

Inevitable Negativity: Additivity Commands Negative Quantum Channel Entropy

Gilad Gour,¹ Doyeong Kim,² Takla Nateeboun,² Guy Shemesh,¹ and Goni Yoeli¹

¹*Department of Mathematics, Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel*

²*Department of Mathematics and Statistics and Institute for Quantum Science and Technology, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB T2N 1N4, Canada*

Quantum channels represent a broad spectrum of operations crucial to quantum information theory, encompassing everything from the transmission of quantum information to the manipulation of various resources. In the domain of states, the concept of majorization serves as a fundamental tool for comparing the uncertainty inherent in both classical and quantum systems. This paper establishes a rigorous framework for assessing the uncertainty in both classical and quantum channels. By employing a specific class of superchannels, we introduce and elucidate three distinct approaches to channel majorization: constructive, axiomatic, and operational. Intriguingly, these methodologies converge to a consistent ordering. This convergence not only provides a robust basis for defining entropy functions for channels but also clarifies the interpretation of entropy in this broader context. Most notably, our findings reveal that any viable entropy function for quantum channels must assume negative values, thereby challenging traditional notions of entropy.

Contents

I. Introduction	1
II. Classical Channel Majorization	2
A. Constructive approach	3
B. Axiomatic Approach	3
C. Operational approach	4
D. Equivalence	5
E. The Standard Form	5
F. Characterization	6
G. Lower-dimensional Cases	7
III. Quantum Channel Majorization	7
A. Mixing Superchannels	8
B. The Preorder of Channel Majorization	9
C. Relationship to Conditional Majorization	10
D. The Case of Different Output Dimensions	11
IV. Channel Entropy	11
A. Definition and General Properties	12
B. Examples of Channel Entropies	12
C. Entropy of Classical Channels	13
D. Quantum Additivity Implies Negativity	14
V. Conclusions	15
References	16
A. Appendix	17

I. Introduction

Majorization is a pivotal concept in linear algebra, extensively covered in the seminal text by Marshall and Olkin. Its utility spans a variety of fields, including economics, thermodynamics, and quantum information theory, illustrating its broad applicability and fundamental importance. In quantum information, majorization plays a crucial role in the characterization and manipulation of quantum states, as highlighted by Nielsen's majorization theorem [1, 2]. This theorem posits that the interconvertibility among pure bipartite quantum states via local operations and classical communication (LOCC) is governed by a majorization relation between their Schmidt coefficients. Such insights are not only foundational to the understanding of quantum entanglement but also instrumental in applications like entanglement distillation, quantum state discrimination, and quantum key distribution [3, 4]. Over the years, the theory of majorization has evolved to become an indispensable toolkit in quantum information science [5–11].

The majorization relationship between two probability vectors involves a mixing operation that transforms one vector into the other. Specifically, for two probability vectors \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} , we state that $\mathbf{p} \succ \mathbf{q}$ if there is a mixing operation M such that:

$$\mathbf{q} = M\mathbf{p}. \quad (1)$$

This mixing operation must not reduce the uncertainty of the distribution associated with a probability vector; in other words, $\mathbf{p} \succ \mathbf{q}$ indicates that

the system represented by \mathbf{q} is at least as uncertain as that represented by \mathbf{p} . Three distinct conceptual approaches define these mixing operations:

1. *The Constructive Approach:* Here, the mixing operation is defined as a convex combination of permutation matrices. Thus, M in this context is a mixing operation if it can be expressed as $\sum_{j \in [k]} s_j P_j$, mimicking the effect of randomly relabeling outcomes [12].
2. *The Axiomatic Approach:* This approach defines mixing operations as those that preserve the uniform distribution, expressed as $M\mathbf{u}^{(n)} = \mathbf{u}^{(n)}$. This ensures that the most uncertain distribution, the uniform distribution, remains unchanged. Such operations are represented by doubly stochastic matrices.
3. *The Operational Approach:* In this approach, a mixing operation is an $m \times m$ stochastic matrix M that does not enhance the odds of winning a game of chance, formalized as:

$$\Pr_k(\mathbf{p}) \geq \Pr_k(M\mathbf{p}) \quad \forall k \in [m] \quad (2)$$

where \Pr_k represents the probability of winning a k -game, in which a player makes k distinct predictions about outcomes drawn from \mathbf{p} [13].

Remarkably, these three characterizations of mixing operations – constructive, axiomatic, and operational – have been demonstrated to coincide, as highlighted in Birkhoff’s seminal work [14]. Consequently, these approaches are collectively termed as *mixing operations*. This convergence establishes a robust foundation for understanding the concept of uncertainty in systems described with probability vectors. It is worth noting that the recently introduced concept of conditional majorization [15], developed through the same three distinct approaches, has consistently been shown to result in the same pre-order of conditional majorization.

Functions that behave monotonically under majorization are known as Schur convex or Schur concave. Additionally, Schur concave functions that are additive under tensor products are referred to as entropies [16]. Very recently, it was demonstrated that under this definition of entropy, every entropy function can be expressed as a convex combination of Rényi entropies [17]. Thus, the combination of monotonicity under majorization and additivity provides a sufficient framework, establishing that Rényi entropies are the only functions that qualify as entropies, unless the axiom of additivity is removed.

In this paper, we expand the concept of majorization from probability vectors to classical and quantum channels. This expansion, known as channel majorization, evaluates the uncertainty of a channel’s output given a known input. Within the classical-channel domain, we propose three distinct definitions of channel majorization based on the constructive, axiomatic, and operational approaches discussed above, demonstrating their alignment and thus reinforcing the concept of channel majorization. We also establish a standard form for channel majorization and provide characterizations in terms of sublinear functionals, as well as simpler characterizations in lower dimensions.

These definitions are further extended to quantum channels, where we define entropy functions as those that behave monotonically under mixing superchannels and exhibit additivity. Under these foundational assumptions, we show that the entropy of every quantum channel must assume negative values, aligning with similar findings for conditional entropies in earlier work [15]. Furthermore, modifying the requirement so that the entropy of a quantum channel is only weakly additive – additive when taking tensor products of any number of copies of the same channel – indicates that negativity is not a necessity. This distinction underscores the principle that “quantum additivity implies negativity.”

II. Classical Channel Majorization

Consider two classical channels, $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{X' \rightarrow Y}$. Initially, we aim to establish a majorization relation between them under the assumption that the output system Y is identical for both channels, as channel majorization fundamentally compares the uncertainty of two channels relative to the same output system. Subsequently, we extend this notion to accommodate $\mathcal{M}^{X' \rightarrow Y'}$ where $|Y| \neq |Y'|$, by embedding the smaller output space into the larger one, similar to how vector majorization is adapted to vectors of different dimensions. This method enables a broader comparison of channel uncertainties across various output sizes. Furthermore, in any feasible definition of channel majorization, it is expected that the channel-majorization preorder would reduce to vector majorization when the input dimensions of the channels are trivial (i.e., $|X| = |X'| = 1$), since in this scenario, each channel can be effectively represented by a probability vector.

To achieve this, we motivate our definition

through three distinct approaches. As mentioned earlier, all approaches cohesively establish the same ordering within the realm of classical channels, thus providing a robust foundation for our definition of channel majorization. Similar to the definition of majorization, in all the definitions presented below, we state that a channel \mathcal{N} majorizes another channel \mathcal{M} if there exists a mixing superchannel Θ such that $\mathcal{M} = \Theta[\mathcal{N}]$. While these approaches offer different perspectives on how to define the mixing operation Θ , as we will see the outcomes of these three approaches ultimately converge.

A. Constructive approach

In the constructive approach, we propose to construct a mixing operation as it is intuitively suggested. Specifically, a mixing operation Θ is a stochastic map obtained by Bob applying a random permutation post-processing (i.e., doubly stochastic map) to his system Y conditioned on information received from Alice's pre-processing channel. We call such superchannels *random permutation superchannels*. Mathematically, for every classical channel $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}$

$$\Theta[\mathcal{N}] := \mathcal{D}^{YZ \rightarrow Y} \circ \mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y} \circ \mathcal{S}^{X' \rightarrow XZ}, \quad (3)$$

where Z is the classical system Alice sends to Bob after she processes her input system X' via the channel $\mathcal{S}^{X' \rightarrow XZ}$. Upon receiving the value z of the classical system Z , Bob applies a mixing operation to his system Y described by the doubly stochastic channel

$$\mathcal{D}_z^{Y \rightarrow Y}(\rho^Y) := \mathcal{D}^{YZ \rightarrow Y}(\rho^Y \otimes |z\rangle\langle z|^Z), \quad (4)$$

for all classical (i.e., diagonal) density matrices ρ^Y . If \mathcal{D}_z is doubly stochastic for all z , we say that $\mathcal{D}^{YZ \rightarrow Y}$ is a conditionally unital channel.

Definition 1. The channel \mathcal{N} majorizes \mathcal{M} *constructively* if there exists a random permutation superchannel Θ of the form (3) such that $\mathcal{M} = \Theta[\mathcal{N}]$.

B. Axiomatic Approach

In the axiomatic approach, we establish our framework based on a minimalistic axiom, which we consider fundamental for any reasonable definition of a




FIG. 1: A diagram of random permutation superchannel Θ . The classical preprocessing \mathcal{S} sends z to Bob. Bob applies a random permutation channel \mathcal{D}_z corresponding to the received z .

mixing operation. Take, for example, the completely randomizing channel $\mathcal{R}^{X \rightarrow Y}$, which outputs the uniform distribution \mathbf{u}^Y for every input state. We refer to this channel as a *uniform channel*, as it consistently outputs $y \in [n]$ (where $n := |Y|$) with uniform probability $1/n$, regardless of the input $x \in [m]$ (where $m := |X|$). Consequently, having access to X does not reduce the uncertainty associated with Y , marking this channel as having the highest degree of uncertainty or the least degree of predictability about the output system Y .

