. *It is in principle possible to decide if $(p_1, q_1) \rightarrow (p_2, q_2)$ from the knowledge of the Rényi divergences $D_\alpha(p_1, q_1)$ and $D_\alpha(p_2, q_2)$ on any non-empty open subset $(a, b) \subset [0, \infty)$ on which they are both finite.*

In Appendix B, we discuss and illustrate these results in detail for the case of probability vectors, where every step can be carried out explicitly.

Theorem A relies on observations relating Rényi divergences to the theory of Laplace transforms, which we consider to be of independent interest and further explore in Section 3.4. This connection gives rise to an infinite set of inequalities between Rényi divergences, which also hold true for the *Petz quantum Rényi divergence* D_α^P as well as the

maximal (or geometric) quantum Rényi divergence D_α^{\max} in the quantum case. We refer to [30] and Section 3 for an introduction to the various different quantum Rényi divergences. As an example of these inequalities, we find:

$$(-1)^n \frac{d^n}{d\alpha^n} \left(e^{(\alpha-1)(\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho,\sigma) - \mathbb{D}_\infty(\rho,\sigma))} \right) \geq 0 \quad \forall \alpha > 0, n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (10)$$

if $\mathbb{D}_\alpha = D_\alpha^{\text{P}}, D_\alpha^{\max}$ and in the classical case (always assuming that $\mathbb{D}_\infty(\rho, \sigma)$ is finite). In fact, we show that (10) is true for a sufficient family of Rényi divergences (should it exist) if and only if $[\rho, \sigma] = 0$. In particular, neither the Petz- nor the maximal Rényi divergence are sufficient, since they can be “simulated” by classical distributions: For any dichotomy (ρ, σ) there exists a classical dichotomy (p, q) , called *Nussbaum-Szkoła distribution* [31], such that $D_\alpha^{\text{P}}(\rho, \sigma) = D_\alpha(p, q)$ (and similarly for D_α^{\max} for a suitable, different classical dichotomy).

Given the sufficiency of classical Rényi divergences, it is natural to conjecture that some quantum Rényi divergence is sufficient as well.² In Section 3.2 we see that all customary quantum Rényi divergences known to us are not sufficient.

Proposition 1. *The following quantum divergences are not sufficient: The standard quantum f -divergences – including the Petz quantum Rényi divergences – the maximal quantum f -divergences, the minimal (or sandwiched) Rényi divergences, the α - z Rényi divergences, the measured Rényi divergences, the sharp Rényi divergences, the Kringel Rényi divergences. Moreover, the collection of all these divergences is also not sufficient.*

For the convenience of the reader, in Appendix E, we provide definitions and summarize the main properties of all these divergences. The reason why none of these divergences are sufficient is very simple: Each of them is not only invariant under unitary conjugation but also invariant under anti-unitary conjugation. In particular, they assign the same values to (ρ, σ) and $(\bar{\rho}, \sigma)$, where $\bar{\rho}$ denotes entry-wise complex conjugate of ρ in the eigenbasis of σ . However, (ρ, σ) in general cannot be interconverted with $(\bar{\rho}, \sigma)$ using completely positive trace-preserving maps. This can be shown using the normal form of interconvertible dichotomies.

This result shows that asking for sufficiency for completely positive interconversion is too restrictive in the quantum case. Since conjugation by anti-unitaries is still positive, it suggests to generalize to interconvertibility by positive trace-preserving maps in order to obtain a well-posed problem. Indeed it is known that several of the above divergences are also monotone under this more general class of maps (at least for certain ranges of α), see Appendix E. Adopting this generalized notion of interconvertibility we can still rule out the Petz and maximal quantum Rényi divergences as sufficient families. The α - z Rényi divergences are only known to be monotonic under positive maps for a smaller range of (α, z) compared to completely positive maps. We conjecture:

Conjecture D. *The minimal quantum Rényi divergences D_α^{\min} (sandwiched quantum Rényi divergences) provide a sufficient family of divergences for interconversion of finite-dimensional density matrices via positive, trace-preserving maps.*

A positive resolution to the conjecture

- a) implies that the minimal quantum Rényi divergences encode all relevant relative information between two quantum states (in the sense of interconvertibility via positive trace-preserving maps),

²We conjectured this in a previous version of this paper.

b) provides a new perspective into the problem of recovery of quantum operations.

So far, not even the sufficiency of classical Rényi divergences seemed to be known. We hope that formulating and discussing the conjecture in detail motivates more researchers to study this interesting problem and make further progress towards its resolution. In Section 3.3 we substantiate our conjecture by proving it for the case that both ρ_1 and ρ_2 are pure states as well as in the special case where ρ_1 is pure and $[\rho_2, \sigma_2] = 0$. In the latter case, it then follows that $[\rho_1, \sigma_1] = 0$ and ρ_2 is pure as well. As a side-result of general interest, we thereby show that there exists no general equivalent of the Nussbaum-Szkoła distributions for the minimal quantum Rényi divergence:

Corollary E. *The minimal quantum Rényi divergences can, in general, not be classically simulated: There exist non-commuting dichotomies (ρ, σ) , such that there is no classical dichotomy (p, q) with $D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) = D_\alpha(p, q)$ for all $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$.*

This statement does not yet rule out the existence of classical simulations for certain specific dichotomies. But if our conjecture is true, then the minimal quantum Rényi divergence cannot be classically simulated for any non-abelian dichotomy. In particular, the latter would always violate at least one of the inequalities (10). Conversely, Conjecture D can be falsified by presenting a single example of a non-abelian dichotomy whose minimal quantum Rényi divergence can be classically simulated. As an illustration and further evidence for our conjecture, we present additional numerical examples of non-abelian mixed dichotomies for which (10) indeed does not hold for the minimal quantum Rényi divergence and hence for which no classical simulation exists (see Fig. 1).

Application to Thermodynamics: Our result for classical states has a direct application in the context of resource theories [32]: The so-called resource theory of athermality [13, 14, 27, 33–35] deals with dichotomies where the second state σ is given by a Gibbs state $\omega_H := \exp(-\beta H)/Z$ of some Hamiltonian H with fixed inverse temperature $\beta > 0$ and all channels (free operations) must map Gibbs states to Gibbs states. In the case of abelian dichotomies (ρ, ω_H) , the Rényi divergences $D_\alpha(\rho, \omega_H)$ with $\alpha \geq 0$ can be interpreted as generalized free energies $F_\alpha(\rho, H)$ of ρ with respect to H . Our results then immediately imply that if $F_\alpha(\rho_1, H_1) = F_\alpha(\rho_2, H_2)$ for all $\alpha \geq 0$, then the two states are thermodynamically completely equivalent because they can be reversibly interconverted by thermodynamically free operations already in the single shot. Moreover, knowledge of the free energies for $\alpha > 0$ is sufficient to decide whether a thermodynamic state-transition is possible.

The situation is quite different in the quantum setting. Since no quantum Rényi divergence is sufficient for interconvertibility with quantum channels, equality of free energies (defined via quantum Rényi divergences with respect to the Gibbs states) does not imply equivalence of states in the resource theory of athermality. Interestingly, this is true because time-reversal, which is precisely an anti-unitary symmetry commuting with the Gibbs state, cannot be detected using free energies while it also cannot be implemented via completely positive maps. It is a longstanding open problem to determine a meaningful and computable sufficient set of conditions for state transitions in the resource theory of athermality (see, however, Ref. [16]). Our result shows that such a set of conditions must be able to detect time-reversal.

Structure of the paper: We first discuss the general structure of interconvertible sets of quantum states in Sec. 2 and then specialize to dichotomies and the associated Rényi divergences in Sec. 3. In Sec. 3.1, we prove the solution to the classical case. Starting from

Sec. 3.2, we discuss the quantum case, which includes a discussion of the role of “complete monotonicity” leading to the inequalities (10) in Sec. 3.4. In the Appendix, we discuss the proof of the classical conjecture without the assumption of absolute continuity (A) and examine in detail the case of probability vectors (B). In particular, we also show that the question of convertibility of two dichotomies can be decided from the knowledge of the Rényi divergences for α in an open subset of $[0, \infty)$ alone. Appendix C contains the proof of the connection between the Koashi-Imoto decomposition and the problem of interconvertibility in infinite dimensions. Appendix D contains a discussion of f -divergences. Finally, in Appendix E we list all families of quantum Rényi divergences known to us and collect their relevant properties.

2 Structure of interconvertible states

We will allow for possibly continuous classical systems and infinite-dimensional quantum systems. For a quantum system S we denote the Hilbert space by \mathcal{H} and the set of density operators on \mathcal{H} by $\mathfrak{S}(S)$. A classical system S is described by a σ -finite measure space (X, μ) . The state space is the set of probability distributions on X which are absolutely continuous with respect to the reference measure μ , i.e., $\mathfrak{S}(S)$ is the space of positive normalized elements of $L^1(X, \mu)$. We will usually identify an absolutely continuous measure with its corresponding μ -density and write $L^1(X, \mu)$ for both sets.

A *channel* between two systems S_i , $i = 1, 2$, is a linear³ completely positive map $T : \mathfrak{S}(S_1) \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}(S_2)$. For quantum systems, this means that T is a completely positive trace-preserving map $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_{S_1}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_{S_2})$ between the Banach spaces of trace class operators. For classical systems, the definition is equivalent to that of a stochastic map. If one of the systems is quantum and the other one is classical, channels describe either measurements or preparations depending on which system is classical or quantum.

Definition 2. Consider two systems S_1 and S_2 and two families of states $(\rho_\theta^{(i)})_{\theta \in \Theta} \subset \mathfrak{S}(S_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, indexed by a set Θ . We say that $(\rho_\theta^{(1)})_{\theta \in \Theta}$ and $(\rho_\theta^{(2)})_{\theta \in \Theta}$ are interconvertible and write

$$(\rho_\theta^{(1)})_{\theta \in \Theta} \longleftrightarrow (\rho_\theta^{(2)})_{\theta \in \Theta}, \quad (11)$$

if there are channels $T : \mathfrak{S}(S_1) \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}(S_2)$ and $R : \mathfrak{S}(S_2) \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}(S_1)$ so that $T(\rho_\theta^{(1)}) = \rho_\theta^{(2)}$, $R(\rho_\theta^{(2)}) = \rho_\theta^{(1)}$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$.

Note that the systems in Definition 2 can be classical or quantum systems. The main result of this section is a structure theorem for interconvertibility. To state it, we need the following result known as the Koashi-Imoto Theorem (see [6]):

Theorem 3 (Koashi-Imoto). Let $(\rho_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ be a collection of states on a separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} such that the union of the supports is (dense in) \mathcal{H} . Then \mathcal{H} decomposes as $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^N \mathcal{J}_j \otimes \mathcal{K}_j$, $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, such that:

- The states ρ_θ decompose as

$$\rho_\theta = \bigoplus_j p_{j|\theta} \rho_{j|\theta} \otimes \omega_j, \quad (12)$$

³To be precise, we should say that T is affine, i.e., $T(p\rho + (1-p)\sigma) = pT(\rho) + (1-p)T(\sigma)$, $0 < p < 1$, $\rho, \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(S_1)$. This, however, ensures that T can be extended *linearly* to the whole span of the states.

where $\{p_{j|\theta}\}_j$ is a probability distribution, and $\rho_{j|\theta}$ is a density matrix for all $\theta \in \Theta$. Furthermore, ω_j are density matrices independent of θ .

- For every channel T on \mathcal{H} that leaves the ρ_θ invariant we have

$$T|_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{J}_j \otimes \mathcal{K}_j)} = \text{id} \otimes T_j, \quad (13)$$

with id on \mathcal{J}_j and T_j a channel on \mathcal{K}_j such that $T_j(\omega_j) = \omega_j$.

The original theorem was proved in the finite-dimensional case in [6]. An elegant algebraic proof is given in [36]. A proof of the infinite-dimensional case can be found in [7, Sec. 3.3.] (in that reference Eq. (13) is not proved, but it follows by the same argument as in the finite-dimensional case).

The family of states (ρ_θ) is interconvertible with the family of states $(\hat{\rho}_\theta)$ which is obtained from the Koashi-Imoto decomposition by $\hat{\rho}_\theta = \oplus_j p_{j|\theta} \rho_{j|\theta}$ on $\hat{\mathcal{H}} = \oplus_j \mathcal{J}_j$. We will call the family of states $(\hat{\rho}_\theta)$ the **Koashi-Imoto minimal form**. Explicit channels interconverting (ρ_θ) with its Koashi-Imoto minimal form are

$$\iota(\hat{\sigma}) = \oplus_j (P_{\mathcal{J}_j} \hat{\sigma} P_{\mathcal{J}_j}) \otimes \omega_j, \quad \text{and} \quad \pi(\sigma) = \oplus_j \text{tr}_{\mathcal{K}_j} [P_{\mathcal{K}_j \otimes \mathcal{J}_j} \sigma P_{\mathcal{K}_j \otimes \mathcal{J}_j}]. \quad (14)$$

Here, P_V denotes the orthogonal projection onto the subspace V . To be specific we have $\iota(\hat{\rho}_\theta) = \rho_\theta$ and $\pi(\rho_\theta) = \hat{\rho}_\theta$.

The following structure theorem says that two families of states are interconvertible if and only if they have unitarily equivalent Koashi-Imoto minimal forms.

Theorem 4. *Let $(\rho_\theta^{(i)})_{\theta \in \Theta}$ be families of quantum states on quantum systems S_i , such that the union of the supports is all of \mathcal{H}_i , $i = 1, 2$. Consider the Koashi-Imoto decompositions*

$$\mathcal{H}_{S_i} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{N_i} \mathcal{J}_j^{(i)} \otimes \mathcal{K}_j^{(i)}, \quad \rho_\theta^{(i)} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{N_i} p_{j|\theta}^{(i)} \rho_{j|\theta}^{(i)} \otimes \omega_j^{(i)}, \quad \theta \in \Theta, i = 1, 2. \quad (15)$$

The following are equivalent

(A) $(\rho_\theta^{(1)})$ and $(\rho_\theta^{(2)})$ are interconvertible.

(B) There is a reordering of j -indices (and $N_1 = N_2$) such that $p_{j|\theta}^{(1)} = p_{j|\theta}^{(2)}$ and there are unitaries $U_j : \mathcal{J}_j^{(1)} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}_j^{(2)}$ so that $\rho_{j|\theta}^{(1)} = U_j \rho_{j|\theta}^{(2)} U_j^*$.

If the equivalent conditions hold and if T, R are channels that interconvert the sets of states, then it follows that

$$T|_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{J}_j^{(1)} \otimes \mathcal{K}_j^{(1)})} = (U_j(\cdot)U_j^*) \otimes T_j, \quad R|_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{J}_j^{(2)} \otimes \mathcal{K}_j^{(2)})} = (U_j^*(\cdot)U_j) \otimes R_j, \quad (16)$$

where the U_j are the unitaries from (B) and T_j and R_j are quantum channels with $T_j(\omega_j^{(1)}) = \omega_j^{(2)}$ and $R_j(\omega_j^{(2)}) = \omega_j^{(1)}$.

For finite-dimensional systems, this theorem is essentially a consequence of [4, Thm. 6]. We include a detailed proof which also covers infinite-dimensional systems in Appendix C. As an illustration, we consider the question of interconvertibility of two families of qubit states:

Example 5. Consider two collections of qubit states $\rho_\theta^{(i)} \in M_2(\mathbb{C})$, $i = 1, 2$. Then either the Koashi-Imoto decomposition of $\rho_\theta^{(i)}$ has a single direct summand or all states commute. In particular, the two families are interconvertible if and only if they are unitarily equivalent or if all states in each family are identical. The second case occurs if and only if, for each family, the (necessarily single) space \mathcal{K} is two-dimensional so that the \mathcal{J} space is trivial.