Furthermore, any stochastic superchannel that does not decrease the conditional uncertainty of the output must map a uniform channel to a uniform channel. Specifically, such a superchannel Θ must satisfy:

$$\Theta[\mathcal{R}^{X \rightarrow Y}] = \mathcal{R}^{X' \rightarrow Y}. \quad (5)$$

We term such superchannels *uniformity-preserving*. This assumption is notably minimal, as it merely asserts that if Y is initially maximally uncertain, then a mixing operation should not reduce this maximal uncertainty.

Is this the only requirement we should impose on Θ ? We propose an additional necessary condition for Θ to be considered a valid mixing operation, which is deeply rooted in the physical properties similar to the requirement that quantum processes (e.g., quantum channels) must be completely positive, not just positive. Consider a bipartite channel $\mathcal{N}^{XZ_0 \rightarrow YZ_1}$ to be *marginally uniform* if, for any classical (i.e., diagonal) states ρ^{XZ_0} , it holds that:

$$\mathcal{N}^{XZ_0 \rightarrow YZ_1}(\rho^{XZ_0}) = \mathbf{u}^Y \otimes \sigma^{Z_1} \quad (6)$$

where $\sigma^{Z_1} := \mathcal{N}^{XZ_0 \rightarrow Z_1}(\rho^{XZ_0})$, with $\mathcal{N}^{XZ_0 \rightarrow Z_1} := \text{Tr}_Y \circ \mathcal{N}^{XZ_0 \rightarrow YZ_1}$, is a classical density matrix, potentially dependent on ρ^{XZ_0} . Each marginally uni-

form channel can be expressed as:

$$\mathcal{N}^{XZ_0 \rightarrow YZ_1} = \mathbf{u}^Y \otimes \mathcal{N}^{XZ_0 \rightarrow Z_1}, \quad (7)$$

where $\mathcal{N}^{XZ_0 \rightarrow Z_1}$ is a channel from systems XZ_0 to Z_1 . In this context, a superchannel Θ must be *completely uniformity-preserving*, meaning for every dynamical system $Z := (Z_0, Z_1)$, and any marginally uniform channel $\mathcal{N}^{XZ_0 \rightarrow YZ_1}$, the channel

$$\mathcal{M}^{X'Z_0 \rightarrow YZ_1} := \Theta \otimes \mathbf{1}^Z[\mathcal{N}^{XZ_0 \rightarrow YZ_1}], \quad (8)$$

should also remain marginally uniform. Here, $\mathbf{1}^Z$ denotes the identity superchannel on the dynamical system Z . Interestingly, we demonstrate in the appendix that there are uniformity-preserving superchannels that are not *completely* uniformity-preserving. Therefore, in our axiomatic approach, it is insufficient for Θ to merely preserve uniformity; it must ensure complete uniformity preservation. Thus, we arrive at the following axiomatic definition of channel-majorization:

Definition 2. $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}$ majorizes $\mathcal{M}^{X' \rightarrow Y}$ *axiomatically* if there exists a completely uniformity-preserving superchannel Θ such that $\mathcal{M} = \Theta[\mathcal{N}]$.




FIG. 2: A completely uniformity-preserving superchannel. Sharply squiggly lines represent systems in their maximally mixed (i.e., uniform) state.

C. Operational approach

In the operational approach, we explore a gambling game utilizing a given channel $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}$, where $m := |X|$ and $n := |Y|$. This game, previously discussed in [18], allows a player complete control over the input system X and challenges them to accurately predict the output Y . To illustrate the




FIG. 3: A diagram of a \mathbf{t} -gambling game with channel $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}$. The \mathbf{t} source determines which k -game to play. Initially, the player, Alice, learns k partially from w , based on which she chooses x to input the channel \mathcal{N} . Once the k value is announced, she provides k guesses of the value y based on her chosen x .

core concept, we begin with a simplified version of the game, similar to the k -game introduced earlier, where the player makes k predictions about Y , the output of channel \mathcal{N} , after selecting the optimal input for \mathcal{N} . The maximal winning probability for this k -game is given as:

$$\Pr_k(\mathcal{N}) = \max_{x \in [m]} \|\mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle x|)\|_{(k)}, \quad (9)$$

where the maximization covers all channel inputs. Each $\mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle x|)$ corresponds to a diagonal density matrix, effectively represented by a probability vector $\mathbf{p}_x \in \text{Prob}(n)$. Note that the components of \mathbf{p}_x , denoted as $\{p_{y|x}\}_{y \in [n]}$, representing the transition matrix of the classical channel \mathcal{N} . With these notations, the maximum winning probability is simplified to

$$\Pr_k(\mathcal{N}) = \max_{x \in [m]} \|\mathbf{p}_x\|_{(k)} \quad (10)$$

This k -game represents just one of many potential gambling games that can be conducted with a classical channel. We aim to generalize this concept and introduce the most comprehensive gambling game achievable with a single use of the channel \mathcal{N} . Consider a scenario where $k \in [n]$ is chosen randomly according to a distribution $\mathbf{t} \in \text{Prob}(n)$. In this setup, the player initially knows only the distribution \mathbf{t} , not k itself. The player may learn k either before or after selecting the channel input, leading

to two distinct optimal winning probabilities:

$$\text{learn before: } \sum_{k \in [n]} t_k \max_{x \in [m]} \|\mathbf{p}_x\|_{(k)} \quad (11)$$

$$\text{learn after: } \max_{x \in [m]} \sum_{k \in [n]} t_k \|\mathbf{p}_x\|_{(k)}, \quad (12)$$

That is, when the player is aware of the specific k -game to be played, she selects the input $x \in [m]$ that maximizes her winning probability $\|\mathbf{p}_x\|_{(k)}$. However, if she does not know k , her optimal strategy involves selecting x to maximize the average probability $\sum_{k \in [n]} t_k \|\mathbf{p}_x\|_{(k)}$.

The two game variations can be unified into a family of games, which we call the \mathbf{t} -*gambling game*. Unlike the discussion above, here we assume that $\mathbf{t} \in \text{Prob}(n\ell)$ is a joint probability vector whose components are denoted by t_{kw} , where $k \in [n]$ signifies the selection of the k -game to be played, and $w \in [\ell]$ signifies the information the player acquires before choosing the channel's input. We also denote by $t_w := \sum_{k \in [n]} t_{kw}$ the probability that a player will receive the value w and by $t_{k|w} := t_{kw}/t_w$ the conditional probability that a k -game will be played given that the player received w . If there is no correlation between the systems, i.e., $t_{k|w}$ does not depend on w , then the game reduces to the game in which the player learns k after selecting the input to the channel. On the other hand, the case of perfect correlation between the systems, i.e., $t_{k|w} = \delta_{kw}$, corresponds to the case where the player knows k before the input selection.

Once the player receives $w \in [\ell]$, the player chooses an optimal choice $x \in [m]$ that maximizes $\sum_{k \in [n]} t_{k|w} \|\mathbf{p}_x\|_{(k)}$ as the channel input. Thus, the optimal winning probability for such a \mathbf{t} -game with a channel \mathcal{N} can be expressed as:

$$\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{N}) = \sum_{w \in [\ell]} t_w \max_{x \in [m]} \sum_{k \in [n]} t_{k|w} \|\mathbf{p}_x\|_{(k)}. \quad (13)$$

The \mathbf{t} -game above represents the most general gambling game that can be played with a single use of a channel.

Definition 3. We say that \mathcal{N} majorizes \mathcal{M} *operationally* if for every \mathbf{t} -game

$$\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{N}) \geq \text{Pr}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{M}). \quad (14)$$

D. Equivalence

The three distinct approaches proposed above lead to the same preorder on classical channels.

Theorem 4. Given two classical channels \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} , the following are equivalent:

1. \mathcal{N} majorizes \mathcal{M} constructively
2. \mathcal{N} majorizes \mathcal{M} axiomatically
3. \mathcal{N} majorizes \mathcal{M} operationally

Henceforth we will simply say that \mathcal{N} majorizes \mathcal{M} , and symbolically $\mathcal{N} \succ \mathcal{M}$, if any of the equivalent conditions above hold.

In proving the equivalence between the constructive and axiomatic approaches, we demonstrate something slightly stronger than what is stated in the theorem. Specifically, we show that the set of completely uniformity-preserving operations is exactly equal to the set of random permutation superchannels. This means that not only is the concept of channel majorization equivalent, but the set of mixing operations is unique. We will refer to both random permutation superchannels and completely uniformity-preserving operations simply as *mixing operations*.

E. The Standard Form

The majorization preorder on probability vectors becomes a partial order when restricted to elements in $\text{Prob}^{\downarrow}(n)$, the set of all probability vectors with entries in non-increasing order. That is, if $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \text{Prob}^{\downarrow}(n)$ then the equivalence relation $\mathbf{p} \sim \mathbf{q}$, i.e., $\mathbf{p} \succ \mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{q} \succ \mathbf{p}$, can hold only if $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q}$. Here we establish a similar result for channel majorization by introducing a similar standard form. We say that two channels \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} are equivalent under majorization, and write $\mathcal{N} \sim \mathcal{M}$, if $\mathcal{N} \succ \mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M} \succ \mathcal{N}$. In the definition below we consider a channel $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}$ with $m := |X|$, $n := |Y|$ and an $n \times m$ transition (stochastic) matrix $N := [\mathbf{p}_1 \cdots \mathbf{p}_m]$, where for each $x \in [m]$ the probability vector \mathbf{p}_x is the diagonal of $\mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle x|)$.

Definition 5. \mathcal{N} is given in its standard form if:

1. $\mathbf{p}_x = \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow$ for all $x \in [m]$.
2. Every column of N is *not* majorized by a convex combination of other columns of N .
3. For all $x \in [m-1]$ there exists $\ell \in [n]$ such that $\|\mathbf{p}_x\|_{(k)} = \|\mathbf{p}_{x+1}\|_{(k)}$ for all $k \in [\ell-1]$ and $\|\mathbf{p}_x\|_{(\ell)} > \|\mathbf{p}_{x+1}\|_{(\ell)}$.

From this definition it follows that for every channel $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}$ with an $n \times m$ transition matrix N , there exists a standard form with an $n \times m'$ transition matrix N' obtained from N in three steps:

1. For every $x \in [m]$ replace \mathbf{p}_x with \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow .
2. Remove every column of N that is majorized by a convex combination of other columns of N . This will result in an $n \times m'$ column stochastic matrix \tilde{N} with $m' \leq m$.
3. Rearrange the columns \tilde{N} such that for all $x \in [m'-1]$ the first $\ell \in [n]$ for which $\|\mathbf{p}_x\|_{(\ell)} \neq \|\mathbf{p}_{x+1}\|_{(\ell)}$ satisfies $\|\mathbf{p}_x\|_{(\ell)} > \|\mathbf{p}_{x+1}\|_{(\ell)}$.

After the third step, the resulting matrix N' is in the standard form and we have $\mathcal{N} \sim \mathcal{N}'$.

As an example, consider the case $n := |Y| = 2$. Here, the transition matrix of a channel $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}$ has a transition matrix of the form

$$N = \begin{bmatrix} r_1 & r_2 & \cdots & r_m \\ 1 - r_1 & 1 - r_2 & \cdots & 1 - r_m \end{bmatrix} \quad (15)$$

where without loss of generality we assume that $1 \geq r_1 \geq \cdots \geq r_m \geq 1/2$. This means that the first column $(r_1, 1 - r_1)^T$ majorizes all the other columns! Hence, the standard form of this transition matrix is the channel with trivial input given by the vector (diagonal density matrix) $(r_1, 1 - r_1)^T$. Note that this example demonstrates that if the transition matrix of the standard form of a classical channel $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}$ has more than one column then necessarily $|Y| > 2$.

In the next theorem (proven in the appendix) we show that there is no freedom left in the definition above in the sense that if $\mathcal{N} \sim \mathcal{M}$, and if both \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} are given in their standard form, then necessarily $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M}$.

Theorem 6. Using the above notations, $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y} \sim \mathcal{M}^{X' \rightarrow Y}$ if and only if $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y} = \mathcal{M}^{X' \rightarrow Y}$ (in particular, $X \cong X'$).

F. Characterization

A classical channel can be fully represented with a transition matrix. One can look at the transition matrix as a collection of probability vectors that are conditioned on the input. From this perspective, we can relate channel majorization to the majorization relation between sets of probability vectors. Compactly, classical channel majorization can be characterized by set majorization, which is defined as follows.

Definition 7. Let $\mathfrak{K}_1, \mathfrak{K}_2 \subseteq \text{Prob}(n)$. We say that $\mathfrak{K}_1 \succ \mathfrak{K}_2$ (as sets) if for every $\mathbf{q} \in \mathfrak{K}_2$ there exists $\mathbf{p} \in \mathfrak{K}_1$ such that $\mathbf{p} \succ \mathbf{q}$.

In the following theorem we consider two classical channels $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{X' \rightarrow Y}$, with $n := |Y|$, $m := |X|$, and $m' := |X'|$. Moreover, we denote each column of the transition matrices of \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} as

$$\mathbf{p}_x := \mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle x|) \quad \forall x \in [m] \quad (16)$$

and

$$\mathbf{q}_y := \mathcal{M}(|y\rangle\langle y|) \quad \forall y \in [m']. \quad (17)$$

Recall that in the classical domain, we view diagonal density matrices as probability vectors. Since we assume that the transition matrices of \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} are given in their standard form, we have in particular that $\mathbf{p}_x = \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow$ for all $x \in [m]$, and similarly $\mathbf{q}_y = \mathbf{q}_y^\downarrow$ for all $y \in [m']$. Finally, we will denote by $\text{Conv}(\mathcal{N})$ and $\text{Conv}(\mathcal{M})$ the convex hulls of the sets $\{\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m\}$ and $\{\mathbf{q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{q}_{m'}\}$, respectively. In the following theorem, we provide several characterizations of channel majorization. In the appendix, we also show that whether \mathcal{N} majorizes \mathcal{M} can be determined efficiently with a linear program.

Theorem 8. The following are equivalent:

1. $\mathcal{N} \succ \mathcal{M}$.
2. $\text{Conv}(\mathcal{N}) \succ \text{Conv}(\mathcal{M})$.
3. There exists an $m \times m'$ stochastic matrix $S = (s_{x|w})$ such that

$$\sum_{x \in [m]} s_{x|w} \mathbf{p}_x \succ \mathbf{q}_w \quad \forall w \in [m']. \quad (18)$$

4. For all $\mathbf{s} \in \text{Prob}^\downarrow(n)$

$$\max_{x \in [m]} \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_x \geq \max_{w \in [m']} \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{q}_w. \quad (19)$$

G. Lower-dimensional Cases

In the simple scenario where $|X| = |X'| = 1$, it is straightforward to verify that the majorization relationship $\mathcal{N} \succ \mathcal{M}$ corresponds to vector majorization. Similarly, when dealing with a two-dimensional output space, i.e., $|Y| = 2$, the situation remains straightforward as each channel $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}$ can be represented in a standard form that assumes a trivial input, as outlined in the discussion around Eq. (15). We now turn our attention to more complex cases. Let us define $m := |X|$, $m' := |X'|$, and $n := |Y|$, assuming that the channels are described in their standard forms to facilitate a more nuanced exploration of their properties.

Example 1. The case $m = 1$ (and $n, m' > 1$). In this case $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}$ can be viewed as a probability vector $\mathbf{p} \in \text{Prob}(n)$. Using the notations in (17) we obtain from (18) that $\mathbf{p} \succ \mathcal{M}$ if and only if $\mathbf{p} \succ \mathbf{q}_w$ for all $w \in [m']$. It is worth mentioning that it is well known [19–21] that the set $\{\mathbf{q}_w\}_{w \in [m']}$ has an optimal upper bound $\mathbf{r} \in \text{Prob}(n)$ with the property that $\mathbf{r} \succ \mathbf{q}_w$ for all $w \in [m']$, and if also $\mathbf{p} \succ \mathbf{q}_w$ for all $w \in [m']$ then necessarily $\mathbf{p} \succ \mathbf{r}$. We give the explicit form of \mathbf{r} in the appendix and conclude here that $\mathbf{p} \succ \mathcal{M}$ if and only if $\mathbf{p} \succ \mathbf{r}$.

Example 2. The case $m = 2$. Interestingly, this case can also be solved analytically. Note that it is more general than the first example with $m = 1$. In this case, the matrix S that appears in (18) has only two rows, and since it is column stochastic, each of its columns has the form $(t_w, 1 - t_w)^T$, where for each $w \in [m']$, $t_w := s_{1|w}$. Hence, we get from the theorem above, particularly (18), that $\mathcal{N} \succ \mathcal{M}$ if and only if for every $w \in [m']$ there exists $t_w \in [0, 1]$

such that

$$t_w \mathbf{p}_1 + (1 - t_w) \mathbf{p}_2 \succ \mathbf{q}_w. \quad (20)$$

Since the channels are given in their standard form, the components of all the probability vectors above are arranged in non-increasing order. Thus, in terms of the Ky-Fan norms, the relation above is equivalent to the condition that for all $w \in [m']$ and all $k \in [n]$ we have

$$t_w \|\mathbf{p}_1\|_{(k)} + (1 - t_w) \|\mathbf{p}_2\|_{(k)} \geq \|\mathbf{q}_w\|_{(k)}. \quad (21)$$

Rearranging terms, this can be expressed as

$$t_w (\|\mathbf{p}_1\|_{(k)} - \|\mathbf{p}_2\|_{(k)}) \geq \|\mathbf{q}_w\|_{(k)} - \|\mathbf{p}_2\|_{(k)}. \quad (22)$$

To divide both sides by $\|\mathbf{p}_1\|_{(k)} - \|\mathbf{p}_2\|_{(k)}$, we employ the notations \mathcal{J}_+ , \mathcal{J}_- , and \mathcal{J}_0 to represent subsets of integers $k \in [n]$ for which $\|\mathbf{p}_1\|_{(k)} - \|\mathbf{p}_2\|_{(k)}$ is positive, negative, or zero, respectively. Thus, for $k \in \mathcal{J}_+$ we divide both sides of (22) by the expression $\|\mathbf{p}_1\|_{(k)} - \|\mathbf{p}_2\|_{(k)} > 0$ to get

$$t_w \geq \mu_w := \max \left\{ 0, \max_{k \in \mathcal{J}_+} \frac{\|\mathbf{q}_w\|_{(k)} - \|\mathbf{p}_2\|_{(k)}}{\|\mathbf{p}_1\|_{(k)} - \|\mathbf{p}_2\|_{(k)}} \right\}. \quad (23)$$

For $k \in \mathcal{J}_-$ we have $\|\mathbf{p}_1\|_{(k)} - \|\mathbf{p}_2\|_{(k)} < 0$ so that the division of both sides of (22) by $\|\mathbf{p}_1\|_{(k)} - \|\mathbf{p}_2\|_{(k)}$ flip the inequality. Hence,

$$t_w \leq \nu_w := \min \left\{ 1, \min_{k \in \mathcal{J}_-} \frac{\|\mathbf{p}_2\|_{(k)} - \|\mathbf{q}_w\|_{(k)}}{\|\mathbf{p}_2\|_{(k)} - \|\mathbf{p}_1\|_{(k)}} \right\}. \quad (24)$$

Finally, for $k \in \mathcal{J}_0$ the left-hand side of (22) is zero so that $\|\mathbf{p}_2\|_{(k)} \geq \|\mathbf{q}_w\|_{(k)}$. Hence, we conclude that $\mathcal{N} \succ; \text{ftf} \mathcal{M}$ if and only if for every $w \in [m']$ the following conditions hold:

1. $\nu_w \geq \mu_w$.
2. For all $k \in \mathcal{J}_0$, $\|\mathbf{p}_2\|_{(k)} \geq \|\mathbf{q}_w\|_{(k)}$.