One can see from Theorem 4 that a set of states (ρ_θ) is interconvertible with a set of commuting quantum states if and only if the ρ_θ are jointly diagonalizable. In fact, we can even rule out continuous classical systems:

Proposition 6. Let (ρ_θ) be a collection of states on a quantum system S (resp. finite-dimensional quantum system S). The following are equivalent

- (1) The states ρ_θ are pairwise commutative.
- (2) The Koashi-Imoto decomposition of \mathcal{H}_S has one-dimensional \mathcal{J}_j spaces (see Theorem 3).
- (3) (ρ_θ) is interconvertible with a set of commuting states on a quantum system (resp. finite-dimensional quantum system) S .
- (4) (ρ_θ) is interconvertible with a set of states on a (not necessarily discrete) classical system.
- (5) There is an entanglement-breaking channel $T : \mathfrak{S}(S) \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}(S)$ that has every ρ_θ as a fixpoint.

Remark 7. Point (2) implies that for commuting states $(\rho_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ the Koashi-Imoto minimal form $\hat{\rho}_\theta$ of ρ_θ is simply given by the probability distribution $\{p_{j|\theta}\}_{j=1}^N$. See also Appendix B for an explicit discussion of the Koashi-Imoto minimal form for finite-dimensional commuting states.

Proof. (2) \Rightarrow (1) is clear. The converse direction follows because any quantum channel on \mathcal{J}_j that fixes all states $\rho_{j|\theta}$ (for fixed j) must be the identity channel per definition of the spaces \mathcal{J}_j . Since we assume that all the $\rho_{j|\theta}$ commute, this requires $\dim \mathcal{J}_j = 1$. This and Theorem 4 also implies the equivalence of (1) and (2) with (3). The implication (3) \Rightarrow (4) is clear.

(4) \Leftrightarrow (5): The assumption of (4) guarantees that there is a channel $T : \mathfrak{S}(S) \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}(S)$ which has every ρ_θ as a fixed point and factorizes through a classical system. The result now follows from the fact channels factors through a classical system if and only if they are entanglement breaking. A proof for this which allows for continuous classical systems and infinite-dimensional quantum systems is given in [37, Thm. 2] (their assumption that the classical system is a complete separable metric space is not used in the part of the argument proving this claim).

(4) \Rightarrow (2): Let $(p_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ be a collection of states on a classical system described by $L^1(X, \mu)$ which are interconvertible with (ρ_θ) . This means that the two von Neumann algebras with indexed families of states defined as $(\mathcal{M}_1, (\sigma_\theta^{(1)})) := (L^\infty(X, \mu), (p_\theta))$ and $(\mathcal{M}_2, (\sigma_\theta^{(2)})) := (\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S), (\rho_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$ are equivalent, i.e., there exist normal unital completely positive maps $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$ and $\Psi : \mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1$ such that $\sigma_\theta^{(1)} \circ \Psi = \sigma_\theta^{(2)}$ and $\sigma_\theta^{(2)} \circ \Phi = \sigma_\theta^{(1)}$ for all θ . It follows from a recent result in the theory of sufficient subalgebras [38, Thm. 1]

that the minimal sufficient subalgebras of \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 are isomorphic. These subalgebras are

$$\mathcal{N}_i = \bigcap_{\Phi \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{M}_i)} \{x \in \mathcal{M} \mid \Phi(x) = x \text{ holds, if } \sigma_\theta^{(i)} \circ \Phi = \sigma_\theta^{(i)} \forall \theta \in \Theta\}, \quad (17)$$

where $\text{Ch}(\mathcal{M}_i)$ is the set of normal unital completely positive maps $\mathcal{M}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_i$. The restrictions of the $\sigma_\theta^{(2)} = \rho_\theta$ to \mathcal{N}_2 are just the minimal form obtained from the Koashi-Imoto decomposition of ρ_θ , meaning that $\mathcal{N}_2 = \bigoplus_j \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{J}_j)$. On the other hand, \mathcal{N}_1 is commutative since it is a subalgebra of $L^\infty(X, \mu)$. Since $\mathcal{N}_1 \cong \mathcal{N}_2$, all the \mathcal{J}_j spaces must hence be one-dimensional. \square

Proposition 6 can be interpreted as a generalization of the no-teleportation theorem as the latter is recovered if $(\rho_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ is the maximal family containing all states.

Remark 8. In the finite-dimensional case, there is a nice alternative proof of (5) \Rightarrow (3): That T is entanglement breaking implies that its Choi-Jamiolkowski matrix $\rho_T := (\text{id} \otimes T)(|\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|)$ is separable so that we can write $\rho_T = \sum_{i=1}^r p_i \omega_i \otimes \tau_i$. Since T is trace-preserving we have $\sum_{i=1}^r p_i \omega_i = \mathbf{1}/d_S$. Defining the effect operators $E_i = p_i d_S \omega_i^\top$, where \top denotes the transposition induced by the choice of maximally entangled state $|\Omega\rangle$, we find that

$$T(\sigma) = d_S \text{tr}_1[(\sigma^\top \otimes \mathbf{1})\rho_T] = \sum_{i=1}^r \text{tr}[E_i \sigma] \tau_i. \quad (18)$$

Hence T is a measure-and-prepare channel with respect to the POVM $\{E_i\}$ and thus factors through the classical system $X = \{1, \dots, r\}$. In the infinite-dimensional case, a similar argument is possible. Here, one has to replace Ω by a vector state with a faithful marginal. However, this approach is complicated by the fact that separable states, in general, do not admit a countable convex combination into product states but might require an integral instead (see [37]).

Corollary 9. *Let $(\rho_\theta^{(i)})$ be interconvertible collections of states on systems S_i , $i = 1, 2$. If the $\rho_\theta^{(1)}$ commute (e.g., if S_1 is a classical system), the states $\rho_\theta^{(2)}$ commute.*

Remark 10. As positive maps with abelian range or domain are completely positive, Corollary 9 also applies to interconversion via positive instead of completely positive maps.

Proof. Assume that S_1 is a quantum system. By Proposition 6, commutativity of $\rho_\theta^{(1)}$ implies that the spaces $\mathcal{J}_j^{(i)}$ in Theorem 4 are of dimension 1. But said Theorem then implies that the same is true for $\rho_\theta^{(2)}$. Applying Proposition 6 a second time shows the assertion.

Now let S_1 be a classical system and let T, R be interconverting channels. Then $S = T \circ R : \mathfrak{S}(S_2) \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}(S_2)$ is a channel that factors through a classical system which has every $\rho_\theta^{(2)}$ as a fixpoint. The result follows from Proposition 6. \square

Remark 11. For pairs (ρ, σ) of finite-dimensional density matrices Corollary 9 can also be deduced from [39, Thm. 6].

3 Dichotomies: Sufficient families of Rényi divergences

For this section, we restrict to interconvertibility in the case of $|\Theta| = 2$. That is we consider two *dichotomies* (ρ_i, σ_i) , $i = 1, 2$, of states and ask whether there exist channels T and R mapping between the two systems such that

$$\begin{aligned} T(\rho_1) &= \rho_2, & R(\rho_2) &= \rho_1, \\ T(\sigma_1) &= \sigma_2, & R(\sigma_2) &= \sigma_1. \end{aligned}$$

We are interested in examining the connection of this problem to suitable families of (quantum) Rényi divergences. For this reason, we will always make the following assumption when talking about dichotomies:

Assumption. *In the main text, we only consider dichotomies (ρ, σ) with $\rho \ll \sigma$. For quantum states, this means that $\text{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \text{supp}(\sigma)$ while it means that ρ is absolutely continuous with respect to σ (in the sense of measures) for classical systems. The classical case is treated without the assumption on absolute continuity in Appendix A.*

Here, a family of Rényi divergences means functions $\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma)$ defined for pairs of states with $\text{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \text{supp}(\sigma)$ and certain values of α and which satisfies certain axioms [30, Sec. 4.2]. For us, the most important properties a family of Rényi divergences has to satisfy are the *data processing inequality*,

$$\mathbb{D}_\alpha(T(\rho), T(\sigma)) \leq \mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma), \quad (19)$$

which should hold on a subset $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}$ (independent of (ρ, σ)), and the property that for commuting states one recovers the classical Rényi divergences, i.e., if $\rho = \sum p_i |i\rangle\langle i|$, $\sigma_i = \sum q_i |i\rangle\langle i|$ then $\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma) = D_\alpha(p, q)$, where

$$D_\alpha(p, q) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \sum p_i^\alpha q_i^{1-\alpha}. \quad (20)$$

Definition 12. *Let \mathbb{D}_α be a family of Rényi divergences that fulfills data-processing for a subset $\Lambda \subseteq [0, \infty)$. We say that the family \mathbb{D}_α is **sufficient** if the following holds: Let (ρ_1, σ_1) and (ρ_2, σ_2) be dichotomies on systems S_1 and S_2 such that $\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho_i, \sigma_i)$ is finite for all α in an open subset interval $(a, b) \subset \Lambda$. Then, the dichotomies are interconvertible if and only if all their Rényi divergences are equal:*

$$(\rho_1, \sigma_1) \leftrightarrow (\rho_2, \sigma_2) \iff \mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = \mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho_2, \sigma_2) \quad \forall \alpha \in (a, b) \subset \Lambda.$$

In the following, we explore the notion of sufficiency of Rényi divergences in the classical and in the quantum case.

3.1 The classical case

For classical systems, there is a unique family of Rényi divergences given by

$$D_\alpha(p, q) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \int_X \left(\frac{dp}{dq} \right)^\alpha dq \quad \text{if } p \ll q. \quad (21)$$

where p, q are both probability measures on a space X . As already stated, the conjecture is true for dichotomies on (possibly continuous) classical systems, which we will prove in this

section. Recall that by $L^1(X, \mu)$, we denote the μ -absolutely continuous measures as well as their μ -densities at the same time.

We briefly comment on the existence of the Rényi divergences for continuous distributions. As the integrand in Eq. (21) is positive, the Rényi divergences $D_\alpha(p, q)$ make sense in $[0, \infty]$ for all $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$ if $p \ll q$. In the limit $\alpha \rightarrow 1$, the Rényi divergence agrees with the relative entropy (or Kullback-Leibler divergence) $\int \log(\frac{dp}{dq}) dp$. In the following, we use the notation

$$Q_\alpha(p, q) = e^{(\alpha-1)D_\alpha(p, q)} = \int \left(\frac{dp}{dq}\right)^\alpha dq. \quad (22)$$

These quantities also make sense for all $\alpha < 0$ (but may be infinite) if we define $(\frac{dp}{dq})^\alpha$ as the *pseudo-inverse*. If one has $p \ll q$ and $q \ll p$ then it follows that $(\frac{dp}{dq})^{-\alpha} = (\frac{dq}{dp})^\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. In this case it holds that $Q_\alpha(p, q) = Q_{1-\alpha}(q, p)$ and $D_\alpha(p, q) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} D_{1-\alpha}(q, p)$.

Theorem 13. *Let (X, μ) be a probability space and let $p \ll q$ be probability distributions in $L^1(X, \mu)$. Then there is a Borel probability measure \tilde{q} on $(-\infty, \infty]$ such that*

$$D_\alpha(p, q) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \int_{(-\infty, \infty]} e^{-t\alpha} d\tilde{q}(t) \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (23)$$

where both sides of the equality may be infinite. It follows that $\tilde{p} := e^{-t} \tilde{q} \ll \tilde{q}$ is a probability measure and that $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) \leftrightarrow (p, q)$ where the second dichotomy is viewed in $L^1((-\infty, \infty], \tilde{q})$. If the Rényi divergences $D_\alpha(p, q)$ exist for an open set of $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, then \tilde{q} and, hence, \tilde{p} are uniquely determined by (23).

With this we obtain that the Rényi divergences are sufficient for classical systems:

Theorem 14 (Sufficiency of Rényi divergences). *Let (X_i, μ_i) , $i = 1, 2$, be σ -finite measure spaces and $p_i \ll q_i$ probability measures in $L^1(X_i, \mu_i)$. If there is an open interval $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$D_\alpha(p_1, q_1) = D_\alpha(p_2, q_2) < \infty \quad \forall \alpha \in (a, b), \quad (24)$$

there are stochastic maps between $L^1(X_1, \mu_1)$ and $L^1(X_2, \mu_2)$ interconverting the dichotomies (p_1, q_1) and (p_2, q_2) .

Proof. From Theorem 13 we get two dichotomies $(\tilde{p}_i, \tilde{q}_i)$ on $(-\infty, \infty]$. From the assumption that the Rényi divergences exist (i.e. are finite) on an open set of $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and the uniqueness statement in Theorem 13 we obtain $(\tilde{p}_1, \tilde{q}_1) = (\tilde{p}_2, \tilde{q}_2)$ and hence $(p_1, q_1) \leftrightarrow (\tilde{p}_1, \tilde{q}_1) = (\tilde{p}_2, \tilde{q}_2) \leftrightarrow (p_2, q_2)$. \square

For finite-dimensional classical systems, this can be reformulated as:

Corollary 15. *Let $\mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{q}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, $i = 1, 2$, be probability vectors (with $\mathbf{p}_i \ll \mathbf{q}_i$). Then there are stochastic matrices $T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_1}$ so that $T\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_2$, $T\mathbf{q}_1 = \mathbf{q}_2$, $R\mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_1$ and $R\mathbf{q}_2 = \mathbf{q}_1$ if and only if $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) = D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ for an open set of α .*

In Appendix B, we discuss the setting of probability vectors in detail and show how to construct the matrices T and R explicitly.

Lemma 16. *A dichotomy (p, q) in $L^1(X, \mu)$ is interconvertible with the same dichotomy viewed as an element of $L^1(X, \nu)$ and both have the same Rényi divergences.*

Proof. To see the claim we consider the stochastic map $T : L^1(X, q) \rightarrow L^1(X, \mu)$ defined by multiplication with the Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{dq}{d\mu}$. This map takes $\frac{dp}{dq} \equiv p \in L^1(X, q)$ to $\frac{dp}{d\mu} \equiv p \in L^1(X, \mu)$ and $1 \equiv q$ to $\frac{dq}{d\mu} \equiv q$. A stochastic map in the other direction is given by multiplication with the pseudo-inverse $(\frac{dq}{d\mu})^{-1}$. This shows that the dichotomies (p, q) viewed as elements of these two different L^1 spaces are interconvertible. It is also clear that the Rényi divergence is the same for both L^1 -spaces. \square

Lemma 17. *Let μ_1, μ_2 be finite Borel measures on \mathbb{R} . If there are $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$ so that*

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha t} d\mu_1(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha t} d\mu_2(t) < \infty \quad \forall \alpha \in (a, b), \quad (25)$$

then $\mu_1 = \mu_2$.

Proof. Set $\mu = \mu_1 - \mu_2$. For $\alpha \in (a, b)$ the function $t \mapsto e^{-\alpha t}$ is in $L^1(\mathbb{R}, |\mu|)$ (because $|\mu| \leq \mu_1 + \mu_2$). The same holds for complex α if $a < \operatorname{Re}(\alpha) < b$. The Laplace transform $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha t} d\mu(t)$ is analytic in the strip with real part in (a, b) and, by assumption, equal to zero on this strip. Pick $c \in (a, b)$ and consider the finite Borel measure $\nu = e^{-ct} d\mu(t)$ whose Fourier transform is $\hat{\nu}(\xi) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-(c+i\xi)t} d\mu(t)$ and hence vanishes for all ξ . Injectivity of the Fourier transform implies $\nu = 0$ and hence $\mu_1 = \mu_2$. \square

This Lemma is an injectivity statement for the two-sided Laplace transform. While this is surely known, we could not find this precise statement in the literature.