These two conditions ensure that for each $w \in [m']$ there exists $t_w \in [0, 1]$ satisfying (20).

III. Quantum Channel Majorization

In this section, we extend the definition of channel majorization to the quantum domain. Since the extension of games of chance does not follow trivially [22], we will consider here only two approaches: the axiomatic and constructive approaches. We will see that like in the classical case, the two approaches

lead to the same definition of quantum channel majorization.

Our focus will be on examining the transition from one quantum channel $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ to another quantum channel $\mathcal{M} \in \text{CPTP}(A' \rightarrow B)$. The superchannel facilitating this evolution will be denoted by Θ . It's important to note that we consider the conversion of the dynamics $A \rightarrow B$ into the dynamics $A' \rightarrow B$; in essence, it represents the evolution of evolution itself.

Every superchannel Θ can be implemented with an auxiliary system R , a channel $\mathcal{E} \in \text{CPTP}(RB \rightarrow B)$, and isometry $\mathcal{V} \in \text{CPTP}(A' \rightarrow RA)$. For any channel $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$, the action of Θ is described by [23, 24]

$$\Theta[\mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B}] = \mathcal{E}^{RB \rightarrow B} \circ \mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B} \circ \mathcal{V}^{A' \rightarrow RA}. \quad (25)$$

Furthermore, as established in [24], the minimal dimension of R is determined by the rank of the marginal of the Choi matrix $\mathbf{J}_{\Theta}^{AA'}$, which implies that $|R| \leq |AA'|$. A superchannel Θ is said to be in its *standard form* if it is represented as in the above equation with $|R|$ minimized to its feasible lowest dimension. Note that the above superchannel can be interpreted as Alice applies the pre-processing isometry $\mathcal{V}^{A' \rightarrow RA}$ and sends the (correlated) quantum system R to Bob, who then applies the post-processing channel $\mathcal{E}^{RB \rightarrow B}$.

Quantum channel majorization is a pre-order relationship defined between two quantum channels, $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ and $\mathcal{M} \in \text{CPTP}(A' \rightarrow B)$. Analogous to its classical counterpart, this pre-order is established through the concept of a mixing superchannel, denoted as Θ . The primary objective is to formulate a robust and precise definition of such a mixing superchannel, which effectively captures the essence of uncertainty or the degree of predictability in quantum channels.

A. Mixing Superchannels

The Constructive Approach

Consider the superchannel Θ as given in (25). This form of a superchannel is the same one we used in the classical domain, but with all quantum systems (e.g., A , A' , etc) replaced with classical counterparts (cf. (3)). Building on this similarity, recall that in the classical domain, a classical mixing superchannel was defined in such a way that upon receiving the classical system R (which we de-

noted earlier by Z), Bob applies a doubly stochastic channel. That is, we required that the channel $\mathcal{E}_z^{B \rightarrow B}(\cdot) := \mathcal{E}^{RB \rightarrow B}(|z\rangle\langle z| \otimes (\cdot))$ is doubly stochastic.

Similarly, in the quantum case, we replace the classical message z that was received from Alice with a quantum state τ^R . That is, we require that Bob processes the information sent by Alice on the system R , which arrives in the form of a marginal quantum state τ^R , and chooses a doubly stochastic channel

$$\mathcal{E}_{\tau}^{B \rightarrow B}(\omega^B) := \mathcal{E}^{RB \rightarrow B}(\tau^R \otimes \omega^B). \quad (26)$$

That is, we require that \mathcal{E}_{τ} is a doubly stochastic channel for every choice of $\tau \in \mathfrak{D}(R)$. Every channel $\mathcal{E}^{RB \rightarrow B}$ that satisfies the condition above is said to be *conditionally unital*.

Definition 9. Let Θ be in its standard form as in (25). Θ is said to be a *mixing operation* if $\mathcal{E}^{RB \rightarrow B}$ is conditionally unital.

The Axiomatic Approach

Let $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(AC_0 \rightarrow BC_1)$ and denote its marginal

$$\mathcal{N}^{AC_0 \rightarrow B} := \text{Tr}_{C_1} \circ \mathcal{N}^{AC_0 \rightarrow BC_1}. \quad (27)$$

Similar to the classical case, we say that a quantum channel $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(AC_0 \rightarrow BC_1)$ is *marginally uniform* with respect to B if

$$\mathcal{N}^{AC_0 \rightarrow BC_1} = \mathbf{u}^B \otimes \mathcal{N}^{AC_0 \rightarrow C_1}. \quad (28)$$

Alternatively, a quantum channel $\mathcal{N}^{AC_0 \rightarrow BC_1}$ is marginally uniform if

$$\mathcal{N}^{AC_0 \rightarrow BC_1} = \mathcal{R}^B \circ \mathcal{N}^{AC_0 \rightarrow BC_1}, \quad (29)$$

where $\mathcal{R}^B \in \text{CPTP}(B \rightarrow B)$ is the uniform channel (also known as a completely randomizing channel, or completely depolarizing channel). The mixing operation then should preserve the maximally mixed state on B . This leads to the following definition in the quantum case.




FIG. 4: The superchannel Θ maintains the marginal uniformity of the channel $\text{id}^{A \rightarrow C} \otimes \mathbf{u}^B$.

Definition 10. A superchannel Θ is said to be *completely uniformity-preserving* if for every pair of systems $C := (C_0, C_1)$, and every marginally uniform channel $\mathcal{N}^{AC_0 \rightarrow BC_1}$ with respect to B , the channel

$$\mathcal{M}^{A'C_0 \rightarrow B'C_1} := \Theta \otimes \mathbb{1}^C [\mathcal{N}^{AC_0 \rightarrow BC_1}] \quad (30)$$

is marginally uniform with respect to B' .

At first, the definition of channel majorization involving the unbounded dimensions of C might appear complex, particularly because it requires verifying that the channel \mathcal{M} remains marginally uniform across all marginally uniform choices of \mathcal{N} . However, building on Choi's work, which characterizes completely positive maps by the preservation of positivity for a specific operator — the maximally entangled state [25] — we introduce a streamlined approach. In the appendix, we demonstrate that a superchannel Θ preserves complete uniformity if and only if it maintains the marginal uniformity of a particular channel:

$$\mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow BC} = \text{id}^{A \rightarrow C} \otimes \mathbf{u}^B, \quad (31)$$

where we took $|C_0| = 1$ so that $C = C_1$ is a replica of A . That is, Θ is completely uniformity-preserving if the channel

$$\Theta \otimes \mathbb{1}^C [\text{id}^{A \rightarrow C} \otimes \mathbf{u}^B] \quad (32)$$

is marginally uniform with respect to B (see Fig. 4).

Now, just like in the classical case, the notions of mixing operations and completely uniformity-preserving coincide.

Theorem 11. A superchannel is a mixing operation if and only if it is completely uniformity preserving.

The theorem above states that every superchannel as given in (25) is completely uniformity preserving if and only if the channel \mathcal{E}_τ as defined in (26) is doubly stochastic for every choice of density matrix τ^R . This equivalence between the constructive and axiomatic approaches provides a compelling motivation for the following definition of channel majorization.

B. The Preorder of Channel Majorization

In the following definition, we consider two quantum channels $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ and $\mathcal{M} \in \text{CPTP}(A' \rightarrow B)$.

Definition 12. We say that \mathcal{N} majorizes \mathcal{M} and write $\mathcal{N} \succ \mathcal{M}$, if there exists a mixing superchannel Θ such that $\mathcal{M} = \Theta[\mathcal{N}]$.

We will also use the notation $\mathcal{N} \sim \mathcal{M}$ if both $\mathcal{N} \succ \mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M} \succ \mathcal{N}$. In this case, we will say that \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} are equivalent. With this in mind, quantum channel majorization has several basic properties.

First, if the input systems are trivial, that is, if $A \cong A' \cong \mathbb{C}$ the channels \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} are naturally identified with the states $\rho^B = \mathcal{N}(1)$ and $\sigma^B = \mathcal{M}(1)$, and in this case, channel majorization reduces to state majorization between ρ and σ . Since the set of pure states, which we denote by $\text{Pure}(B)$, is the equivalence class of maximal elements under state majorization, those pure states must also be equivalent under channel majorization.

It is simple to check that every state ρ^B is equivalent to the replacement channel $\mathcal{N}(\sigma^A) = \text{Tr}[\sigma^A] \rho^B$. Thus, channel majorization between replacement channels reduces to state majorization between the states that the channels output.

Another basic property of channel majorization is that $\mathcal{N} \succ \mathcal{N} \circ \mathcal{F}$ for any two channels $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ and $\mathcal{F} \in \text{CPTP}(A' \rightarrow A)$. Intuitively, this relation manifests the intuition that the uncertainty about the output of $\mathcal{N} \circ \mathcal{F}$ cannot be smaller than the output of \mathcal{N} .

Channel majorization respects the topological, convex, and tensor structures of quantum mechanics: The subset of channels in $\text{CPTP}(A' \rightarrow B)$ that

majorize \mathcal{N} is topologically closed and the subset of those majorized by \mathcal{N} is both topologically closed and convex. Moreover, if $\mathcal{N}_1 \succ \mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{N}_2 \succ \mathcal{M}_2$ then $\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2 \succ \mathcal{M}_1 \otimes \mathcal{M}_2$.

Some preorders have maximal and minimal elements. For channel majorization, the identity channel is a maximal element and the uniform channel is a minimal element. Specifically, for all $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ we have

$$\text{id}^B \succ \mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B} \succ \mathcal{R}^B. \quad (33)$$

Moreover, every unitary channel $\mathcal{U} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ with $A \cong B$ is equivalent to the identity channel; i.e., $\text{id}^B \sim \mathcal{U}^{A \rightarrow B}$. Therefore, all unitary channels are maximal elements of $\text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ under channel majorization. More generally, in the appendix, we show that for $|B| \geq |A|$, every isometry channel in $\text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ is a maximal element of $\text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ under channel majorization.

The last property we consider here involves a combination of maximal and minimal elements. Specifically, let B' be a replica of A and suppose $|B| \geq |A|$. Let $\mathcal{V} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ be an isometry channel and $\psi \in \text{Pure}(BB')$ the bipartite channel $\mathcal{V}^{A \rightarrow B} \otimes \mathbf{u}^{B'}$ combines the maximal element $\mathcal{V} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ and the minimal element $\mathbf{u}^{B'}$ of channels with output system B' .

Theorem 13. Using the notations above,

$$\mathcal{V}^{A \rightarrow B} \otimes \mathbf{u}^{B'} \sim \psi^{BB'} \quad (34)$$

C. Relationship to Conditional Majorization

Conditional majorization [15, 26] (see also chapter 7 of [13]) is a preorder defined on the set of bipartite density matrices. Specifically, consider two systems A and A' held by Alice and one system B held by Bob. We say that a bipartite density matrix $\rho^{A'B}$ conditionally majorizes another bipartite state $\sigma^{A'B}$ relative to Bob, and write $\rho^{A'B} \succ_B \sigma^{A'B}$, if there exists a conditionally mixing channel $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A'B \rightarrow AB)$ such that

$$\sigma^{A'B} = \mathcal{N}^{A'B \rightarrow AB}(\rho^{A'B}). \quad (35)$$

The channel $\mathcal{N}^{A'B \rightarrow AB}$ is a conditionally mixing channel if it satisfies two conditions:

1. It is $B \not\rightarrow A$ signaling, i.e., it can be expressed

as

$$\mathcal{N}^{A'B \rightarrow AB} = \mathcal{E}^{RB \rightarrow B} \circ \mathcal{V}^{A' \rightarrow RA} \quad (36)$$

for some isometry \mathcal{V} and a channel \mathcal{E} . The reference system R can always be taken to have dimension

$$|R| = \text{Rank}\left(J_{\mathcal{N}}^{A'A}\right) \leq |A'A| \quad (37)$$

where $J_{\mathcal{N}}^{A'A}$ is the marginal of the Choi matrix $J_{\mathcal{N}}^{A'BA\bar{B}}$ of $\mathcal{N}^{A'B \rightarrow A\bar{B}}$ (\bar{B} is a replica of B).

2. It is conditionally unital; i.e., for all states ρ^B

$$\mathcal{N}^{A'B \rightarrow AB}(\rho^{A'} \otimes \mathbf{u}^B) = \sigma^A \otimes \mathbf{u}^B \quad (38)$$

where σ^A is some density matrix.

Note that by tracing out system B , we can express σ^A as

$$\sigma^A = \mathcal{N}^{A'B \rightarrow A}(\rho^{A'} \otimes \mathbf{u}^B), \quad (39)$$

where $\mathcal{N}^{A'B \rightarrow A} := \text{Tr}_B \circ \mathcal{N}^{A'B \rightarrow AB}$.

In order to make the connection between conditional majorization and channel majorization we will use the following characterization of conditional mixing channels (this characterization was not discovered before, and it is proved in the appendix).

Theorem 14. The channel $\mathcal{N}^{A'B \rightarrow AB}$ is a conditionally mixing operation if and only if it has the form (36), where $\mathcal{E}^{RB \rightarrow B}$ is a conditionally unital channel.

Remark. It is important to observe that the theorem specifies that a $B \not\rightarrow A$ signaling channel \mathcal{N} , as described in (36), is conditionally unital if and only if the channel \mathcal{E} is conditional unital. This insight offers a subtle simplification of the condition presented in equation (38).

With this theorem, it becomes evident that there is a close relationship between channel majorization and conditional majorization. Specifically, for every superchannel Θ , defined as in equation (25), we can construct the channel

$$\Delta_{\Theta}^{A'B \rightarrow AB} := \mathcal{E}^{RB \rightarrow B} \circ \mathcal{V}^{A' \rightarrow RA}. \quad (40)$$

Note that the channel Δ_{Θ} does not allow signaling

from B to A . Consequently, the mapping

$$\Theta \mapsto \mathbf{f}(\Theta) := \Delta_\Theta, \quad (41)$$

establishes a bijection between the set of all superchannels from $\text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ to $\text{CPTP}(A' \rightarrow B)$, and the set of all $B \nrightarrow A$ -signalling signaling channels in $\text{CPTP}(A'B \rightarrow AB)$. Furthermore, when we limit the domain of \mathbf{f} to the set of mixing superchannels, it follows from the aforementioned theorem that \mathbf{f} is a bijection from the set of mixing superchannels to the set of mixing bipartite channels in $\text{CPTP}(A'B \rightarrow AB)$.

The bijection between conditional mixing channels and mixing superchannels indicates a potential close relationship between channel majorization and conditional majorization. However, it remains uncertain whether this relationship can be utilized to establish a deeper link between the two concepts. This uncertainty stems from the fact that channel majorization is associated with quantum channels, while conditional majorization pertains to bipartite quantum states.

In contrast, for the classical scenario, the connection is more apparent, as illustrated by the following theorem.

Theorem 15. Let $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{X' \rightarrow Y}$ be two classical channels. Then, $\mathcal{N} \succ \mathcal{M}$ if and only if

$$\sum_{x \in [m]} p_x \mathbf{e}_x \otimes \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{e}_x) \succ_Y \sum_{w \in [m']} q_w \mathbf{e}_w \otimes \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{e}_w) \quad (42)$$

for some $\mathbf{p} \in \text{Prob}(m)$ and $\mathbf{q} \in \text{Prob}(m')$.

D. The Case of Different Output Dimensions

Majorization typically involves comparing two probability vectors of equal dimensions, but this can be extended to vectors of differing dimensions by padding the shorter vector with zeros. In the channel domain, we expand the concept of quantum channel majorization by introducing additional isometries to account for varying dimensions of output systems.

Formally, quantum channel majorization across all dimensions is defined as follows. Let $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ and $\mathcal{M} \in \text{CPTP}(A' \rightarrow B')$ be any two channels (where we do not assume $B \cong B'$). We say that $\mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B}$ majorizes $\mathcal{M}^{A' \rightarrow B'}$ and write




FIG. 5: A bijection between a mixing superchannel and conditionally mixing channel

$\mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B} \succ \mathcal{M}^{A' \rightarrow B'}$, if one of the following occurs:

1. $|B| > |B'|$ and there exists an isometry channel $\mathcal{U} \in \text{CPTP}(B' \rightarrow B)$ such that

$$\mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B} \succ \mathcal{U}^{B' \rightarrow B} \circ \mathcal{M}^{A' \rightarrow B'} \quad (43)$$

where \succ above stands for channel majorization as introduced in Definition 12 for two channels of the same output dimensions.

2. $|B| \leq |B'|$ and there exists an isometry channel $\mathcal{V} \in \text{CPTP}(B \rightarrow B')$ such that

$$\mathcal{V}^{B \rightarrow B'} \circ \mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B} \succ \mathcal{M}^{A' \rightarrow B'}. \quad (44)$$

With this generalization of channel majorization, we are now ready to provide our definition of **an** entropy of a quantum channel.

IV. Channel Entropy

In the work by [16], entropy for classical static systems is characterized as a function over probability vectors that exhibits Schur-concavity and additivity. Following from the findings of [17], any function that meets these criteria necessarily represents a convex combination of Rényi entropies. In this section, we aim to generalize this well-founded definition of entropy to the domain of channels in the most logical and straightforward manner. This extension will allow us to explore entropy in the broader context of

channels, aligning the conceptual underpinnings of static system entropy with dynamic quantum processes.

A. Definition and General Properties

Let

$$\mathbb{H} : \bigcup_{A,B} \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (45)$$

be a function mapping the set of all quantum channels across finite dimensions to the real line. The function \mathbb{H} assigns to each quantum channel $\mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B}$ a real number, denoted by $\mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}}$. Note that we are using similar notations as used for conditional entropy since the entropy of a quantum channel signifies the uncertainty associated with system B given access to the input of the channel.

Our objective is to identify when \mathbb{H} constitutes an entropy. For systems where $|A| = 1$, we denote $\mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}}$ as $\mathbb{H}(B)_{\mathcal{N}} := \mathbb{H}(\rho^B)$, aligning with the notation of quantum-state entropy. This notation proves useful when examining composite systems with multiple subsystems. Since we define entropy functions as non-constant zero functions, we assume (implicitly throughout this paper, and in the definition below) the existence of non-trivial systems A and B and a channel $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ such that $\mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} \neq 0$.

Definition 16. The function \mathbb{H} as given in (45) is called *entropy* if it satisfies the following properties:

1. Monotonicity: If $\mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B} \succ \mathcal{M}^{A' \rightarrow B'}$ then $\mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} \leq \mathbb{H}(B'|A')_{\mathcal{M}}$,
2. Additivity: $\mathbb{H}(BB'|AA')_{\mathcal{N} \otimes \mathcal{M}} = \mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} + \mathbb{H}(B'|A')_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Remark. We say that a quantum channel entropy is *normalized* if the uniform qubit state has unit entropy. The term ‘normalized’ is justified in [15], where it was shown that any non-zero additive function on states that is monotone under majorization must take strictly positive values on all non-pure states.