For the proof of Theorem 13, we need the concept of the *push-forward measure* from measure theory [40]. Let X_1 and X_2 be measurable spaces, and let $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ be a measurable function. If q is a measure of X_1 , then the push-forward measure $f_*(q)$ is defined by $f_*(q)(A) = q(f^{-1}(A))$. One has $g \in L^1(X_2, f_*(q))$ if and only if $g \circ f \in L^1(X_1, q)$. In this case it holds that

$$\int_{X_2} g df_*(q) = \int_{X_1} g \circ f dq. \quad (26)$$

Proof of Theorem 13. By Lemma 16 we may assume $(X, \mu) = (X, q)$. Set $f = -\log(\frac{dp}{dq}) : X \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$. Define $\tilde{q} := f_*(q)$ as the push-forward measure of q under f . Then (23) follows from (26):

$$Q_\alpha(p, q) = \int_X \left(\frac{dp}{dq}\right)^\alpha dq = \int_X e^{-\alpha f(dp/dq)} dq = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha t} d\tilde{q}(t) \quad (27)$$

We now show that (p, q) and (\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) are interconvertible. We may consider the push-forward as a stochastic map $f_* : L^1(X, q) \rightarrow L^1((-\infty, \infty], \tilde{q})$. This definition makes use of the fact that all elements in $L^1(X, q)$ may be regarded as measures on X (which are absolutely continuous with respect to q).⁴ Then $\tilde{p} = e^{-t} \tilde{q}$ is equal to $f_*(p)$ because

$$f_*(p)(A) = p(f^{-1}(A)) = \int_{f^{-1}(A)} \frac{dp}{dq} dq = \int_{f^{-1}(A)} e^{-f} dq = \int_A e^{-t} d\tilde{q}(t) = \tilde{p}(A) \quad (28)$$

for all Borel measurable $A \subset \mathbb{R}$. We now define a stochastic map $R : L^1((-\infty, \infty], \tilde{q}) \rightarrow L^1(X, q)$ as $g \mapsto R(g) = g \circ f$. This definition uses that elements of L^1 spaces are essentially

⁴The proper definition in terms of densities is $f_* : L^1(X, q) \ni g \mapsto \frac{df_*(gq)}{d\tilde{q}} \in L^1((-\infty, \infty], \tilde{q})$.

functions (in contrast to the other definitions where we viewed them as measures). From the definition, it is clear that R preserves positivity and that $R(g)$ is always measurable. Since $\tilde{q} = f_*(q)$, R satisfies $\int R(g) dq = \int g d\tilde{q}$ and hence maps probability densities to probability densities (therefore, R is indeed a stochastic map). It remains to be shown that R maps the dichotomy (\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) to (p, q) . In terms of densities this means that $R(t \mapsto e^{-t}) = \frac{dp}{dq}$ and $R1 = 1$ q -almost everywhere. The latter is clear and we check the former:

$$\int_A R(t \mapsto e^{-t}) dq = \int_A e^{-f(x)} dq(x) = \int_A \frac{dp}{dq} dq = p(A). \quad (29)$$

□

3.2 Quantum case: Insufficiency of known quantum Rényi divergences

We now turn to the quantum case. Let us start by providing examples of quantum Rényi divergences. The most well-known families are:

1. The *Petz quantum Rényi divergence*, defined as

$$D_\alpha^P(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \operatorname{tr}[\rho^\alpha \sigma^{1-\alpha}], \quad (30)$$

where $\sigma^{1-\alpha}$ denotes the *pseudo-inverse* of σ . D_α^P satisfies the DPI on $\Lambda = [0, 2]$ [30, Sec. 4.4], see also Appendix D.

2. The *minimal quantum Rényi divergence* (or sandwiched Rényi divergence) given by

$$D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \operatorname{tr}[(\sigma^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}})^\alpha] =: \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log Q_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma), \quad (31)$$

which satisfies the DPI on $\Lambda = [\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$ [30, Sec. 4.3][39]. The name is referring to the fact that among all families of additive Rényi divergences, the minimal quantum Rényi divergence is the smallest [30, Sec. 4.2].

3. The maximal quantum Rényi divergence

$$D_\alpha^{\max}(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \operatorname{tr}[\sigma(\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}})^\alpha]. \quad (32)$$

It satisfies the DPI on $\Lambda = [0, 2]$ (and is also only maximal on this region) [23, Thm. 4.4], [30, Sec. 4.2.3], see also Appendix D.

All three divergences are additive. Furthermore D_α^{\min} and D_α^P coincide in the limits $\alpha \rightarrow 1, \infty$ (if the limits exist) [30]:

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} D_\alpha^P(\rho, \sigma) =: D_\infty(\rho, \sigma) \quad (33)$$

and

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} D_\alpha^P(\rho, \sigma) = D(\rho, \sigma). \quad (34)$$

The *quantum max-divergence* $D_\infty(\rho, \sigma)$ can be defined as $D_\infty(\rho, \sigma) = \inf\{\lambda : \rho \leq \exp(\lambda)\sigma\}$. In contrast to the minimal and Petz quantum Rényi divergences, the maximal quantum Rényi divergence has the limit [30]

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} D_\alpha^{\max}(\rho, \sigma) = \text{tr}[\rho \log(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma^{-1} \rho^{\frac{1}{2}})] =: D^{\text{BS}}(\rho, \sigma), \quad (35)$$

where $D^{\text{BS}}(\rho, \sigma)$ is known as Belavkin-Staszewski relative entropy [41]. It fulfills $D(\rho, \sigma) \leq D^{\text{BS}}(\rho, \sigma)$ with equality if and only if the density matrices commute [23].

Apart from the given examples, a variety of quantum Rényi divergences has been defined in the literature. In Appendix E, we provide an overview of those quantum Rényi divergences known to us and summarize their most important properties.

Since quantum Rényi divergences fulfill the data-processing inequality, they must be invariant under unitary transformations. Importantly, the known Rényi divergences (that we discuss in Appendix E) are also invariant under conjugation by an anti-unitary operator:

$$\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma) = \mathbb{D}_\alpha(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\sigma}) = \mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho^\top, \sigma^\top), \quad (36)$$

where \bar{A} and A^\top denote complex conjugation and transposition of an operator A , respectively, with respect to some chosen basis. The reason for this is that all of the given divergences are constructed as (optimizations over) traces of matrix functions of ρ and σ . This property is, therefore, closely related to the fact that one can actually compute the Rényi divergences.

Lemma 18. *Let \mathbb{D}_α be a quantum Rényi divergence that is anti-unitarily invariant. Then \mathbb{D}_α is not sufficient.*

Proof. Consider a dichotomy (ρ, σ) that is *irreducible*, meaning that any operator A for which $[\rho, A] = [\sigma, A] = 0$ must be proportional to the identity. (Equivalently, consider a single block in the Koashi-Imoto minimal form.) By anti-unitary invariance we have $\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma) = \mathbb{D}_\alpha(\bar{\rho}, \sigma)$, where complex conjugation is with respect to the eigenbasis of σ . If \mathbb{D}_α was sufficient, Theorem 4 would imply that there exists a unitary U such that

$$U\rho U^* = \bar{\rho}, \quad U\sigma U^* = \sigma. \quad (37)$$

However, in general, such unitaries do not exist. As an example, consider

$$\rho = \frac{1}{6} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & i & i \\ -i & 2 & i \\ -i & -i & 2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (38)$$

in the eigenbasis of σ and assume all eigenspaces of σ are 1-dimensional. Then $U = \text{diag}(e^{i\phi_1}, e^{i\phi_2}, e^{i\phi_3})$, but $U\rho U^* = \bar{\rho}$ requires

$$e^{i(\phi_1 - \phi_2)} = -1, \quad e^{i(\phi_1 - \phi_3)} = -1, \quad e^{i(\phi_2 - \phi_3)} = -1, \quad (39)$$

which is a contradiction since the first two equations imply $e^{i(\phi_2 - \phi_3)} = +1$. \square

Corollary 19. *None of the known families of quantum Rényi divergence presented in Appendix E is sufficient. Moreover, the whole collection of quantum Rényi divergences taken together is also not sufficient.*

3.3 Sufficiency and positive maps: A conjecture

As we saw above, there is a simple way to show that a given quantum Rényi divergence is not sufficient: Just check if it is invariant under complex conjugation. This test rules out all of the commonly employed quantum Rényi divergences. Complex conjugation is a particular example of positive, trace-preserving maps and any such map maps quantum states to quantum states. This suggests broadening the perspective and discussing interconvertibility with respect to positive maps instead of completely positive maps. In the following, we therefore write

$$(\rho_1, \sigma_1) \longleftrightarrow_P (\rho_2, \sigma_2) \quad (40)$$

if the two dichotomies can be interconverted using positive trace-preserving maps T, R . This generalization, in fact, matches well with the reason why we use completely positive maps to describe quantum processes in the first place: They are required due to the possible presence of entanglement. However, a dichotomy (ρ, σ) does not contain any information about how the given system may be correlated to another systems.

Interestingly, several of the known quantum Rényi divergences are known to be monotonic under positive trace-preserving maps, at least for certain ranges of their parameters. This includes the Petz Rényi divergences, the maximal quantum Rényi divergences as well as the minimal quantum Rényi divergences. We now explore sufficiency of Rényi divergences with respect to interconversion by positive maps.

Let us first observe that the Koashi-Imoto minimal form is not the right minimal form for positive instead of completely positive maps. Consider again the dichotomy (ρ, σ) from the proof of Lemma 18. Then we find

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\rho \oplus \frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho}, \frac{1}{2}\sigma \oplus \frac{1}{2}\bar{\sigma} \right) \longleftrightarrow_P \left(\frac{1}{2}\rho \oplus \frac{1}{2}\rho, \frac{1}{2}\sigma \oplus \frac{1}{2}\sigma \right) \simeq (\rho \otimes \mathbf{1}/2, \sigma \otimes \mathbf{1}/2) \longleftrightarrow (\rho, \sigma).$$

This provides an example where positive maps allow to interconvert a minimal form with two blocks to a minimal form with one block. It is an open problem to find a suitable minimal form for positive maps.⁵

In the following, we say that a quantum Rényi divergence \mathbb{D}_α can be *classically simulated* if for every dichotomy (ρ, σ) there exists classical dichotomy (p, q) such that

$$\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma) = D_\alpha(p, q) \quad \forall \alpha \in \Lambda. \quad (41)$$

Lemma 20 ([23], see also Appendix D). *Both the Petz and the maximal quantum Rényi divergences can be classically simulated.*

For the case of the Petz Rényi divergences, the associated classical dichotomies are known as *Nussbaum-Szkoła distributions* [31]. Recall from Corollary 9 and Remark 10 that non-commuting dichotomies cannot be interconverted with classical dichotomies using positive maps. We thus find:

Corollary 21. *Neither the Petz quantum Rényi divergences nor the maximal Rényi divergence are sufficient.*

⁵We suspect that the right minimal form arises from the Koashi-Imoto minimal form by mapping all unitary or anti-unitary equivalent blocks to a single block, but leave it to future work to settle this question.

In fact, both families arise in the context of *quantum f -divergences* [23], all of which can be classically simulated and hence are not sufficient, see Appendix D. To our knowledge, no other quantum Rényi divergence is known to be classically simulable.

In particular, for $\alpha \in [1/2, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ we have $D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) \leq D_\alpha^{\text{P}}(\rho, \sigma)$ with equality if and only if $[\rho, \sigma] = 0$ (as seen above, the two quantities coincide for arbitrary dichotomies in the limits $\alpha \rightarrow 1, \infty$). This follows from the Araki-Lieb-Thirring inequality [42, 43] and its equality conditions [44], see also [45, 46]. Since we cannot use the Nussbaum-Szkoła distributions to show an analogous statement for D_α^{\min} , this family might, therefore, still be sufficient. We will see below that D_α^{\min} is not classically simulable by constructing a restricted class of non-commuting states for which there cannot exist any (sufficiently regular) probability measure with matching Rényi divergences. This leads us to our conjecture:

Conjecture 22. *Let (ρ_1, σ_1) and (ρ_2, σ_2) be pairs of density operators on quantum system S_1 and S_2 . Let (a, b) , $\frac{1}{2} \leq a < b$, be any interval on which the minimal quantum Rényi divergences of both dichotomies are finite. Then the dichotomies are interconvertible via positive, trace-preserving maps if and only if they have the same minimal quantum Rényi divergences on this interval, i.e.,*

$$(\rho_1, \sigma_1) \leftrightarrow (\rho_2, \sigma_2) \iff D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho_2, \sigma_2) < \infty \quad \forall \alpha \in (a, b). \quad (42)$$

As in the classical case, a positive resolution of the conjecture directly implies a corresponding no-go result for catalysis, because D_α^{\min} is additive over tensor products:

Corollary 23 (No catalysis). *If Conjecture 22 is true and $D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho_1 \otimes \omega, \sigma_1 \otimes \chi) < \infty$ for $\alpha \in (a, b)$,*

$$(\rho_1 \otimes \omega, \sigma_1 \otimes \chi) \longleftrightarrow_P (\rho_2 \otimes \omega, \sigma_2 \otimes \chi) \implies (\rho_1, \sigma_1) \longleftrightarrow_P (\rho_2, \sigma_2). \quad (43)$$

The no catalysis corollary offers a way to falsify our conjecture: It is sufficient to find a single non-trivial example of catalysis for interconvertibility via positive maps to rule out sufficiency for any additive divergence. On the other hand, we believe that it may be possible to prove a no-go result for catalysis in the quantum case without first proving Conjecture 22, possibly by making use of the normal form for interconvertible dichotomies, see Section 2. Such a result would certainly constitute evidence in favor of our conjecture. However, we have not been able to prove such a result. In fact, even in the classical case, we are not aware of a proof that does not already also essentially imply the sufficiency of Rényi divergences. We therefore leave it as an open problem to prove that there is no catalysis for the interconvertibility of quantum dichotomies via positive maps.

We also leave as an open problem to find a way to create numerical examples of dichotomies (ρ_1, σ_1) and (ρ_2, σ_2) for which $D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho_2, \sigma_2)$ for all $\alpha \in \Lambda$, but for which one does not know a priori that $(\rho_1, \sigma_1) \leftrightarrow_P (\rho_2, \sigma_2)$.

In general $D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) \neq D_\alpha^{\min}(\sigma, \rho)$. We have stated the conjecture with only one ordering of the states in the Rényi divergences, as this is sufficient in the classical case. Indeed, for commuting states, we have

$$D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} D_{1-\alpha}^{\min}(\sigma, \rho) \quad (44)$$

if $\rho \ll \sigma \ll \rho$. Therefore, as long as the Rényi divergence is finite for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, it is not necessary to consider both orderings explicitly. It can be shown that this relation holds *if and only if* $[\rho, \sigma] = 0$ using the Araki-Lieb-Thirring inequality and its equality condition.

In particular, if one demands $D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho_2, \sigma_2)$ and $D_\alpha^{\min}(\sigma_1, \rho_1) = D_\alpha^{\min}(\sigma_2, \rho_2)$, then $[\rho_1, \sigma_1] = 0$ implies $[\rho_2, \sigma_2] = 0$. We prove a (much) weaker statement of this form, see Lemma 26 below. This may indicate that the corresponding quantum result requires a condition about equality of Rényi divergences with respect to both orderings.

We will now present affirmative results to weaker statements supporting the idea that Conjecture 22 should be true. We say that the conjecture holds for two pairs of states (or for a certain class of pairs of states) if (42) holds for these states. As a corollary of the complete solution for the classical case, we get:

Lemma 24. *The conjecture holds for commuting pairs of states.*

Under the additional assumption that one state is pure, the conjecture is true:

Lemma 25. *The conjecture is true for pairs (ρ_1, σ_1) and (ρ_2, σ_2) of density operators if the $\rho_i = |\psi^{(i)}\rangle\langle\psi^{(i)}|$ are pure states.*

Lemma 26. *Let (ρ_1, σ_1) and (ρ_2, σ_2) be pairs of density operators with equal minimal quantum Rényi divergences on finite-dimensional quantum systems. If (ρ_1, σ_1) commute and ρ_2 is pure, the conjecture is true.*

Remark 27. We comment on the implications of Lemmas 25 and 26: One should take Lemma 25 with a grain of salt as it is also true for the Petz quantum Rényi divergences (with a similar proof). Lemma 26 however is false for the Petz quantum Rényi divergence (and by the same argument also for D_α^{\max}). This is a consequence of the existence of the Nussbaum-Skoła distributions P and Q as defined in Appendix D. As noted before (see Corollary 21 and after), their Petz quantum Rényi divergences coincide with those of (ρ, σ) but they cannot be interconvertible. Since for non-commuting ρ and σ the distribution P is never pure and $D_\alpha^P(\rho, \sigma) > D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma)$ this is not in conflict with the validity of Lemma 25 for D_α^P nor with Lemma 26.