There are several properties of entropy that follow directly from the definition above. First, observe that in the case that the input system A is trivial (when $|A| = 1$), a channel entropy function reduces to a state entropy function. Specifically, irrespective

of the normalization axiom, every pure state necessarily has zero entropy, while every mixed state has positive entropy. Secondly, the entropy of a replacement channel equals the entropy of the state that it outputs, as intuitively expected.

Next, the entropy of quantum channels is invariant under the action of pre-processing unitaries applied by Alice and post-processing isometries applied by Bob. That is, for a quantum channel $\mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B}$, unitary channel $\mathcal{U}^{A' \rightarrow A}$, and isometry channel $\mathcal{V}^{B \rightarrow B'}$,

$$\mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} = \mathbb{H}(B'|A')_{\mathcal{V} \circ \mathcal{N} \circ \mathcal{U}}. \quad (46)$$

From the normalization and additivity properties, it follows that for any two systems A and B , $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{R}^{A \rightarrow B}) = \log |B|$. Therefore, from Theorem 13, we deduce

$$0 = \log |A| + \mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{V}}, \quad (47)$$

for any isometry channel $\mathcal{V}^{A \rightarrow B}$. That is, isometries with an input dimension greater than one have negative entropy. We summarize this key observation in the following theorem.

Theorem 17. Let \mathbb{H} be a channel entropy and $\mathcal{V} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ be an isometry channel. Then,

$$\mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{V}} = -\log |A|. \quad (48)$$

B. Examples of Channel Entropies

One set of examples of channel entropies are those derived from channel divergences. Specifically, let \mathbb{D} be a dynamical relative entropy. Then, the function

$$\mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} := \log |B| - \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{N} || \mathcal{R}) \quad (49)$$

is an entropy. The additivity follows from the additivity of \mathbb{D} and the monotonicity under mixing operations from the DPI of \mathbb{D} . In fact, as discussed also in [27], this example of channel entropy behaves monotonically under the larger set of uniformity-preserving superchannels.

There is another way to construct channel entropies from conditional entropies of bipartite quantum states. Specifically, let $\mathbb{H} : \rho^{RB} \mapsto \mathbb{H}(B|R)_{\rho}$ be a conditional entropy. We extend the definition of \mathbb{H} to act on every quantum channel $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow$

B) as

$$\mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} := \inf \mathbb{H}(B|R)_{\mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B}(\rho^{RA})} , \quad (50)$$

where the infimum is over all systems R and all density matrices ρ^{RA} . We first argue that we can take the optimization above to run over all pure states ρ^{RA} with $R \cong A$. To see why, first recall that if $\psi^{R'RA}$ is a purification of ρ^{RA} then

$$\mathbb{H}(A|R)_{\mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B}(\rho^{RA})} \geq \mathbb{H}(B|RR')_{\mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B}(\psi^{R'RA})} , \quad (51)$$

since the tracing of R' in this context is a conditionally mixing operation (and conditional entropies of bipartite states behave monotonically under such operations [13, 15]). Thus, we can restrict the infimum in (50) to pure states. Moreover, since conditional entropy is invariant under isometries, we get from the Schmidt decomposition of $\psi^{R'RA}$ that we can replace system $R'R$ with a system isomorphic to A . We therefore conclude that

$$\mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} := \min_{\psi \in \text{Pure}(RA)} \mathbb{H}(B|R)_{\mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B}(\psi^{RA})} , \quad (52)$$

where R is a replica of A . In the appendix, we show that $\mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}}$ as defined above satisfies the monotonicity axiom of entropies, and we give now two examples in which it satisfies the additivity axiom as well so that for these cases it is indeed a channel entropy.

When \mathbb{D} is taken to be the Umegaki relative entropy, and \mathbb{H} is taken to be the von-Neumann conditional entropy we get the same channel entropy (49) and in (50). While this equality does not hold in general, it does happen also for the min-channel entropy. That is, substituting $\mathbb{D} = D_{\max}$ (the max-relative entropy) in (49) yields the same channel entropy as we get by taking $\mathbb{H} = H_{\min}$ to be the conditional min-entropy.

Specifically, the min-entropy of a quantum channel can be defined similarly to (49) as:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\min}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} &= \log |B| - D_{\max}(\mathcal{N} || \mathcal{R}) \\ &= \log |B| - \min \{ \log t : t\mathcal{R} \geq \mathcal{N} \} , \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

where the relation \geq between superoperators is the partial order induced by the convex cone of completely positive maps ($t\mathcal{R} \geq \mathcal{N}$ if and only if $t\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{N}$

is completely positive). Or similar to (50) as:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\min}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} &:= \min_{\psi \in \text{Pure}(RA)} H_{\min}(B|R)_{\mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B}(\psi^{RA})} \\ &= - \max_{\psi \in \text{Pure}(RA)} D_{\max}(\mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B}(\psi^{RA}) || \psi^R \otimes I^B) . \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

It is not too hard to check that the two definitions above coincide (see appendix for more details). The following theorem provides justification for the terminology of the min-entropy of a channel.

Theorem 18. Let \mathbb{H} be an entropy of a quantum channel. For all $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$

$$\mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} \geq H_{\min}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} . \quad (55)$$

Observe that we have already established equality between all channel entropies whenever \mathcal{N} is either a uniform or an isometry channel.

C. Entropy of Classical Channels

The entropy of classical channels can be viewed as extensions of entropy functions that are defined on probability vectors. If \mathbb{H} is an entropy of a classical probability vector, we can define its maximal and minimal extensions to the classical channel domain using the approach introduced in [28]. Specifically, we define the minimal and maximal extensions of \mathbb{H} to the channel $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(X \rightarrow Y)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mathbb{H}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} &:= \sup_{\mathbf{q} \in \text{Prob}(m)} \{ \mathbb{H}(\mathbf{q}) : \mathbf{q} \succ \mathcal{N} \} \\ \overline{\mathbb{H}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} &:= \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in \text{Prob}(m)} \{ \mathbb{H}(\mathbf{q}) : \mathcal{N} \succ \mathbf{q} \} \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where the infimum/supremum are also over $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Every entropy function on classical channels H' that reduces to \mathbb{H} on probability vectors must satisfy for every classical channel $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}$:

$$\underline{\mathbb{H}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} \leq H'(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} \leq \overline{\mathbb{H}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} . \quad (57)$$

In the next theorem, we provide a formula for the maximal extension for the case when \mathbb{H} is quasiconcave (e.g. Rényi entropies). As before, we denote by $\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m \in \text{Prob}(n)$ the output vectors of \mathcal{N} .

Theorem 19. Using the notations above,

$$\overline{\mathbb{H}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} = \min_{x \in [m]} \mathbb{H}(\mathbf{p}_x) \quad (58)$$

for any quasiconcave classical entropy \mathbb{H} .

That is, the maximal extension of a quasiconcave entropy function equals its minimum entropy output. In the classical case, it is known that the minimum entropy output is additive. Thus, $\overline{\mathbb{H}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}}$ is an entropy. However, in general, minimal and maximal extensions of a function from a smaller domain to a larger one may not be additive even if the function is additive on the restricted domain. Indeed, as we discuss now the minimal extension $\underline{\mathbb{H}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}}$ is not additive.

The condition $\mathbf{q} \succ \mathcal{N}$ is equivalent to $\mathbf{q} \succ \mathbf{p}_x$ for all $x \in [n]$ (see Example 1 of Sec. II G). The optimal (i.e., minimal) vector \mathbf{r} that satisfies $\mathbf{r} \succ \mathbf{p}_x$ for all $x \in [m]$ can be computed using the lattice-majorization technique which is discussed in the appendix. The existence of such a minimal element implies that $\underline{\mathbb{H}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} = \mathbb{H}(\mathbf{r})$. The expression for the components of the optimal vector \mathbf{r} is somewhat cumbersome (see appendix), however, it is relatively simple to show that it is not additive and therefore $\underline{\mathbb{H}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}}$ is not an entropy.

While $\underline{\mathbb{H}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}}$ is not additive under tensor products, it is super-additive, and therefore can be regularized. That is, its regularization is defined as

$$\underline{\mathbb{H}}^{\text{reg}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \underline{\mathbb{H}}(Y^n|X^n)_{\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}}, \quad (59)$$

and the super-additivity of $\underline{\mathbb{H}}$ ensures that the limit above exists. Observe that $\underline{\mathbb{H}}^{\text{reg}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}}$ is at least weakly additive in the sense that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\underline{\mathbb{H}}^{\text{reg}}(Y^k|X^k)_{\mathcal{N}^{\otimes k}} = k \underline{\mathbb{H}}^{\text{reg}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}}. \quad (60)$$

It is left as an open problem if this regularized version of $\underline{\mathbb{H}}$ is fully additive so that it is an entropy function. Remarkably, if $\mathbb{H} = H$ is the Shannon entropy, i.e., $H(\mathbf{t}) := -\sum_{x \in [n]} t_x \log t_x$ for all $\mathbf{t} \in \text{Prob}(n)$, then $\underline{H}^{\text{reg}} = \overline{H}$, and in particular fully additive.

Theorem 20. Let \mathbb{H} be a channel entropy that reduces to the Shannon entropy of probability vectors. Then for every classical channel \mathcal{N} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} &= \underline{H}^{\text{reg}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} \\ &= \overline{H}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} \\ &= \min_{x \in [m]} H(\mathbf{p}_x). \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Observe that the theorem above is a uniqueness theorem indicating that there is only one channel entropy that extends the Shannon entropy to the channel domain.

D. Quantum Additivity Implies Negativity

In Theorem 17, we have learned that every entropy of quantum channels must assume strictly negative values. This is not the case for classical channels since in (57) we saw that every entropy function on classical channels that reduces to \mathbb{H} on probability vectors must be no smaller than its minimal extension $\underline{\mathbb{H}}$ as defined in (56). Thus, since $\underline{\mathbb{H}}$ is non-negative, every entropy of classical channels is always non-negative.

At first glance, it may seem that the same argument should work also for the quantum domain. That is, let \mathbb{H} be an entropy on classical states (probability vectors) and let $\underline{\mathbb{H}}$ be its minimal extension on a quantum channel $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ given as

$$\underline{\mathbb{H}}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} := \sup_{\mathbf{q} \in \text{Prob}(m)} \left\{ \mathbb{H}(\mathbf{q}) : \mathbf{q} \succ \mathcal{N} \right\}. \quad (62)$$

The problem with the function above is that it is not well defined for many quantum channels in $\text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$. That is, for many quantum channels there is no classical probability vector \mathbf{q} that satisfies $\mathbf{q} \succ \mathcal{N}$. Thus, for such channel \mathcal{N} , we cannot argue that its entropy is non-negative.

Another attempt to construct a non-negative entropy of a quantum channel may involve the maximal extension defined as follows. As before, let \mathbb{H} be an entropy on classical states and let $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$ be its maximal extension on a quantum channel $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ given as

$$\overline{\mathbb{H}}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} := \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in \text{Prob}(m)} \left\{ \mathbb{H}(\mathbf{q}) : \mathcal{N} \succ \mathbf{q} \right\}. \quad (63)$$

Unlike the minimal extension, this maximal exten-

sion is well defined for every $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ since every quantum channel majorizes the uniform state which can be viewed as a classical state (probability vector).

While the function $\overline{\mathbb{H}}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}}$ behaves monotonically under channel majorization, it is not additive and therefore not an entropy. Thus, if we remove the requirement of additivity from the definition of entropy we would get functions that can be non-negative on all quantum channels.

Since the function $\overline{\mathbb{H}}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}}$ is sub-additive, its regularization exists and is given by

$$\overline{\mathbb{H}}^{\text{reg}}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \overline{\mathbb{H}}(B^n|A^n)_{\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}}. \quad (64)$$

Similar to (60), the function above is weakly additive in the sense that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\overline{\mathbb{H}}^{\text{reg}}(B^k|A^k)_{\mathcal{N}^{\otimes k}} = k \overline{\mathbb{H}}^{\text{reg}}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}}. \quad (65)$$

Thus, the function $\overline{\mathbb{H}}^{\text{reg}}$ has the following three properties:

1. It is non-negative.
2. It satisfies the monotonicity axiom of an entropy.
3. It satisfies weak additivity.

Moreover, combining this with Theorem 17 we get that $\overline{\mathbb{H}}^{\text{reg}}$, in general, *cannot* be (fully) additive. Thus, it is the strong (i.e., non-weak) additivity axiom of entropy of quantum channels that gives rise to negative values. In fact, recall that we used strong additivity to get (47).

V. Conclusions

In this study, we meticulously crafted a framework for both classical and quantum channel majorization, approached through constructive, axiomatic, and operational methodologies. Despite their methodological distinctions, each approach culminates in a consistent and robust ordering of channels. Significantly, our findings demonstrate that any entropy function applicable to quantum channels must adopt negative values. This discovery not only challenges conventional understandings of entropy but also necessitates a reevaluation of its foundational concepts within quantum mechanics.

Looking forward, several avenues exist for expanding this research. Initially, we defined games of chance exclusively within classical channels. Extending this to quantum channels remains a compelling prospect. While preliminary efforts have been made [22], identifying an operational framework that incorporates quantum games of chance and aligns with the ordering derived from quantum channel majorization presents an intriguing challenge.

Additionally, previous work provided operational interpretations for the von-Neumann entropy extension to quantum channels, specifically as the optimal rate in a quantum channel merging protocol. Further exploration into operational interpretations for both von-Neumann entropy and other Rényi entropies could yield new insights.

In the domain of classical channels, an open question persists regarding which state entropies, \mathbb{H} , see their regularized minimal extensions align with their maximal extensions. In Theorem 20 we established that for the Shannon entropy, this alignment offers a uniqueness result, demonstrating a unique extension of Shannon entropy to classical channels. Whether similar conclusions hold for Rényi entropies remains to be seen.

Ultimately, this research clarifies the framework of quantum channel majorization and opens avenues for future explorations into the operational manipulation of quantum channels. Inspired by the success of the quantum state merging protocol, where negative entropy plays a pivotal role, this concept, particularly within this framework, promises to drive significant advancements in both the theoretical and practical realms of quantum information science.

Acknowledgments

GG wishes to express gratitude to Mark Wilde for engaging in valuable discussions related to the topics covered in this paper. Additionally, GG thanks Ludovico Lami for suggesting the key terms “constructive,” “axiomatic,” and “operational,” which have significantly shaped this work. GG, DK, and TN acknowledge support from NSERC.

-
- [1] M. A. Nielsen, Conditions for a class of entanglement transformations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 436 (1999).
- [2] M. A. Nielsen and G. Vidal, Majorization and the interconversion of bipartite states, *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **1**, 76 (2001).
- [3] K. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and J. Oppenheim, Secure key from bound entanglement, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 160502 (2005).
- [4] R. Renner, Security of quantum key distribution, *International Journal of Quantum Information* **06**, 1 (2008).
- [5] M. H. Partovi, Majorization formulation of uncertainty in quantum mechanics, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 052117 (2011).
- [6] Z. Puchała, Lukasz Rudnicki, and K. Życzkowski, Majorization entropic uncertainty relations*, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **46**, 272002 (2013).
- [7] M. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim, Fundamental limitations for quantum and nanoscale thermodynamics, *Nature Communications* **4**, 2059 (2013).
- [8] G. Gour, M. P. Müller, V. Narasimhachar, R. W. Spekkens, and N. Yunger Halpern, The resource theory of informational nonequilibrium in thermodynamics, *Physics Reports* **583**, 1 (2015), the resource theory of informational nonequilibrium in thermodynamics.
- [9] J. M. Renes, Relative submajorization and its use in quantum resource theories, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **57**, 122202 (2016).
- [10] J.-L. Li and C.-F. Qiao, An optimal measurement strategy to beat the quantum uncertainty in correlated system, *Advanced Quantum Technologies* **3**, 2000039 (2020).
- [11] G. Zhu, A. Liu, L. Xiao, K. Wang, D. Qu, J. Li, C. Qiao, and P. Xue, Experimental investigation of conditional majorization uncertainty relations in the presence of quantum memory, *Phys. Rev. A* **108**, L050202 (2023).
- [12] S. Friedland, V. Gheorghiu, and G. Gour, Universal uncertainty relations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 230401 (2013).
- [13] G. Gour, Resources of the quantum world (2024), arXiv:2402.05474 [quant-ph].
- [14] G. Birkhoff, Three observations on linear algebra, *Univ. Nac. Tucuman, Rev. Ser. A* **5**, 147 (1946).
- [15] G. Gour, M. M. Wilde, S. Brandsen, and I. J. Geng, Inevitability of knowing less than nothing (2022), arXiv:2208.14424 [quant-ph].
- [16] G. Gour and M. Tomamichel, Entropy and relative entropy from information-theoretic principles, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **67**, 6313 (2021).
- [17] X. Mu, L. Pomatto, P. Strack, and O. Tamuz, From blackwell dominance in large samples to rényi divergences and back again, *ECONOMETRICA* **89**, 475 (2021).
- [18] S. Brandsen, I. J. Geng, and G. Gour, What is entropy? a perspective from games of chance, *Phys. Rev. E* **105**, 024117 (2022).
- [19] R. Bapat, Majorization and singular values. iii, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **145**, 59 (1991).
- [20] G. M. Bosyk, G. Bellomo, F. Holik, H. Freytes, and G. Sergioli, Optimal common resource in majorization-based resource theories, *New Journal of Physics* **21**, 083028 (2019).
- [21] Y. Yuan, Y. Xiao, Z. Hou, S.-M. Fei, G. Gour, G.-Y. Xiang, C.-F. Li, and G.-C. Guo, Strong majorization uncertainty relations and experimental verifications, *npj Quantum Information* **9**, 65 (2023).
- [22] S. Brandsen, I. J. Geng, M. M. Wilde, and G. Gour, Quantum conditional entropy from information-theoretic principles (2021), arXiv:2110.15330 [quant-ph].
- [23] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Transforming quantum operations: Quantum supermaps, *Europhysics Letters* **83**, 30004 (2008).
- [24] G. Gour, Comparison of quantum channels by superchannels, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **65**, 5880 (2019).
- [25] M.-D. Choi, Completely positive linear maps on complex matrices, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **10**, 285 (1975).
- [26] G. Gour, A. Grudka, M. Horodecki, W. Kłobus, J. Lodyga, and V. Narasimhachar, Conditional uncertainty principle, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 042130 (2018).
- [27] G. Gour and M. M. Wilde, Entropy of a quantum channel, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **3**, 023096 (2021).
- [28] G. Gour and M. Tomamichel, Optimal extensions of resource measures and their applications, *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 062401 (2020).
- [29] G. Gour, Uniqueness and optimality of dynamical extensions of divergences, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 010313 (2021).

A. Appendix

The standard form of a superchannel

Lemma 21. Every classical superchannel Θ can be written in the following *standard form*

$$\Theta [\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}] = \sum_{\substack{x \in [m] \\ y \in [m']}} \mathcal{E}_{xy}^{Y \rightarrow Y'} \circ \mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y} \circ \mathcal{F}_{xy}^{X' \rightarrow X} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $x \in [m]$ and $y \in [m']$, $\mathcal{E}_{xy} \in \text{CPTP}(Y \rightarrow Y')$ are classical channels, and for all $y' \in m'$

$$\mathcal{F}_{xy}^{X' \rightarrow X} (\mathbf{e}_{y'}^{X'}) := \delta_{yy'} s(x|y) \mathbf{e}_x^X, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where $\{s(x|y)\}_{x,y}$ is some conditional probability distribution.