Remark 28 (α - z Rényi divergences). The α - z quantum Rényi divergence generalizes the minimal and Petz quantum Rényi divergences, see Appendix E. If we formulate the conjecture in terms of the α - z Rényi divergence instead of D_α^{\min} we obtain a stronger statement than Lemma 26: Suppose that $D_{\alpha,z}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = D_{\alpha,z}(\rho_2, \sigma_2)$ for the values $(\alpha, z) = (\alpha^*, \alpha^*)$ and $(\alpha, z) = (\alpha^*, 1)$ with $\alpha^* \in [1/2, 1)$ and moreover $[\rho_1, \sigma_1] = 0$. Then we can deduce already that $[\rho_2, \sigma_2] = 0$ even if ρ_2 is not pure. To see this, note that (since $[\rho_1, \sigma_1] = 0$)

$$D_{\alpha,z}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = D_\alpha^P(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) \quad (45)$$

and $D_{\alpha,\alpha}(\rho_2, \sigma_2) = D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho_2, \sigma_2)$, $D_{\alpha,1}(\rho_2, \sigma_2) = D_\alpha^P(\rho_2, \sigma_2)$. Therefore

$$D_{\alpha^*}^P(\rho_2, \sigma_2) = D_{\alpha^*}^P(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = D_{\alpha^*}^{\min}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = D_{\alpha^*}^{\min}(\rho_2, \sigma_2), \quad (46)$$

which is only possible if $[\rho_2, \sigma_2] = 0$. It is therefore conceivable that Conjecture 22 is true for the α - z quantum Rényi divergence but not for the minimal quantum Rényi divergence.

Lemmas 25 and 26 both deal with a dichotomy (ρ, σ) where ρ is pure. Let us, therefore, first evaluate the minimal quantum Rényi divergence for this special case. It is useful to define the quantity

$$Q_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) = \text{tr}\left[\left(\sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \rho \sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}}\right)^\alpha\right] = \text{tr}\left[\left(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^\alpha\right], \quad (47)$$

so that $D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) = (\alpha - 1)^{-1} \log Q_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma)$. The second equality is seen as follows: Set $A = \sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \rho^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and use that the singular value decomposition implies $\text{tr}[(A^*A)^\alpha] = \text{tr}[(AA^*)^\alpha]$. If $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is pure and $\sigma = \sum v_i P_i$ is its spectral resolution, then

$$Q_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) = \langle \psi, \sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \psi \rangle^\alpha = \left(\sum u_i v_i^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \right)^\alpha = \left(\sum \frac{u_i}{v_i} v_i^{1/\alpha} \right)^\alpha, \quad (48)$$

where we used the shorthand $p_i = \langle \psi, P_i \psi \rangle$.

Proof of Lemma 25. For $j = 1, 2$, let $\rho_j = |\psi^{(j)}\rangle\langle\psi^{(j)}|$ with $|\psi^{(j)}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_j$ and let

$$\sigma_j = \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} v_i^{(j)} P_i^{(j)} \quad (49)$$

with $P_i^{(j)}$ being the spectral projectors of σ_j and $\{v_i^{(j)}\}_{i=1}^{n_j}$ the spectrum of σ_j . Note that n_j counts the number of distinct eigenvalues of the state σ_j and not the dimension of \mathcal{H}_j . We further define the sub-normalized vectors $|\psi_i^{(j)}\rangle = P_i^{(j)} |\psi^{(j)}\rangle$ with associated norms

$$u_i^{(j)} = \||\psi_i^{(j)}\rangle\|^2 = \langle \psi^{(j)} | P_i^{(j)} | \psi^{(j)} \rangle. \quad (50)$$

Finally, denote by $R^{(j)}$ the orthonormal projectors onto $\text{span}\{|\psi_i^{(j)}\rangle\}_{i=1}^{n_j}$. By construction we have $[R^{(j)}, \sigma^{(j)}] = 0$ and $R^{(j)} |\psi^{(j)}\rangle = |\psi^{(j)}\rangle$. Now let $D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho_2, \sigma_2)$ for all α in some open subset of $(1, \infty)$. Using (48) we obtain

$$\sum_i \left(\frac{u_i^{(1)}}{v_i^{(1)}} \right) q_i^{(1)\frac{1}{\alpha}} = \sum_i \left(\frac{u_i^{(2)}}{v_i^{(2)}} \right) v_i^{(2)\frac{1}{\alpha}} \quad (51)$$

on some non-empty open interval of $(1, \infty)$. Both sides are analytic in α and can be analytically continued to all $\alpha > 0$. The equality then extends to all $\alpha > 0$. Substituting $1/\alpha \mapsto \alpha$, we get for all $\alpha > 0$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \left(\frac{u_i^{(1)}}{v_i^{(1)}} \right) v_i^{(1)\alpha} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \left(\frac{u_i^{(2)}}{v_i^{(2)}} \right) v_i^{(2)\alpha}. \quad (52)$$

Since exponential functions $x \mapsto \exp(ax)$ with distinct a are linearly independent and the $v_i^{(j)}$ are distinct for fixed j , we find that $n_1 = n_2$ and that there exists a permutation π such that:

$$v_j^{(2)} = v_{\pi(j)}^{(1)}, \quad u_j^{(2)} = u_{\pi(j)}^{(1)}. \quad (53)$$

From now on, we relabel the indices so that $\pi = \text{id}$. By construction we have

$$R^{(1)} \sigma_1 = \sum_j \frac{v_j^{(1)}}{u_j^{(1)}} |\psi_j^{(1)}\rangle\langle\psi_j^{(1)}|, \quad R^{(2)} \sigma_2 = \sum_j \frac{v_j^{(2)}}{u_j^{(2)}} |\psi_j^{(2)}\rangle\langle\psi_j^{(2)}|. \quad (54)$$

Eqs. (50) and (53) imply that there exists a unitary operator $U : R^{(1)}\mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow R^{(2)}\mathcal{H}_2$ such that

$$U |\psi^{(1)}\rangle = |\psi^{(2)}\rangle, \quad UR^{(1)} \sigma_1 R^{(1)} U^* = R^{(2)} \sigma_2 R^{(2)}. \quad (55)$$

Furthermore

$$\mathrm{tr}[(\mathbf{1} - R^{(1)})\sigma_1] = 1 - \sum_j v_j^{(1)} = 1 - \sum_j v_j^{(2)} = \mathrm{tr}[(\mathbf{1} - R^{(2)})\sigma_2]. \quad (56)$$

Hence there exist trace-preserving completely positive maps $\tilde{T} : \mathcal{T}((\mathbf{1} - R^{(1)})\mathcal{H}_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}((\mathbf{1} - R^{(2)})\mathcal{H}_2)$ and $\tilde{S} : \mathcal{T}((\mathbf{1} - R^{(2)})\mathcal{H}_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}((\mathbf{1} - R^{(1)})\mathcal{H}_1)$ such that

$$\tilde{T}((\mathbf{1} - R^{(1)})\sigma_1) = (\mathbf{1} - R^{(2)})\sigma_2 \quad (57)$$

$$\tilde{S}((\mathbf{1} - R^{(2)})\sigma_2) = (\mathbf{1} - R^{(1)})\sigma_1. \quad (58)$$

We can hence define the quantum channels $T : \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ and $S : \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ by

$$T(\tau) := UR^{(1)}\tau R^{(1)}U^* + \tilde{T}((\mathbf{1} - R^{(1)})\tau(\mathbf{1} - R^{(1)})) \quad (59)$$

$$S(\varphi) := U^*R^{(2)}\varphi R^{(2)}U + \tilde{S}((\mathbf{1} - R^{(2)})\varphi(\mathbf{1} - R^{(2)})), \quad (60)$$

which fulfill

$$T(\rho_1) = \rho_2, \quad S(\rho_2) = \rho_1, \quad T(\sigma_1) = \sigma_2, \quad S(\sigma_2) = \sigma_1. \quad (61)$$

□

Remark 29. The above proof of Lemma 25 can also be carried out if \mathcal{H}_j are infinite-dimensional provided that $D_\alpha(\rho_j, \sigma_j)$ are finite for all $\alpha > 1$. This is not always the case. To see this, first note that any two discrete probability distributions $u, v \in \ell^1$ with $u \ll v$ may arise from a suitable pure state $|\psi\rangle$ and mixed state σ as in (48). For example, consider

$$u_i = \frac{6}{\pi^2} \frac{1}{i^2}, \quad v_i = \frac{1}{\zeta(2+s)} \frac{1}{i^{2+s}}, \quad (62)$$

where ζ is the Riemann-Zeta function. Then

$$D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) = \log(\zeta(2+s)) + \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log\left(\frac{6}{\pi^2} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i^{-\frac{2+s-\alpha s}{\alpha}}\right), \quad (63)$$

which diverges for $\alpha \geq \frac{2+s}{1+s}$. Incidentally, the Petz quantum Rényi divergence, in this case, is given by

$$D_\alpha^P(\rho, \sigma) = \log(\zeta(2+s)) + \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log\left(\frac{6}{\pi^2} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i^{-(2+(1-\alpha)(2+s))}\right), \quad (64)$$

which converges if and only if $\alpha < \frac{3+s}{2+s}$. Thus, for $\alpha \in (\frac{3+s}{2+s}, \frac{2+s}{1+s})$ the Petz quantum Rényi divergence is infinite while the minimal quantum Rényi divergence is finite, showing that their difference is in general unbounded.

Lemma 26 will follow from the following more general statement:

Lemma 30. *Let $\rho \ll \sigma$ be finite-dimensional quantum states with ρ being pure and $[\rho, \sigma] \neq 0$. Then there is no classical system with probability distributions $p \ll q$ and $(\frac{dp}{dq})^{\pm 1} \in L^\infty(q)$ (pseudo-inverse!) with $D_\alpha(p, q) = D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma)$.*

For the proof of Lemma 30 we use the following argument: The function $Q_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma)$ can be extended to a meromorphic function on \mathbb{C} , which has an essential singularity at the origin if and only if ρ and σ do not commute. The assumption that the Radon-Nikodym derivative is essentially bounded from above and below will, however, imply that $Q_\alpha(p, q)$ is holomorphic in the origin. This shows that ρ and σ commute so that interconvertibility follows from Lemma 24.

Proof. That $Q_\alpha(\rho, \sigma)$ indeed extends to a meromorphic function is seen from Eq. (48). Also note that ρ and σ commute if and only if exactly one of the u_i 's is equal to one (so that the others are zero by (49)). This is, in turn, equivalent to $Q_\alpha(\rho, \sigma)$ being proportional to an exponential function. The limits of $Q_\alpha(\rho, \sigma)$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0^\pm$ are

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0^\pm} \left(\sum \frac{u_i}{v_i} v_i^{1/\alpha} \right)^\alpha = v_\pm \cdot \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0^\pm} \left(\sum \frac{u_i}{v_i} \left(\frac{v_i}{v_\pm} \right)^{1/\alpha} \right)^\alpha = v_\pm, \quad (65)$$

where v_+ is the largest and v_- is the smallest number among the v_i (i.e. the maximal, resp. minimal, eigenvalue of σ). Therefore, $Q_\alpha(\rho, \sigma)$ has an essential singularity at the origin if $v_+ > v_-$ which is equivalent to non-commutativity of ρ and σ . In the commuting case $Q_\alpha(\rho, \sigma)$ is an entire function and has no singularity. Therefore, having the essential singularity at the origin is indeed equivalent to commutativity of ρ and σ .

Now let $p \ll q$ be probability distributions on a σ -finite measure space such that $(\frac{dp}{dq})^{\pm 1} \in L^\infty(q)$. We will show that $Q_\alpha(p, q)$ has an analytic extension to all of \mathbb{C} . This holomorphic extension is defined by allowing complex α in the definition $Q_\alpha(p, q) = \int (\frac{dp}{dq})^\alpha dq$. These integrals exist in L^1 for all complex $\alpha = \pm a + ib$, $a > 0$, $b \in \mathbb{R}$, because $\int |(\frac{dp}{dq})^\alpha| dq = \int |\frac{dp}{dq}|^{\pm a} dq \leq \|(\frac{dp}{dq})^{\pm 1}\|_{L^\infty(q)}^a < \infty$. \square

3.4 Complete monotonicity

A non-constant smooth function $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called *completely monotone*, if

$$(-1)^n \frac{d^n}{d\alpha^n} f(\alpha) > 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (66)$$

Bernstein's theorem [47] states that completely monotone functions are precisely the Laplace transforms of positive Borel measures μ on $[0, \infty)$, i.e.,

$$f(\alpha) = \int_0^\infty e^{-t\alpha} d\mu(t), \quad \alpha > 0. \quad (67)$$

One has $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0^+} f(\alpha) = \mu(\{0\})$ and this limit exists in $(0, \infty]$. Note that multiplying f by an exponential corresponds to a shift of the measure μ : $f(\alpha)e^{s\alpha} = \int_0^\infty e^{-(t-s)\alpha} d\mu(t) = \int_0^\infty e^{-t\alpha} d\mu(t+s)$.

For probability distributions $p \ll q$ on a σ -finite measure space (X, μ) the argument used to prove the classical case constructs a probability measure \tilde{q} on $(-\infty, \infty]$ so that the two-sided Laplace transform of \tilde{q} is $Q_\alpha(p, q)$. The support of this measure \tilde{q} is contained in $[-D_\infty(p, q), \infty]$. If now $D_\infty(p, q) = \log \|\frac{dp}{dq}\|_{L^\infty(q)}$ is finite, then we can multiply $Q_\alpha(p, q)$ by $e^{\alpha D_\infty(p, q)}$ to obtain a completely monotone function. With this idea, we obtain:

Proposition 31. *Let $\rho \ll \sigma$ be quantum states and let \mathbb{D}_α be a family of quantum Rényi divergences with $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma) = D_\infty(\rho, \sigma) < \infty$. Then there are classical probability*

distributions $p \ll q$ on a σ -finite measure space such that $\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma) = D_\alpha(p, q)$ if and only if the function

$$f(\alpha) = e^{(\alpha-1)(\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma) - D_\infty(\rho, \sigma))} \quad (68)$$

is completely monotone.

Proof. The only if part of the proof was explained in the text before the proposition. The assumption implies that the function $g(\alpha) = e^{-D_\infty(\rho, \sigma)} f(\alpha)$ is also completely monotone. Let μ be the measure defined by the function g through Eq. (67). Define a probability measures q and p on $[-D_\infty(\rho, \sigma), \infty]$ by $q(t) = \mu(t + D_\infty(\rho, \sigma)) + (1 - \mu((-\infty, \infty)))\delta_\infty(t)$ and $dp(t) = e^{-t}dq(t)$. The latter is normalized since

$$p([-D_\infty(\rho, \sigma), \infty]) = (1 - \mu((-\infty, \infty))) + \int_{-D_\infty(\rho, \sigma)}^{\infty} e^{-t}dq(t) = 1.$$

We set $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma) = e^{(\alpha-1)\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma)}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q}_\alpha(p, q) &= \int_{-D_\infty(\rho, \sigma)}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha t} dq(t) = e^{\alpha D_\infty(\rho, \sigma)} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\alpha t} d\mu(t) \\ &= e^{\alpha D_\infty(\rho, \sigma)} g(\alpha) = e^{(1-\alpha)\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma)} = \mathbb{Q}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma). \end{aligned}$$

□

We apply Proposition 31 to show that if Conjecture 22 is true, there are infinitely many inequalities on the minimal quantum Rényi divergence which separate the quantum and classical case. Furthermore, we give an alternative proof of our claim that the maximal quantum Rényi divergence is not complete. We start with the latter:

If $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is pure and σ be arbitrary with $\psi \in \text{supp}(\sigma)$ then

$$e^{(\alpha-1)D_\alpha^{\max}(\rho, \sigma)} = \text{tr}[\sigma(\sigma^{-1/2}\rho\sigma^{-1/2})^\alpha] = \|\sigma^{-1/2}\psi\|^{2(\alpha-1)}.$$

That this is exponential in α implies that the appropriately translated version of \mathbb{Q}_α is completely monotone so that classical distributions with the same Rényi divergences exist. Just as in the other proof, this contradicts interconvertibility Proposition 6 whenever ρ and σ do not commute.

We now turn to the inequalities separating commutativity and non-commutativity. If a family \mathbb{D}_α of Rényi divergences is sufficient, it holds for a dichotomy (ρ, σ) with $\rho \ll \sigma$ and $\mathbb{D}_\infty(\rho, \sigma) < \infty$ that

$$[\rho, \sigma] = 0 \iff (-1)^n \frac{d^n}{d\alpha^n} \left(e^{(\alpha-1)(\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma) - \mathbb{D}_\infty(\rho, \sigma))} \right) \geq 0 \quad \forall \alpha > 0, n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (69)$$

Notice also that each of the functions $(-1)^n \frac{d^n}{d\alpha^n}(\dots)$ is completely monotone in α . Evaluating (69) for $n = 1$, we find

$$(\alpha - 1)\partial_\alpha \mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma) < \mathbb{D}_\infty(\rho, \sigma) - \mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma). \quad (70)$$

Many more point-wise inequalities are known for completely monotone functions [47–49]. For example, suppose that $\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}^L$ are two non-increasingly ordered vectors ($n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots$)




Figure 1: The derivatives $(-1)^k \partial_\alpha^k g(\alpha|\rho_s, \sigma)$ for $\mathbb{D}_\alpha = D_\alpha^{\min}$ in the case $\rho_s = e^{s\sigma_x}/2 \cosh(s)$, $\sigma = e^{\sigma_z}/\cosh(1)$ and for various values of s (see Eq. (73) for the definition of $g(\alpha|\rho, \sigma)$). If $g(\alpha|\rho_s, \sigma)$ was completely monotone, all curves would have to be monotonically decreasing and convex. Note that $[\rho_s, \sigma] = 0$ if and only if $s = 0$. For $s = 0$ the function is completely monotone. As s increases, the commutator-norm $\|[\rho_s, \sigma]\|$ increases monotonically while lower and lower derivatives signal that the function is not completely monotone. Already for $s = 0.3$ one can see that the second derivative is not completely monotone.

such that $\mathbf{n} \succ \mathbf{m}$, i.e., $\sum_{j=1}^k n_j \geq \sum_{j=1}^k m_j$ for all $k = 1, \dots, L-1$ and $\sum_{j=1}^L n_j = \sum_{j=1}^L m_j$. Then [48]

$$\prod_{j=1}^L (-1)^{n_j} f^{(n_j)}(x) \geq \prod_{j=1}^L (-1)^{m_j} f^{(m_j)}(x) \quad (71)$$

for any completely monotone function f . In other words, the function

$$\mathbf{n} \mapsto \prod_{j=1}^L (-1)^{n_j} f^{(n_j)}(x) \quad (72)$$

is Schur-convex. For $L = 2$ this yields log-convexity of completely monotone functions. Exploring the resulting inequalities for Rényi divergences seems like an interesting open problem.

As discussed above, if Conjecture 22 is true, then the function

$$g(\alpha|\rho, \sigma) := e^{-\alpha D_\infty(\rho, \sigma)} e^{(\alpha-1) D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma)} = e^{-\alpha D_\infty(\rho, \sigma)} Q_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) \quad (73)$$

is completely monotone if and only if $[\rho, \sigma] = 0$. This allows us to obtain additional evidence in favor of the conjecture by numerical means. Specifically, we can compute $g(\alpha|\rho, \sigma)$ and its derivatives for a choice of (ρ, σ) numerically and see whether (69) holds true. We have checked this for numerous examples without finding a counter-example to our conjecture. A numerical example for qubits is presented in Fig. 1. Note that these numerical results also provide a different means to see that no equivalent of Nussbaum-Szkoła distributions exist for the minimal quantum Rényi divergence.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Bjarne Bergh, Milan Mosonyi, Robert Salzmann, Joseph Schindler, Alexander Stottmeister, David Sutter, Marco Tomamichel, Reinhard F. Werner and Andreas Winter for interesting and helpful discussions. N.G. acknowledges financial support by the MICIIN with funding from European Union NextGenerationEU (PRTR-C17.I1) and by the Generalitat de Catalunya. H.W. acknowledges support by the DFG through SFB 1227 (DQ-mat), Quantum Valley Lower Saxony, and funding by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germanys Excellence Strategy EXC-2123 QuantumFrontiers 390837967.

A Interconvertibility from Rényi Divergences without absolute continuity

In the main text, we only considered classical dichotomies with $p \ll q$. In this appendix, we generalize Theorem 14 to arbitrary pairs of probability measures. To do this, we first have to find a way to define Rényi divergences for such measures. We appeal to the Lebesgue decomposition theorem stating that if p and q are probability measures on a measure space, then there is a unique decomposition

$$p = \lambda p^{\parallel} + (1 - \lambda)p^{\perp}, \quad p^{\parallel} \ll q, \quad p^{\perp} \perp q, \quad \lambda \in [0, 1], \quad (74)$$

with p^{\parallel} and p^{\perp} probability measures as well. Now, for $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ define [23]

$$D_{\alpha}(p, q) := \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log(\lambda) + D_{\alpha}(p^{\parallel}, q), & \text{if } \alpha \in (0, 1) \\ D_{\alpha}(p, q), & \text{if } p \ll q, \alpha > 1, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (75)$$

This reduces to the usual definition for $p = p^{\parallel} \ll q$. Moreover, note that for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ we have $D_{\alpha}(p, q) = 0$ precisely if $\lambda = 1$ and hence $p = p^{\parallel}$. It thus follows that $p = q$. Our main result now generalizes as follows:

Theorem 32. *Let (X_i, μ_i) , $i = 1, 2$, be measured spaces and p_i, q_i probability measures in $L^1(X_i, \mu_i)$ such that p_i is not orthogonal to q_i . If there is an open interval $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$D_{\alpha}(p_1, q_1) = D_{\alpha}(p_2, q_2) < \infty \quad \forall \alpha \in (a, b), \quad (76)$$

there are stochastic maps between $L^1(X_1, \mu_1)$ and $L^1(X_2, \mu_2)$ interconverting the dichotomies (p_1, q_1) and (p_2, q_2) .

Some remarks are in order: First, if $p_1 \perp q_1$ and $p_2 \perp q_2$ the two dichotomies are trivially interconvertible. Therefore we don't loose much by excluding this case (one could incorporate it by considering Q_{α} instead of D_{α}).

Second, let us comment on the role of the interval (a, b) : Suppose that p_i is not absolutely continuous with respect to q_i . Then the conditions of the Theorem require $0 \leq a < b \leq 1$, because otherwise the Rényi divergence is infinite by definition. Conversely, if $p_i \ll q_i$ and $b > 1$, then we already know from Theorem 14 that the Rényi divergences must match for all $0 < \alpha < b$, since the two dichotomies are interconvertible and the Rényi-divergences are non-decreasing in α . Thus we can in fact always assume $(a, b) \subseteq (0, 1)$.

Proof sketch. We only need to discuss the case $\lambda < 1$. We thus get as input $D_\alpha(\lambda_1 p_1^\parallel, q_1) = D_\alpha(\lambda_2 p_2^\parallel, q_2)$. One can now check that the proof of Theorem A also applies to subnormalized measures p_i , which then implies $(\lambda_1 p_1^\parallel, q_1) \leftrightarrow (\lambda_2 p_2^\parallel, q_2)$ (in particular $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 =: \lambda$). The result then follows from Lemma 33 below. \square

Lemma 33. *Let (X_i, μ_i) , $i = 1, 2$, be σ -finite measure spaces and let $p_i^\parallel, p_i^\perp, q_i \in L^1(X_i, \mu_i)$ be probability measures such that $p_i^\parallel \ll q_i$ and $p_i^\perp \perp q_i$. Suppose $(p_1^\parallel, q_1) \leftrightarrow (p_2^\parallel, q_2)$. Then for any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ we also have*

$$(\lambda p_1^\parallel + (1 - \lambda) p_1^\perp, q_1) \leftrightarrow (\lambda p_2^\parallel + (1 - \lambda) p_2^\perp, q_2) \quad (77)$$

Proof. If $r \in L^1(X_1, \mu_1)$, we define r_s and r_c to be the singular and absolutely continuous parts of r with respect to q_1 . Note that $r \mapsto r_s$ and $r \mapsto r_c$ are linear substochastic maps and that $r = r_s + r_c$. We have $(p_1)_c = \lambda p_1^\parallel$, $(p_1)_s = (1 - \lambda) p_1^\perp$, $(q_1)_s = 0$ and $(q_1)_c = q_1$. Set $p_i = \lambda p_i^\parallel + (1 - \lambda) p_i^\perp$. Let T_1 be a stochastic map taking (p_1^\parallel, q_1) to (p_2^\parallel, q_2) . Define

$$S_1(r) = r_s(X_1) p_2^\perp + T_1(r_c).$$

Indeed, $S_1(p_1) = (1 - \lambda) p_2^\perp + T_1(\lambda p_1^\parallel) = (1 - \lambda) p_2^\perp + \lambda p_2^\parallel = p_2$ and $S_1(q_1) = T_1(q_1) = q_2$. Constructing S_2 mapping in the other direction analogously proves the claim. \square

We proved Theorem 32 by reducing it to Theorem 14. Alternatively, we can adapt the proof of Theorem 14 so that it does not require absolute continuity to begin with. We sketch this here:

Direct proof of Theorem 32. Let (p, q) be a dichotomy on a σ -finite measure space (X, μ) . Let $p = p_c + p_s$ be the Lebesgue decomposition with respect to q . First, note that we may choose $\mu = p_s + q$ without loss of generality. Set $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty, -\infty\}$. We start with an arbitrary dichotomy of probability measures on $L^1(X, \mu)$ and define a measurable function

$$f(x) = \infty \cdot \chi_{\text{supp}(q) \setminus \text{supp}(p)}(x) - \log\left(\frac{dp}{dq}(x)\right) \chi_{\text{supp}(q)}(x) - \infty \cdot \chi_{\text{supp}(p_s)}(x). \quad (78)$$

This is just $f = -\log(\frac{dp}{dq})$ if we interpret $\frac{dp}{dq}$ as infinite on $\text{supp}(p) \setminus \text{supp}(q)$ (and as zero on $\text{supp}(q) \setminus \text{supp}(p)$ as usual). We again consider the push-forward measure $\tilde{\mu} := f_*(\mu)$ and $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) = (f_*(p), f_*(q))$ which is a dichotomy in $L^1(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mu})$. For measures $r \ll \tilde{\mu}$ we denote by r_s (resp. r_c) the singular (resp. absolutely) part with respect to \tilde{q} . With this we have $\tilde{\mu} = \tilde{p}_s + \tilde{q}$ and it holds that

$$\tilde{p}(\{\infty\}) = \tilde{q}(\{-\infty\}) = 0, \quad \tilde{p}(\{-\infty\}) = p_s(X), \quad \tilde{q}(\{\infty\}) = q(X \setminus \text{supp}(p)). \quad (79)$$

Just as in Eq. (28), one sees that

$$\frac{d\tilde{p}_c}{d\tilde{q}}(t) = e^{-t} \chi_{(-\infty, \infty]}(t). \quad (80)$$

We now define stochastic maps $f_* : L^1(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^1(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mu})$ and $R : L^1(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mu}) \rightarrow L^1(X, \mu)$. The map f_* is the push-forward with f and R is given by

$$R(g \cdot \tilde{\mu}) = (g \circ f) \mu = g(-\infty) p_s + (g \circ f) \cdot q. \quad (81)$$

This map is positive, preserves normalization and indeed satisfies $R(\tilde{q}) = R(\chi_{(-\infty, \infty]} \cdot \tilde{\mu}) = (\chi_{(-\infty, \infty]} \circ f) \cdot q = q$ and $R(\tilde{p}) = R((\chi_{\{-\infty\}} + \frac{d\tilde{p}_c}{d\tilde{q}})\tilde{\mu}) = p_s + e^{-f} \cdot q = p_s + p_c = p$. With the definition Eq. (75) we have

$$D_\alpha(p, q) = D_\alpha(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-t\alpha} d\tilde{q}(t), \quad \alpha \in (0, 1). \quad (82)$$

If we had two dichotomies (p_i, q_i) with equal Rényi divergences then this implies that the two-sided Laplace transforms of \tilde{q}_1 and \tilde{q}_2 are equal. By injectivity of the Laplace transform (see Lemma 17), it follows that $\tilde{q}_1 = \tilde{q}_2$ and hence that $(\tilde{p}_1)_c = e^{-t}\tilde{q}_1 = e^{-t}\tilde{q}_2 = (\tilde{p}_2)_c$. Furthermore, $(p_1)_s(X_1) = 1 - (\tilde{p}_1)_c(\mathbb{R}) = 1 - (\tilde{p}_2)_c(\mathbb{R}) = (p_2)_s(X_2)$. Therefore, we also have $\tilde{p}_1 = (\tilde{p}_1)_c + (\tilde{p}_1)_s = (\tilde{p}_1)_c + (p_1)_s(X_1)\delta_{-\infty} = (\tilde{p}_2)_c + (p_2)_s(X_2)\delta_{-\infty} = \tilde{p}_2$. With this we also get $\tilde{\mu}_1 = \tilde{\mu}_2$ which proves interconvertibility because

$$(p_1, q_1) \leftrightarrow (\tilde{p}_1, \tilde{q}_1) = (\tilde{p}_2, \tilde{q}_2) \leftrightarrow (p_2, q_2).$$

□

B Convertibility and interconvertibility for probability vectors

Here, we discuss the Koashi-Imoto minimal form and solution to the classical case (see Theorem A) for pairs of probability vectors, where everything can be constructed explicitly.

Minimal form. Let $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be probability vectors. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q}$ has no zero entry and let l be the number of zero entries of \mathbf{q} . If necessary, apply a permutation to \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} , so that

$$\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_n) = \left(\frac{p_1}{q_1}, \frac{p_2}{q_2}, \dots, \frac{p_n}{q_n} \right) \quad (83)$$

is ordered such that $r_1 \geq r_2 \geq \dots \geq r_n$. If $l > 0$, $r_1 = \dots = r_l = \infty$. Denote by m the number of *distinct* entries of the vector \mathbf{r} . For example, if $\mathbf{p} = (\frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{12}, 0)$ and $\mathbf{q} = (0, \frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2})$, then $\mathbf{r} = (\infty, 6, 3, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0)$ and $m = 5$. Each entry of \mathbf{r} appears with a certain multiplicity which we denote by d_1, \dots, d_m and we collect the corresponding indices in a set I_j with size $d_j = |I_j|$ (in the above example this means $d_1 = d_2 = d_3 = 1, d_4 = 2, d_5 = 1$ and $I_1 = \{1\}, I_2 = \{2\}, I_3 = \{3\}, I_4 = \{4, 5\}, I_5 = \{6\}$). The minimal form is given by the probability vectors $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ on \mathbb{R}^m with entries

$$\tilde{p}_j = \sum_{k \in I_j} p_k, \quad \tilde{q}_j = \sum_{k \in I_j} q_k. \quad (84)$$

Let us define $s(j) := \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} d_k$ and the vectors $\mathbf{w}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_j}$ with

$$w_k^{(1)} = \frac{p_k}{\tilde{p}_1}, \quad w_k^{(j)} = \frac{q_{s(j)+k}}{\tilde{q}_j}, \quad j = 2, \dots, m. \quad (85)$$

Note that $\frac{p_j}{q_j} = \frac{\tilde{p}_k}{\tilde{q}_k}$ for all k and $j \in I_k$ as long as $0 \neq \tilde{q}_k, \tilde{p}_k$. The dichotomy (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) can be interconverted with its minimal form $(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \tilde{\mathbf{q}})$ using the stochastic matrices $T \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$

and $R \in M_{n \times m}(\mathbb{R})$ given by

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} \underbrace{1 \cdots 1}_{d_1} & & & & \\ & \underbrace{1 \cdots 1}_{d_2} & & & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & \underbrace{1 \cdots 1}_{d_m} \end{pmatrix}, \quad R = \begin{pmatrix} w_1^{(1)} & & & & \\ \vdots & & & & \\ w_{d_1}^{(1)} & \cdots & & & \\ & & & w_1^{(m)} & \\ & & & \vdots & \\ & & & w_{d_m}^{(m)} & \end{pmatrix}. \quad (86)$$

Both matrices T and R have a block form. In the case of T these blocks have dimension $1 \times d_i$ and for R they have dimension $d_i \times 1$. Note that R could be written as $R = \text{diag}(\mathbf{w}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{w}^{(m)})$ with some abuse of notation. We will now show that $(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \tilde{\mathbf{q}})$ are the Koashi-Imoto minimal form of (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) . We may decompose \mathbb{R}^n and the probability vectors \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} as

$$\mathbb{R}^n = \bigoplus_{j=1}^m \mathbb{R}^{d_j}, \quad \mathbf{p} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^m \tilde{p}_j \mathbf{w}_j, \quad \mathbf{q} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^m \tilde{q}_j \mathbf{w}_j. \quad (87)$$

This is precisely the classical version of the Koashi-Imoto decomposition for the dichotomy (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) . We see that the \mathcal{J}_j spaces are all trivial (anything else would imply a form of non-commutativity) and that the \mathcal{K}_j spaces are given by \mathbb{R}^{d_j} with the role of the states ω_j taken by the vectors \mathbf{w}_j . If we “trace out” the \mathbf{w}_j ’s, then we obtain the vectors $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$. That this decomposition is, in fact, the minimal one follows from the proof of Corollary 15. The stochastic matrix T effectively implements the push-forward map f_* with $f = -\log(\frac{dp}{dq})$ while R implements the associated recovery map. We will also explicitly see the minimality below.

Interconvertibility. Let $(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1), (\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ be classical dichotomies. Without loss of generality we again assume the ordering as above. Denote the minimal forms by $(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{q}}_i)$ and the stochastic matrices interconverting them with $(\mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{q}_i)$ by T_i and R_i (as in Eq. (86)). In this case the interconvertibility, if possible, can always be achieved using the maps $R_1 T_2$ and $R_2 T_1$. Collecting our results we get:

Corollary 34. *The following are equivalent*

- (1) $(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1)$ and $(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ are interconvertible,
- (2) $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) = D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ for all α in an open interval $(a, b) \subset (0, \infty)$ (with $(a, b) \subseteq (0, 1)$ if $\mathbf{p}_i \ll \mathbf{q}_i$ does not hold.),
- (3) $(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{q}}_1) = (\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_2, \tilde{\mathbf{q}}_2)$,
- (4) $R_1 T_2(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2) = (\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1)$ and $(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2) = R_2 T_1(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1)$.

In the case of finite-dimensional probability vectors the equivalence of (2) and (3) can be seen explicitly as follows. We treat the general case where $\mathbf{p} \ll \mathbf{q}$ does not hold. Since r_k is constant for $k \in I_j$ we find (assuming $\tilde{q}_1 = 0$ and setting $\lambda = \sum_{j=2}^m \tilde{p}_j = 1 - \tilde{p}_1$, compare wit Eq. (75))

$$\exp[(\alpha - 1)D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})] = \lambda^\alpha \sum_{j=2}^m \sum_{k \in I_j} q_k r_k^\alpha = \lambda^\alpha \sum_{j=2}^m \tilde{q}_j \tilde{r}_j^\alpha = \exp[(\alpha - 1)D_\alpha(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \tilde{\mathbf{q}})] \quad (88)$$




Figure 2: Koashi-Imoto minimal form from the point of view of Lorenz curves: The blue curve on the left corresponds to $L_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})}$. Removing all points from the Lorenz curve that lie in the interior of straight line segments (the blue points) yields the Lorenz curve $L_{(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \tilde{\mathbf{q}})}$ on the right. This corresponds to the map T . Obviously, no further “anchoring points” can be removed from the curve without altering it.

with $\tilde{r}_j := \tilde{p}_j / \tilde{q}_j = r_k$ for $k \in I_j$. Therefore $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = D_\alpha(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \tilde{\mathbf{q}})$. Since $\tilde{r}_j^\alpha = \exp(\alpha \log(\tilde{r}_j))$ and exponential functions $x \mapsto \exp(ax)$ are linearly independent for distinct a , we find that $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) = D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2) \quad \forall \alpha \in (a, b)$ implies

$$\tilde{q}_{1,j} = \tilde{q}_{2,j}, \quad \tilde{r}_{1,j} = \tilde{r}_{2,j}, \quad \lambda_1 = \lambda_2, \quad j = 2, \dots, m \quad (89)$$

where we used $\lambda_i = \sum_{j=2}^m \tilde{p}_{i,j} = \sum_{j=2}^m \tilde{r}_{i,j} \tilde{q}_j$. Hence, we can reconstruct $\tilde{p}_{1,j} = \tilde{p}_{2,j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$. We thus find

$$D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) = D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2) \quad \forall \alpha \in (a, b) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{q}}_1) = (\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_2, \tilde{\mathbf{q}}_2). \quad (90)$$

Lorenz curves. It is useful to visualize the Koashi-Imoto decomposition for probability vectors. Given a dichotomy (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) of n -dimensional probability vectors (again ordered according to the ratios r_j), consider the piece-wise linear function $x \mapsto L_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})}(x)$ whose graph is given by linearly joining the $n + 1$ points

$$(x_j, y_j) = \left(\sum_{k=1}^j q_k, \sum_{k=1}^j p_k \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, n, \quad (x_0, y_0) = 0. \quad (91)$$

(The graph of) $L_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})}$ is called a *Lorenz curve*. Its slope between x_j and x_{j+1} is given precisely by r_j . Since $r_j \geq r_{j+1}$ the curve is concave, see Fig. 2 for an example. It is known that [9, 11, 15, 50]

$$(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2) \Leftrightarrow L_{(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1)}(x) \geq L_{(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)}(x) \quad \forall x \in [0, 1]. \quad (92)$$

If a Lorenz curve $L_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})}$ contains several consecutive linear segments with identical slope (corresponding to identical values of r_j), it is clear that the same curve can be obtained from a lower-dimensional vector, where the corresponding entries in \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} are simply

summed up. Doing this for all consecutive linear segments with identical slopes precisely corresponds to the map T above and yields $(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \tilde{\mathbf{q}})$. From this picture it is also clear that the resulting dichotomy is minimal, see Fig. 2 for an illustration.

Convertibility from Rényi divergences for $\alpha > 0$ alone. If $(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ then $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) \geq D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ due to the data-processing inequality. Interestingly, the converse is not true: $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) \geq D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ does in general not imply $(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ [27]. Still, we will now show that the knowledge of $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1)$ and $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ for $\alpha \in (a, b)$ is sufficient to decide whether $(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$.

Proposition 35. *There is an algorithm to determine if a given dichotomy $(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1)$ is convertible to a dichotomy $(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$, i.e., if $(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$, from the knowledge of the Rényi divergences $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1)$ and $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ on any open subset $(a, b) \subset [0, \infty)$ on which they are both finite.*

This follows from the following Lemma since knowing the Lorenz curves allows one to decide convertibility (see previous paragraph) and since we can reconstruct the Lorenz curves from $(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \tilde{\mathbf{q}})$ algorithmically.

Lemma 36. *There is an algorithm to reconstruct $(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \tilde{\mathbf{q}})$ from the knowledge of $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$ over any open subset $(a, b) \subset [0, \infty)$ on which $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) < \infty$.*

Proof. We have seen in (88) that (assuming the general case with $\tilde{q}_1 = 0$ and $\lambda = 1 - \tilde{p}_1$)

$$\exp((\alpha - 1)D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})) = \lambda^\alpha \sum_{j=2}^m \tilde{q}_j \tilde{r}_j^\alpha = \mathcal{L}[t \mapsto \sum_{j=2}^m \tilde{q}_j \delta(t + \log(\lambda \tilde{r}_j))](\alpha), \quad (93)$$

where \mathcal{L} is the (two-sided) Laplace-transform. Since the Laplace-transform is injective on any open interval (see Lemma 17), we can perform an inverse Laplace transform and read off \tilde{q}_j and $\lambda \tilde{r}_j$ for $j = 2, \dots, m$. Since $\sum_{j=2}^m \tilde{r}_j \tilde{q}_j = \sum_{j=2}^m \tilde{p}_j = \lambda$, we obtain

$$\lambda = 1 - \tilde{p}_1 = \sqrt{\sum_{j=2}^m \lambda \tilde{r}_j \tilde{q}_j} \quad (94)$$

and consequently \tilde{p}_j for all j . Thus we have reconstructed $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ from the knowledge of the Rényi divergences. \square

C Proof of Theorem 4 for infinite-dimensional systems

The direction (B) \Rightarrow (A) is straightforward. For (A) \Rightarrow (B), consider the Koashi-Imoto minimal forms $\hat{\rho}_\theta^{(i)}$ acting on $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_i = \bigoplus_j \mathcal{J}_j^{(i)}$. Define the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}_i = \bigoplus_j \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{J}_j^{(i)})$ whose pre-dual $(\mathcal{M}_i)_* = \bigoplus_j \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{J}_j^{(i)})$ contains $\hat{\rho}_\theta^{(i)}$. We have positive trace-preserving maps $\pi_i : \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_{S_i}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}_i)_*$, $\iota_i : (\mathcal{M}_i)_* \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_{S_i})$ as in Eq. (14). Let T_1 and T_2 be channels interconverting $\rho_\theta^{(1)}$ and $\rho_\theta^{(2)}$. Then $\hat{T}_1 = \pi_2 T_1 \iota_1$ and $\hat{T}_2 = \pi_1 T_2 \iota_2$ are completely positive trace-preserving maps between $(\mathcal{M}_1)_*$ and $(\mathcal{M}_2)_*$ which interconvert $\hat{\rho}_\theta^{(1)}$ and $\hat{\rho}_\theta^{(2)}$. By the Koashi-Imoto theorem, it now holds that $\hat{T}_2 \hat{T}_1 = \text{id}$ and $\hat{T}_1 \hat{T}_2 = \text{id}$. Consider the unital completely positive maps $\alpha_i : \mathcal{M}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_j$ dual to \hat{T}_j , $j \neq i$. We

then obtain $\alpha_1\alpha_2 = \text{id}_{\mathcal{M}_2}$ and $\alpha_2\alpha_1 = \text{id}_{\mathcal{M}_1}$. Since the α_i are contractive, but their product is isometric, it follows that the α_i are both isometric. From Kadison's theorem on completely positive isometries [51, Thm. 7], we obtain that both α_i are $*$ -isomorphisms and that $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2^{-1}$. In particular, $\mathcal{M}_1 \cong \mathcal{M}_2$. Consequently, the block structures are equivalent, i.e., $N_1 = N_2$, and there is a reordering of indices such that the j th block of \mathcal{M}_1 is isomorphic to the j th block of \mathcal{M}_2 . The adjoints of the unitaries implementing α_1 then map $\rho_{j|\theta}^{(1)}$ to $\rho_{j|\theta}^{(2)}$ and we get $p_{j|\theta}^{(1)} = p_{j|\theta}^{(2)}$.

It remains to be shown that interconverting channels are of the form Eq. (16). From the Koashi-Imoto theorem we get that for all interconverting channels R, T there are channels $E_j : \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{K}_j^{(1)}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{K}_j^{(2)})$ such that $(R \circ T)|_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{J}_j^{(1)} \otimes \mathcal{K}_j^{(1)})} = \text{id}_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{J}_j^{(1)})} \otimes E_j$ for all j . We apply this to the specific channel $S = \oplus_j ((U_j(\cdot)U_j^*) \otimes (\omega_j^{(2)} \text{tr}[\cdot]))$ which clearly maps $\rho_\theta^{(1)}$ to $\rho_\theta^{(2)}$. Thus evaluation of $R \circ S$ on states of the form $\sigma = \oplus_j (U_j^* \sigma_j U_j \otimes \omega_j^{(1)})$ shows

$$R(\oplus_j (\sigma_j \otimes \omega_j^{(2)})) = R \circ S(\sigma) = \oplus_j (U_j^* \sigma_j U_j \otimes \omega_j^{(1)}).$$

As this holds for all states σ_j , the channel acts as $U_j^*(\cdot)U_j \otimes R_j$ on the j th block. This then gives $R_j(\omega_j^{(2)}) = \omega_j^{(1)}$ as claimed. Applying the analogous argument to T finishes the proof. \square

D Quantum f -divergences

Following [23], this section is concerned with the notions of *standard*, *maximal* and *measured* quantum f -divergences. [23] treats the topic in the setting of general von Neumann algebras. For an account of the development of the notions see there and the references therein. Here, we are only concerned with classical and quantum states in the sense of the previous sections and will summarize the theory only for these cases. The Petz quantum Rényi divergences are examples for *standard* quantum f -divergences, while the maximal Rényi divergences can be obtained through *maximal* quantum f -divergences (see below). We will show that neither of the two families of quantum divergences is sufficient in the sense introduced above by demonstrating (well-known) constructions of classical dichotomies with equal divergences as an arbitrary but fixed (quantum) dichotomy. By Corollary 9, interconvertibility cannot hold in general, and the claimed result follows. We thus see, in particular, that neither Petz nor maximal Rényi divergences are sufficient.

Let $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function. The (classical) f -divergence of two probability distributions $p \ll q$ is

$$Q_f(p, q) = \int_X f\left(\frac{dp}{dq}\right) dq \in (-\infty, \infty].$$

We assume f to be convex to ensure that the DPI holds for classical channels as well as to guarantee good behavior towards 0 and ∞ , see [23], but the definition in principle makes sense also for non-convex functions. To define the quantum generalizations mentioned above, let $\rho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ be a density operator. We denote its purification by $|\rho\rangle = \sum_i \sqrt{p_i} \psi_i \otimes \bar{\psi}_i$ in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}$. Here, $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$ denotes the conjugate Hilbert space of \mathcal{H} . We can identify linear operators A on \mathcal{H} with linear operators \bar{A} on $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$. Alternatively, we can identify $|\rho\rangle \equiv \sqrt{\rho}$ in the Hilbert space of Hilbert-Schmidt operators on \mathcal{H} (and we will mainly employ this picture).

We start with the notion of standard quantum f -divergences, see [23, Sec. 2]. Let σ be another density operator with $\text{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \text{supp}(\sigma)$. The *relative modular operator* $\Delta_{\rho,\sigma}$ acts on a Hilbert-Schmidt operator A by

$$\Delta_{\rho,\sigma}A = \rho A \sigma^{-1}$$

where σ^{-1} again denotes the pseudo-inverse of σ . On $\mathcal{H} \otimes \overline{\mathcal{H}}$ we identify $\Delta_{\rho,\sigma} \equiv \rho \otimes \overline{\sigma^{-1}}$. $\Delta_{\rho,\sigma}$ is a self-adjoint operator which is unbounded if \mathcal{H} is infinite dimensional. For $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ convex, we define the *standard quantum f -divergence* of ρ and σ to be

$$Q_f^{\text{std}}(\rho, \sigma) = \langle \sigma | f(\Delta_{\rho,\sigma}) | \sigma \rangle = \text{tr}[\sqrt{\sigma} f(\Delta_{\rho,\sigma})(\sqrt{\sigma})] \in (-\infty, \infty].$$

It is unitarily invariant, and if f is operator convex then Q_f^{std} satisfies the DPI. For $g(t) = t \log(t)$ we obtain the Umegaki relative entropy

$$Q_g^{\text{std}}(\rho, \sigma) = D(\rho, \sigma) = \text{tr}[\rho \log(\rho) - \rho \log(\sigma)].$$

Considering the family $f_\alpha : x \mapsto x^\alpha$ we recover [23, Sec. 3.1] the Petz quantum Rényi divergence as

$$D_\alpha^{\text{P}}(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log Q_{f_\alpha}^{\text{std}}(\rho, \sigma).$$

f_α is operator convex for $\alpha \in [1, 2]$ and operator concave for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ [52]. Therefore, $Q_{f_\alpha}^{\text{std}}$ satisfies the DPI on $[1, 2]$ while $-Q_{f_\alpha}^{\text{std}}$ satisfies it on $[0, 1]$. By monotonicity of \log and due to $\alpha - 1$ being positive on $(1, 2]$ and negative on $[0, 1)$ we find that D_α^{P} satisfies the DPI on $[0, 2]$.

To construct the classical dichotomies let $\rho = \sum_i p_i R_i$ and $\sigma = \sum_j q_j S_j$ be the spectral decompositions of ρ and σ . Then $f(\Delta_{\rho,\sigma})(A) = \sum_{i,j} f(p_i q_j^{-1}) R_i A S_j$, so

$$Q_f^{\text{std}}(\rho, \sigma) = \sum_{i,j} q_j f(p_i q_j^{-1}) \text{tr}[R_i S_j].$$

Setting $P_{ij} = p_i \text{tr}[R_i S_j]$ and $Q_{ij} = q_j \text{tr}[R_i S_j]$ yields classical states with the same f -divergences as ρ and σ (for all f). P and Q are known as the *Nussbaum-Skóla distributions* [31].

We now turn towards the *maximal quantum f -divergences*, see [23, Sec. 4]. With ρ and σ as above and $T_{\rho,\sigma} = \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \geq 0$ (possibly unbounded) they are given by the formula

$$Q_f^{\text{max}}(\rho, \sigma) = \text{tr}[\sigma f(T_{\rho,\sigma})] \in (-\infty, \infty].$$

It is again unitarily invariant and satisfies the data processing inequality provided that f is operator convex. The maximal quantum Rényi divergence is obtained from this as

$$D_\alpha^{\text{max}}(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log Q_{f_\alpha}^{\text{max}}(\rho, \sigma).$$

As above for D_α^{P} we find that D_α^{max} satisfies the DPI on $[0, 2]$. It can be computed as

$$Q_f^{\text{max}}(\rho, \sigma) = \min_{C, (p,q), T} Q_f(p, q)$$

where the minimum ranges over all (possibly continuous) classical systems C , dichotomies with $p, q \in \mathfrak{S}(C)$ and channels $T : \mathfrak{S}(C) \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}(S)$ that map (p, q) into (ρ, σ) . To show that

the minimum is indeed attained, set $\omega = \rho + \sigma$ and consider $T_{\rho,\omega}$ with spectral decomposition $T_{\rho,\omega} = \int_{[0,1]} t dP_{\rho,\omega}(t)$. Note that although $T_{\rho,\sigma}$ can be unbounded in general, $T_{\rho,\omega}$ is always bounded with $0 \leq T_{\rho,\omega} \leq \mathbf{1}$. This follows since $S_\omega - T_{\rho,\omega} = T_{\sigma,\omega} \geq 0$ with S_ω denoting the projection onto $\text{supp}(\omega) = \text{supp}(\sigma)$. In particular, the spectral measure of $T_{\rho,\omega}$ is indeed supported on $[0, 1]$. We can now define a finite Borel measure μ on $[0, 1]$ by setting

$$\mu(A) = \text{tr}[\omega P_{\rho,\omega}(A)] = \text{tr}[E_{\rho,\omega}(A)]$$

where $E_{\rho,\omega}(A) := \sqrt{\omega} P_{\rho,\omega}(A) \sqrt{\omega}$. We then define a channel $T : L^1(X, \mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ by setting

$$T(g) = \int g dE_{\rho,\omega}.$$

Let $p(t) = t$ and $q(t) = 1 - t$, which are indeed probability densities relative to μ . It then holds that $T(1) = \omega$, $T(p) = \rho$ and $T(q) = \omega - \rho = \sigma$. Furthermore, for every operator convex function f it holds that $Q_f^{\max}(\rho, \sigma) = Q_f(p, q)$ [23]. Apart from operator convexity, nothing in this construction depends on the f used to define the quantum f -divergence. This proves the existence of a single pair of classical distributions with the same (maximal) f -divergences as ρ and σ .

Finally, to define the *measured quantum Rényi divergence* we set, for any convex function,

$$Q_f^{\text{meas}}(\rho, \sigma) = \sup_{\mathcal{M}} Q_f(\mathcal{M}(\rho), \mathcal{M}(\sigma))$$

where the supremum runs over all quantum-classical channels (i.e. measurements) $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow L^1(X)$ (that is, the classical system is not fixed). Note, that since the output system is classical, complete positivity is equivalent to positivity so that the data processing inequality for positive maps follows immediately from the definition. The measured quantum Rényi divergences are now

$$D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log Q_{f_\alpha}^{\text{meas}}(\rho, \sigma) = \sup_{\mathcal{M}} D_\alpha(\mathcal{M}(\rho), \mathcal{M}(\sigma)). \quad (95)$$

They satisfy the data processing inequality for all $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ (since the output system is classical, we do not have the same restriction coming from operator convexity as for the Petz and maximal divergence). Furthermore, for each α there exists a (projective) measurement realizing the supremum [23, Ex. 5.16] and D_α^{meas} is continuous in $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ [53]. In particular, the limit $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ yields the measured relative entropy D^{meas} , cf. Appendix E.

E The insufficient zoo of divergences

In this appendix, we collect definitions and some relevant information regarding DPI for the most used families of quantum Rényi divergences. We include the respective limits $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ as part of the definition of the divergence. This list is certainly not exhaustive, but we are not aware of more families being known.⁶ The different properties are summarized in Table 1. Recall that we assume $\rho \ll \sigma$.

Every family that satisfies the DPI for positive maps clearly cannot be sufficient for detecting completely positive interconvertibility. Apart from this, some families can be excluded completely from being sufficient, even for positive interconvertibility, since they allow for classical dichotomies with equal divergences as genuinely quantum ones.

⁶There does exist the family of *iterated mean divergences* introduced in [54] but since it is parametrized by a discrete parameter (that accumulates at 1), it does not lie in our scope.

	cp-DPI	p-DPI	additive	$\alpha \rightarrow 1$
geometric/max D_α^{\max}	$[0, 2]$	$[0, 2]$	yes	D^{BS}
sharp $D_\alpha^\#$	$[1, \infty)$	$[1, \infty)$	subadditive	D^{BS}
log-Euclidean D_α^b	$[0, 1]$	$[0, 1]$	yes	D
Petz D_α	$[0, 2]$	$[0, 1]$	yes	D
sandwiched/min D_α^{\min}	$[\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$	$[\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$	yes	D
α -z $D_{\alpha,z}$	see (107)	$\{z \geq \max(\alpha, 1-\alpha) \}$ $\{0 < \alpha < 1\}$	yes	D
measured D_α^{meas}	$(0, \infty)$	$(0, \infty)$	superadditive	D^{meas}

Table 1: Summary of properties of quantum Rényi divergences.

Geometric/Maximal

The *maximal quantum Rényi* divergence is defined as

$$D_\alpha^{\max}(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \text{tr}[\sigma(\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}})^\alpha]. \quad (96)$$

Its limit $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ is the Belavkin-Staszewski relative entropy $D^{\text{BS}}(\rho, \sigma)$ [41]. Additivity of D_α^{\max} is immediate from the definition and it satisfies the DPI for positive trace-preserving maps on $\Lambda = [0, 2]$ (and is also maximal only on this region) [23, Thm. 4.4], [30, Sec. 4.2.3], see also Appendix D. This holds in finite as well as infinite dimensions. Since it allows for classical dichotomies with equal divergences, see Appendix D, this family cannot be sufficient.

Sharp

This family has been introduced in [55]. We briefly sketch some background to the definition: For any operator monotone function $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ with $f(1) = 1$ we set

$$\sigma \#_f \rho = \sigma^{1/2} f(\sigma^{-1/2} \rho \sigma^{-1/2}) \sigma^{1/2} \quad (97)$$

In the case of $f(x) = x^\alpha$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we write $\#_\alpha$. Note, that in the notation of Appendix D it holds that $\sigma \#_f \rho = \sigma^{1/2} f(T_{\rho, \sigma}) \sigma^{1/2}$ so that

$$Q_f^{\max}(\rho, \sigma) = \text{tr}[\sigma \#_f \rho]. \quad (98)$$

In particular, $D_\alpha^{\max}(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \text{tr}[\sigma \#_\alpha \rho]$. With this one sets for $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\alpha^\#(\rho, \sigma) &= \inf\{\text{tr}(A) \mid A \geq 0, \rho \leq A \#_{1/\alpha} \sigma\} \\ D_\alpha^\#(\rho, \sigma) &= \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log Q_\alpha^\#. \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

Its limit $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ is the Belavkin-Staszewski relative entropy [56]. It is subadditive and satisfies the DPI for all positive trace-preserving maps [55, Prop. 3.2].

D_α^\sharp can be seen as an example of a *kringel divergence* introduced in [56] that, for a given family \mathbb{D}_α of quantum Rényi divergences, is defined as

$$\mathbb{D}_\alpha^\circ(\rho, \sigma) = \inf_{A \geq \rho} \mathbb{D}_\alpha(A, \sigma)$$

where $\alpha > 1$, while for $\alpha < 1$ the optimization evaluates to $-\infty$. It is shown there that this family is again a family of Rényi divergences. Being defined as an infimum, it is immediate that whenever \mathbb{D}_α satisfies the DPI for (completely) positive maps, so does \mathbb{D}_α° . To our best knowledge, these families have so far only been considered in finite dimension.

log-Euclidean

This family is defined as

$$D_\alpha^b(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \operatorname{tr} e^{\alpha \log(\rho) + (1-\alpha) \log(\sigma)}. \quad (100)$$

It essentially appears already in [57] where it is related to D_α^{\max} although not directly in the context of quantum divergences. See also [58, 59]. Its limit $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ is the quantum relative entropy D . It is furthermore the $z \rightarrow \infty$ limit of the α - z family [60]

$$D_\alpha^b(\rho, \sigma) = D_{\alpha, \infty}(\rho, \sigma) = \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} D_{\alpha, z}(\rho, \sigma). \quad (101)$$

It is thus immediate from the analogous statement for $D_{\alpha, z}$ that D_α^b is additive and satisfies the DPI for positive trace-preserving maps if $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ (also in infinite dimensions). For $\alpha > 1$ the limiting argument cannot be done and, in fact, D^b doesn't satisfy the DPI in this region [58, Lem. 3.17].

It is furthermore a special case of the recently introduced *barycentric Rényi divergences* [59]. Given two quantum divergences $D^{(0)}$ and $D^{(1)}$ it is defined by setting

$$Q_\alpha^{\text{bary}}(\rho, \sigma) = \sup_{0 \leq \tau \ll \rho} \operatorname{tr} \tau - \alpha D^{(0)}(\tau, \rho) - (1 - \alpha) D^{(1)}(\tau, \sigma) \quad (102)$$

(recall that by assumption $\rho \ll \sigma$) and then defining

$$D_\alpha^{\text{bary}}(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log Q_\alpha^{\text{bary}}(\rho, \sigma). \quad (103)$$

For $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ they inherit validity of the DPI from the defining families while for $\alpha > 1$ they don't necessarily define proper divergences if $D^{(0)} \neq D^{(1)}$ since then $D_\alpha^{\text{bary}}(\rho, \rho) > 0$ is possible. D^b is obtained by choosing $D^{(0)} = D^{(1)} = D$ to be the quantum relative entropy.

Petz

The *Petz quantum Rényi divergence* is defined as

$$D_\alpha^P(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \operatorname{tr}[\rho^\alpha \sigma^{1-\alpha}], \quad (104)$$

where $\sigma^{1-\alpha}$ denotes the *pseudo-inverse* of σ . The limit $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ is the quantum relative entropy $D(\rho, \sigma)$. Additivity of D_α^P is immediate from the definition, and it satisfies the DPI for completely positive trace-preserving maps on $\Lambda = [0, 2]$ [30, Sec. 4.4], see also Appendix D. For $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, it is furthermore known to satisfy DPI for positive trace-preserving maps (see α - z divergence below). Both is true in infinite dimensions. Since they allow for classical dichotomies with equal divergences, see Appendix D, this family cannot be sufficient.

Sandwiched/Minimal

The *minimal quantum Rényi divergence* (or *sandwiched Rényi divergence*) is given by

$$D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \text{tr} [(\sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \rho \sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}})^\alpha] =: \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log Q_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma). \quad (105)$$

It satisfies the DPI for positive trace-preserving maps, also in infinite dimension, on $\Lambda = [\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$ [30, Sec. 4.3], [39] and [23, Thm. 3.16]. The limit $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ is the quantum relative entropy.

α - z

A class of Rényi divergences that generalizes both the minimal quantum Rényi divergence as well as the Petz quantum Rényi divergence is the two-parameter α - z *quantum Rényi divergence* [60], defined as

$$D_{\alpha, z}(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \text{tr} [(\sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2z}} \rho^{\frac{\alpha}{z}} \sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2z}})^z]. \quad (106)$$

For $z = \alpha$, it coincides with the minimal quantum Rényi divergence, while for $z = 1$, it coincides with the Petz quantum Rényi divergence and thus satisfies DPI in these cases for the same range of α . Its limit $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ is the quantum relative entropy [53]. DPI for completely positive trace-preserving maps in finite dimension is known to hold *if and only if* one of the following cases applies [61]:

$$\begin{cases} z \geq \max(\alpha, 1 - \alpha), & \text{if } \alpha \in (0, 1), \\ \frac{\alpha}{2} \leq z \leq \alpha & \text{if } \alpha \in (1, 2], \\ \alpha - 1 \leq z \leq \alpha, & \text{if } \alpha \geq 2. \end{cases} \quad (107)$$

If both $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $z \geq \max(\alpha, 1 - \alpha)$ are satisfied it is furthermore known to satisfy DPI also for positive trace-preserving maps even in infinite dimensions [62]. It is clearly additive for all α and z , see also [62, 63]. Since the minimal quantum Rényi divergence does not admit a classical simulation, neither does the α - z quantum Rényi divergence for general values of (α, z) . Furthermore, since the Araki-Lieb-Thirring inequality (see for example [46, Thm. 4.3]) implies that $D_{\alpha, z}(\rho, \sigma)$ is non-constant in z if and only if ρ and σ commute, there cannot exist a classical simulation working for a fixed value of α and more than one value of z .

Measured

The *measured quantum Rényi divergence* is given as

$$D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\rho, \sigma) = \sup_{\mathcal{M}} D_\alpha(\mathcal{M}(\rho), \mathcal{M}(\sigma)) \quad (108)$$

where the supremum runs over all measurements \mathcal{M} , i.e., (completely) positive maps with abelian range. Here, Q_f denotes the classical f -divergence, see Appendix D. Given any positive, trace-preserving map T , the map $\mathcal{M} \circ T$ is a measurement, too. Hence D_α^{meas} satisfies DPI for positive trace-preserving maps for each value of α in finite as well as infinite dimension. From the DPI we get that $D_\alpha^{\text{meas}} \leq D_\alpha^{\text{min}}$ for $\alpha \geq 1/2$. The existence of a pair of states for which the inequality is strict together with D_α^{min} being the minimal additive divergence satisfying DPI [30] shows that D_α^{meas} is not additive. However, clearly D_α^{meas} is *super-additive*:

$$D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2, \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2) = \sup_{\mathcal{M}} D_\alpha(\mathcal{M}(\rho_1, \otimes \rho_2), \mathcal{M}(\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2)) \quad (109)$$

$$\geq \sup_{\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2} D_\alpha(\mathcal{M}_1(\rho_1) \otimes \mathcal{M}_2(\rho_2), \mathcal{M}_1(\sigma_1) \otimes \mathcal{M}_2(\sigma_2)) \quad (110)$$

$$= D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) + D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\rho_2, \sigma_2). \quad (111)$$

As far as we are aware, the measured Rényi divergence does not allow for a classical dichotomy with equal Rényi divergence for all α , since the optimal measurement \mathcal{M} depends on α in general. For $\alpha = 1$ we obtain the *measured relative entropy* $D^{\text{meas}}(\rho, \sigma)$ defined as

$$D^{\text{meas}}(\rho, \sigma) = \sup_{\mathcal{M}} D(\mathcal{M}(\rho), \mathcal{M}(\sigma)) = \sup_{\mathcal{M}} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} D_\alpha(\mathcal{M}(\rho), \mathcal{M}(\sigma)), \quad (112)$$

which coincides with the quantum relative entropy if and only if $[\rho, \sigma] = 0$ [46, Prop. 2.36].

References

- [1] E. Torgersen. *Comparison of Statistical Experiments*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. ISBN: 978-0-521-25030-6. DOI: [10.1017/CB09780511666353](https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511666353).
- [2] D. Petz. “Sufficient subalgebras and the relative entropy of states of a von Neumann algebra”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 105.1 (Mar. 1, 1986), pp. 123–131. ISSN: 1432-0916. DOI: [10.1007/BF01212345](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01212345).
- [3] D. Petz. “Sufficiency of channels over von Neumann algebras”. In: *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics* 39.1 (Mar. 1, 1988), pp. 97–108. ISSN: 0033-5606. DOI: [10.1093/qmath/39.1.97](https://doi.org/10.1093/qmath/39.1.97).
- [4] A. Jenčová and D. Petz. “Sufficiency in Quantum Statistical Inference”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 263.1 (Apr. 1, 2006), pp. 259–276. ISSN: 1432-0916. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-005-1510-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-005-1510-7).
- [5] A. Jenčová and D. Petz. “Sufficiency in Quantum Statistical Inference: A Survey With Examples”. In: *Infinite Dimensional Analysis, Quantum Probability and Related Topics* 09.03 (Sept. 2006), pp. 331–351. DOI: [10.1142/s0219025706002408](https://doi.org/10.1142/s0219025706002408).
- [6] M. Koashi and N. Imoto. “Operations that do not disturb partially known quantum states”. In: *Physical Review A* 66.2 (Aug. 30, 2002). Publisher: American Physical Society, p. 022318. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.66.022318](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.66.022318).
- [7] Y. Kuramochi. “Accessible Information Without Disturbing Partially Known Quantum States on a von Neumann Algebra”. In: *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* 57.8 (Apr. 2018), pp. 2249–2266. DOI: [10.1007/s10773-018-3749-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10773-018-3749-8).

- [8] G. H. Hardy et al. *Inequalities*. Cambridge university press, 1952.
- [9] D. Blackwell. “Equivalent Comparisons of Experiments”. In: *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 24.2 (June 1953). Publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics, pp. 265–272. ISSN: 0003-4851, 2168-8990. DOI: [10.1214/aoms/1177729032](https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177729032).
- [10] E. Ruch and A. Mead. “The principle of increasing mixing character and some of its consequences”. In: *Theoretica chimica acta* 41.2 (June 1, 1976), pp. 95–117. ISSN: 1432-2234. DOI: [10.1007/BF01178071](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01178071).
- [11] E. Ruch, R. Schraner, and T. H. Seligman. “The mixing distance”. In: *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 69.1 (July 1978). Publisher: American Institute of Physics, pp. 386–392. ISSN: 0021-9606. DOI: [10.1063/1.436364](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.436364).
- [12] A. W. Marshall, I. Olkin, and B. C. Arnold. *Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and Its Applications*. Springer Series in Statistics. New York, NY: Springer New York, 2011. ISBN: 978-0-387-40087-7 978-0-387-68276-1. DOI: [10.1007/978-0-387-68276-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-68276-1).
- [13] M. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim. “Fundamental limitations for quantum and nanoscale thermodynamics”. In: *Nature Communications* 4.1 (June 26, 2013). Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group, p. 2059. ISSN: 2041-1723. DOI: [10.1038/ncomms3059](https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms3059).
- [14] M. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim. “(Quantumness in the context of) resource theories”. In: *International Journal of Modern Physics B* 27.1 (Jan. 30, 2013). Publisher: World Scientific Publishing Co., p. 1345019. ISSN: 0217-9792. DOI: [10.1142/S0217979213450197](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217979213450197).
- [15] J. M. Renes. “Relative submajorization and its use in quantum resource theories”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 57.12 (Dec. 2016). Publisher: American Institute of Physics, p. 122202. ISSN: 0022-2488. DOI: [10.1063/1.4972295](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4972295).
- [16] G. Gour et al. “Quantum majorization and a complete set of entropic conditions for quantum thermodynamics”. In: *Nature Communications* 9.1 (Dec. 17, 2018). Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group, p. 5352. ISSN: 2041-1723. DOI: [10.1038/s41467-018-06261-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-06261-7).
- [17] X. Wang and M. M. Wilde. “Resource theory of asymmetric distinguishability”. In: *Physical Review Research* 1.3 (Dec. 11, 2019). Publisher: American Physical Society, p. 033170. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevResearch.1.033170](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevResearch.1.033170).
- [18] F. Buscemi, D. Sutter, and M. Tomamichel. “An information-theoretic treatment of quantum dichotomies”. In: *Quantum* 3 (Dec. 9, 2019). Publisher: Verein zur Förderung des Open Access Publizierens in den Quantenwissenschaften, p. 209. DOI: [10.22331/q-2019-12-09-209](https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2019-12-09-209).
- [19] K. Matsumoto. “Reverse Test and Characterization of Quantum Relative Entropy”. In: arXiv:1010.1030 (Oct. 5, 2010). DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.1010.1030](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1010.1030). arXiv: [1010.1030](https://arxiv.org/abs/1010.1030).
- [20] M. U. Farooq et al. *Asymptotic and catalytic matrix majorization*. Jan. 18, 2023. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2301.07353](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2301.07353). arXiv: [2301.07353](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.07353).
- [21] P. Lipka-Bartosik et al. “Quantum dichotomies and coherent thermodynamics beyond first-order asymptotics”. In: arXiv:2303.05524 (Mar. 9, 2023). DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2303.05524](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.05524). arXiv: [2303.05524](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.05524).
- [22] S. Kullback and R. A. Leibler. “On information and sufficiency”. In: *The annals of mathematical statistics* 22.1 (1951), pp. 79–86. DOI: [10.1214/aoms/1177729694](https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177729694).

- [23] F. Hiai. *Quantum f -Divergences in von Neumann Algebras*. Springer Singapore, 2021. DOI: [10.1007/978-981-33-4199-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-33-4199-9).
- [24] C. Datta et al. “Catalysis of entanglement and other quantum resources”. 2022. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.2207.05694](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2207.05694). arXiv: [2207.05694](https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.05694).
- [25] P. Lipka-Bartosik, H. Wilming, and N. H. Y. Ng. *Catalysis in Quantum Information Theory*. June 1, 2023. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2306.00798](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2306.00798). arXiv: [2306.00798](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.00798).
- [26] D. Jonathan and M. B. Plenio. “Entanglement-Assisted Local Manipulation of Pure Quantum States”. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 83.17 (Oct. 1999), pp. 3566–3569. ISSN: 0031-9007, 1079-7114. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.3566](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.3566).
- [27] F. Brandão et al. “The second laws of quantum thermodynamics”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112.11 (Mar. 17, 2015). Publisher: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, pp. 3275–3279. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.1411728112](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1411728112).
- [28] S. Rethinasamy and M. M. Wilde. “Relative entropy and catalytic relative majorization”. In: *Phys. Rev. Research* 2.3 (Sept. 2020), p. 033455. ISSN: 2643-1564. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevResearch.2.033455](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevResearch.2.033455).
- [29] T. Fritz. “Resource convertibility and ordered commutative monoids”. In: *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* 27.6 (Sept. 2017). Publisher: Cambridge University Press, pp. 850–938. ISSN: 0960-1295, 1469-8072. DOI: [10.1017/S0960129515000444](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129515000444).
- [30] M. Tomamichel. *Quantum Information Processing with Finite Resources*. Springer International Publishing, 2016. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-319-21891-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-21891-5).
- [31] M. Nussbaum and A. Szkoła. “The Chernoff lower bound for symmetric quantum hypothesis testing”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 37.2 (2009), pp. 1040–1057. DOI: [10.1214/08-AOS593](https://doi.org/10.1214/08-AOS593).
- [32] E. Chitambar and G. Gour. “Quantum resource theories”. In: *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 91.2 (Apr. 2019). Publisher: American Physical Society, p. 025001. DOI: [10.1103/RevModPhys.91.025001](https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.91.025001).
- [33] D. Janzing et al. “Thermodynamic Cost of Reliability and Low Temperatures: Tightening Landauer’s Principle and the Second Law”. In: *Int. J. Th. Phys.* 39 (2000), p. 2717. DOI: [10.1023/A:1026422630734](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026422630734).
- [34] F. G. S. L. Brandão et al. “Resource Theory of Quantum States Out of Thermal Equilibrium”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 111.25 (Dec. 18, 2013). Publisher: American Physical Society, p. 250404. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.250404](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.250404).
- [35] N. Yunger Halpern and J. M. Renes. “Beyond heat baths: Generalized resource theories for small-scale thermodynamics”. In: *Physical Review E* 93.2 (Feb. 18, 2016). Publisher: American Physical Society, p. 022126. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevE.93.022126](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.93.022126).
- [36] P. Hayden et al. “Structure of States Which Satisfy Strong Subadditivity of Quantum Entropy with Equality”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 246.2 (Apr. 2004), pp. 359–374. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-004-1049-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-004-1049-z).
- [37] A. S. Holevo, M. E. Shirokov, and R. F. Werner. *Separability and Entanglement-Breaking in Infinite Dimensions*. arXiv:quant-ph/0504204. Apr. 2005. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.quant-ph/0504204](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.quant-ph/0504204).
- [38] Y. Kuramochi. “Minimal sufficient statistical experiments on von Neumann algebras”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 58.6 (June 2017), p. 062203. DOI: [10.1063/1.4986247](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4986247).

- [39] M. Berta, O. Fawzi, and M. Tomamichel. “On variational expressions for quantum relative entropies”. In: *Letters in Mathematical Physics* 107.12 (Dec. 1, 2017), pp. 2239–2265. ISSN: 1573-0530. DOI: [10.1007/s11005-017-0990-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11005-017-0990-7).
- [40] T. Tao. *An introduction to measure theory*. Vol. 126. American Mathematical Soc., 2011.
- [41] V. P. Belavkin and P. Staszewski. “ C^* -algebraic generalization of relative entropy and entropy”. In: *Annales de l’institut Henri Poincaré. Section A, Physique Théorique* 37.1 (1982), pp. 51–58. ISSN: 2400-4863.
- [42] H. Araki. “On an inequality of Lieb and Thirring”. In: *Letters in Mathematical Physics* 19.2 (Feb. 1, 1990), pp. 167–170. ISSN: 1573-0530. DOI: [10.1007/BF01045887](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01045887).
- [43] E. H. Lieb and W. E. Thirring. “Inequalities for the Moments of the Eigenvalues of the Schrödinger Hamiltonian and Their Relation to Sobolev Inequalities”. In: *The Stability of Matter: From Atoms to Stars: Selecta of Elliott H. Lieb*. Ed. by E. H. Lieb and W. Thirring. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2005, pp. 205–239. ISBN: 978-3-540-27056-0. DOI: [10.1007/3-540-27056-6_16](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-27056-6_16).
- [44] F. Hiai. “Equality cases in matrix norm inequalities of golden-thompson type”. In: *Linear and Multilinear Algebra* 36.4 (Apr. 1, 1994). Publisher: Taylor & Francis _eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03081089408818297>, pp. 239–249. ISSN: 0308-1087. DOI: [10.1080/03081089408818297](https://doi.org/10.1080/03081089408818297).
- [45] N. Datta and F. Leditzky. “A limit of the quantum Rényi divergence”. In: *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 47.4 (Jan. 2014). Publisher: IOP Publishing, p. 045304. ISSN: 1751-8121. DOI: [10.1088/1751-8113/47/4/045304](https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/47/4/045304).
- [46] D. Sutter. *Approximate Quantum Markov Chains*. Vol. 28. SpringerBriefs in Mathematical Physics. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2018. ISBN: 978-3-319-78731-2 978-3-319-78732-9. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-319-78732-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-78732-9).
- [47] M. Merkle. “Completely Monotone Functions: A Digest”. In: *Analytic Number Theory, Approximation Theory, and Special Functions: In Honor of Hari M. Srivastava*. Ed. by G. V. Milovanović and M. T. Rassias. New York, NY: Springer, 2014, pp. 347–364. ISBN: 978-1-4939-0258-3. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4939-0258-3_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-0258-3_12).
- [48] A. M. Fink. “Kolmogorov-Landau inequalities for monotone functions”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 90.1 (Nov. 1, 1982), pp. 251–258. ISSN: 0022-247X. DOI: [10.1016/0022-247X\(82\)90057-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-247X(82)90057-9).
- [49] D. S. Mitrinović, J. E. Pečarić, and A. M. Fink. “Some Inequalities for Monotone Functions”. In: *Classical and New Inequalities in Analysis*. Ed. by D. S. Mitrinović, J. E. Pečarić, and A. M. Fink. Mathematics and Its Applications (). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 1993, pp. 365–378. ISBN: 978-94-017-1043-5. DOI: [10.1007/978-94-017-1043-5_13](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-1043-5_13).
- [50] A. Uhlmann. “Ordnungsstrukturen im Raume der gemischten Zustände und die H-Theoreme von Felderhof - van Kampen”. In: *Wiss. Z. Karl-Marx-Univ. Leipzig, Math.-Nat. R.* 27 (1978), pp. 213–228.
- [51] R. V. Kadison. “Isometries of Operator Algebras”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 54.2 (1951), pp. 325–338. ISSN: 0003486X.

- [52] P. Chansangiam. “A Survey on Operator Monotonicity, Operator Convexity, and Operator Means”. In: *International Journal of Analysis* 2015 (Nov. 2015). Ed. by J. Salomon. Publisher: Hindawi Publishing Corporation, p. 649839. ISSN: 2314-498X. DOI: [10.1155/2015/649839](https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/649839).
- [53] M. Mosonyi and F. Hiai. *Some continuity properties of quantum Rényi divergences*. June 27, 2023. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2209.00646](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2209.00646). arXiv: [2209.00646](https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.00646) [math-ph, physics:quant-ph].
- [54] P. Brown, H. Fawzi, and O. Fawzi. “Computing conditional entropies for quantum correlations”. In: *Nature Communications* 12.1 (2021).
- [55] H. Fawzi and O. Fawzi. “Defining quantum divergences via convex optimization”. In: *Quantum* 5 (Jan. 2021), p. 387. ISSN: 2521-327X. DOI: [10.22331/q-2021-01-26-387](https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2021-01-26-387).
- [56] B. Bergh, R. Salzmann, and N. Datta. “The $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ Limit of the Sharp Quantum Rényi Divergence”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 62.9 (Sept. 2021), p. 092205. ISSN: 0022-2488. DOI: [10.1063/5.0049791](https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0049791).
- [57] F. Hiai and D. Petz. “The Golden-Thompson trace inequality is complemented”. In: *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 181 (1993), pp. 153–185. ISSN: 0024-3795. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3795\(93\)90029-N](https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3795(93)90029-N).
- [58] M. Mosonyi and T. Ogawa. “Strong Converse Exponent for Classical-Quantum Channel Coding”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 355.1 (Oct. 2017), pp. 373–426. ISSN: 1432-0916. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-017-2928-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-017-2928-4).
- [59] M. Mosonyi, G. Bunth, and P. Vrana. *Geometric relative entropies and barycentric Rényi divergences*. 2023. arXiv: [2207.14282](https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.14282) [quant-ph].
- [60] K. M. R. Audenaert and N. Datta. “ α -z-Rényi relative entropies”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 56.2 (Feb. 18, 2015), p. 022202. ISSN: 0022-2488. DOI: [10.1063/1.4906367](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4906367).
- [61] H. Zhang. “Equality conditions of data processing inequality for α -z Rényi relative entropies”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 61 (2020), p. 102201.
- [62] S. Kato. *On α -z-Rényi divergence in the von Neumann algebra setting*. 2023. arXiv: [2311.01748](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.01748).
- [63] M. Mosonyi. “The Strong Converse Exponent of Discriminating Infinite-Dimensional Quantum States”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 400.1 (May 2023), pp. 83–132. ISSN: 1432-0916. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-022-04598-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-022-04598-1).