Proof. The most general classical superchannel has the form

$$\Theta [\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}] = \sum_{z \in [k]} \mathcal{E}_z^{Y \rightarrow Y'} \circ \mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y} \circ \mathcal{S}_z^{X' \rightarrow X} \quad (\text{A3})$$

where \mathcal{E}_z are classical channels and \mathcal{S}_z are non-negative such that $\mathcal{S} = \sum_{z \in [k]} \mathcal{S}_z$ is a classical channel. Observe that for every $w \in [m']$ we have

$$\mathcal{S}_z^{X' \rightarrow X} (\mathbf{e}_w^{X'}) = \sum_{x \in [m]} s(xz|w) \mathbf{e}_x^X. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Therefore,

$$\Theta [\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}] (\mathbf{e}_w^{X'}) = \sum_{x \in [m]} \sum_{z \in [k]} s(xz|w) \mathcal{E}_z^{Y \rightarrow Y'} \circ \mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y} (\mathbf{e}_x^X). \quad (\text{A5})$$

Now, denote by $s(x|w) := \sum_{z \in [k]} s(xz|w)$ and define the channels

$$\mathcal{E}_{xw}^{Y \rightarrow Y'} := \frac{1}{s(x|w)} \sum_{z \in [k]} s(xz|w) \mathcal{E}_z^{Y \rightarrow Y'}, \quad (\text{A6})$$

for the case that $s(x|w) > 0$, and otherwise $\mathcal{E}_{xw}^{Y \rightarrow Y'} := 0$ for x and w with $s(x|w) = 0$. With these notations we get

$$\Theta [\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}] (\mathbf{e}_w^{X'}) = \sum_{x \in [m]} s(x|w) \mathcal{E}_{xw}^{Y \rightarrow Y'} \circ \mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y} (\mathbf{e}_x^X) \quad (\text{A7})$$

Observe that for each $x \in [m]$ and $w \in [m']$ we can define a non-negative map $\mathcal{F}_{xw} \in \text{CP}(X' \rightarrow X)$ via

$$\mathcal{F}_{xw}^{X' \rightarrow X} (\mathbf{e}_{w'}^{X'}) = \delta_{w'w} s(x|w) \mathbf{e}_x^X. \quad (\text{A8})$$

With this notation, (A7) implies that

$$\Theta [\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}] = \sum_{x,w} \mathcal{E}_{xw}^{Y \rightarrow Y'} \circ \mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y} \circ \mathcal{F}_{xw}^{X' \rightarrow X}. \quad (\text{A9})$$

■

Example of a uniformity-preserving but not completely-uniformity preserving superchannel

Consider the following pre- and post-processing channels

$$\mathcal{E}_{1,1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{E}_{2,1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A10})$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{1,1} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{F}_{2,1} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{A11})$$

The superchannel

$$\Theta[\mathcal{N}] = \sum_{x \in [2]} \mathcal{E}_{x,1} \mathcal{N} \mathcal{F}_{x,1}, \quad (\text{A12})$$

is uniformity preserving, but $\mathcal{E}_{1,1}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{2,1}$ are not doubly stochastic. According to Lemma 2 proven below, this implies Θ is not completely uniformity preserving.

Proof of Theorem 4

Theorem 4. Given two classical channels \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} , the following are equivalent:

1. \mathcal{N} majorizes \mathcal{M} constructively.
2. \mathcal{N} majorizes \mathcal{M} axiomatically.
3. \mathcal{N} majorizes \mathcal{M} operationally.

To prove this theorem, we divided the proof into two lemmas. First, we show that the set of completely uniformity-preserving superchannels and the set of random permutation superchannels are identical. This implies (and is stronger than) $1 \iff 2$. Secondly, we show that constructive majorization is equivalent to operational majorization defined via games of chance, which proves $1 \iff 3$.

Lemma 22. The set of completely uniformity-preserving superchannels and the set of random permutation superchannels coincide.

Proof. To begin with, suppose Θ is completely uniformity preserving. Then Θ preserves every marginally uniform channel $\mathcal{N}^{XZ_0 \rightarrow YZ_1}$. In particular, consider a classical channel $\mathcal{N}^{XZ_0 \rightarrow YZ_1}$ where $Z_0 \rightarrow Z_1$ is a static system with trivial input system, i.e. $|Z_0| = 1$ and output system $Y \cong X$. Define the channel \mathcal{N} as follows (see Fig. 6):

$$\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow YZ_1}(\mathbf{e}_x^X) := \mathbf{u}^Y \otimes \mathbf{e}_x^{Z_1} \quad \forall x \in [m]. \quad (\text{A13})$$

Since $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow YZ_1}$ is marginally uniform and Θ is completely uniformity preserving, the channel $\mathcal{M}^{X' \rightarrow YZ_1} :=$




FIG. 6: A completely uniformity-preserving superchannel preserves a channel $\mathbf{u}^Y \otimes \text{id}^{X \rightarrow Z}$.

$\Theta \otimes \mathbf{1}^Z [\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y Z_1}]$ is marginally uniform. Consider any input $\mathbf{e}_y^{X'}$ where $y \in [m']$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}^{X' \rightarrow Y Z_1}(\mathbf{e}_y^{X'}) &= \sum_{x,w} \mathcal{E}_{xw}^{Y \rightarrow Y} \circ \mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y Z_1} \circ \mathcal{F}_{xw}^{X' \rightarrow X}(\mathbf{e}_y^{X'}) \\
&= \sum_{x \in [m]} s(x|y) \mathcal{E}_{xy}^{Y \rightarrow Y} \circ \mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y Z_1}(\mathbf{e}_x^X) \\
\text{(A13)} \rightarrow &= \sum_{x \in [m]} s(x|y) \mathcal{E}_{xy}^{Y \rightarrow Y}(\mathbf{u}^Y) \otimes \mathbf{e}_x^{Z_1}
\end{aligned} \tag{A14}$$

To show that each $\mathcal{E}_{xy}^{Y \rightarrow Y}$ is doubly stochastic, we will show that each vector $\mathbf{q}_{xy}^Y := \mathcal{E}_{xy}^{Y \rightarrow Y}(\mathbf{u}^Y)$ equals the uniform vector \mathbf{u}^Y . Since $\mathcal{M}^{X' \rightarrow Y Z_1}$ is marginally uniform we get from the equation above that for all $y \in [m']$

$$\mathbf{u}^Y \otimes \mathbf{r}^{Z_1} = \sum_{x \in [m]} s(x|y) \mathbf{q}_{xy}^Y \otimes \mathbf{e}_x^{Z_1}, \tag{A15}$$

for some $\mathbf{r}^{Z_1} \in \text{Prob}(m)$. Finally, let $x' \in [m]$, and multiply from the left both sides of the equation above by $I^Y \otimes (\mathbf{e}_{x'}^{Z_1})^T$ (i.e., taking the dot product with $\mathbf{e}_{x'}^{Z_1}$ on both sides) we get

$$(\mathbf{e}_{x'}^{Z_1} \cdot \mathbf{r}^{Z_1}) \mathbf{u}^Y = s(x'|y) \mathbf{q}_{x'y}^Y. \tag{A16}$$

When $s_{x'|y}$ is not zero, each $\mathbf{q}_{x'y}^Y$ is proportional to \mathbf{u}^Y but since it is a probability vector (in particular, normalized) it must be equal to \mathbf{u}^Y . This shows that a completely uniformity-preserving superchannel is a random permutation superchannel.

Conversely, a random permutation superchannel is also a completely uniformity-preserving superchannel. To see this, it is enough to show for the marginally uniform channel $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y Z_1}$ defined in (A13) and a random permutation superchannel Θ . Any input $\mathbf{e}_y^{X'}$ into $\Theta[\mathcal{N}]$ results in

$$\begin{aligned}
\Theta[\mathcal{N}](\mathbf{e}_y^{X'}) &= \sum_{x,w} \mathcal{E}_{xw}^{Y \rightarrow Y} \circ \mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y Z_1} \circ \mathcal{F}_{xw}^{X' \rightarrow X}(\mathbf{e}_y^{X'}) \\
\text{(A14)} \rightarrow &= \sum_{x \in [m]} s(x|y) \mathcal{E}_{xy}^{Y \rightarrow Y}(\mathbf{u}^Y) \otimes \mathbf{e}_x^{Z_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since \mathcal{E} is unital, it preserves uniform vector

$$\Theta[\mathcal{N}]\left(\mathbf{e}_y^{X'}\right) = \mathbf{u}^Y \otimes \sum_{x \in [m]} s(x|y) \mathbf{e}_x^{Z_1} \quad (\text{A17})$$

which shows that $\Theta[\mathcal{N}]$ is a marginally uniform channel. Consequently, Θ is a completely uniformity-preserving superchannel. Therefore, a random permutation superchannel is a completely uniformity-preserving superchannel. \blacksquare

Lemma 23. \mathcal{N} majorizes \mathcal{M} constructively if and only if \mathcal{N} majorizes \mathcal{M} operationally, i.e., the following propositions are equivalent:

1. $\mathcal{M} = \Theta[\mathcal{N}]$ where Θ is a random permutation superchannel.
2. $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{N}) \geq \text{Pr}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{M})$ for all \mathbf{t} -games.

It will be convenient to introduce the following notation:

Definition. The *predictability* function $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{N}} : \mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ of a classical channel \mathcal{N} with transition matrix $[\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m] \in \text{STOCH}(n, m)$ is given by

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{s}) := \max_{x \in [m]} \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow. \quad (\text{A18})$$

Proof. By Theorem 8, \mathcal{N} majorizing \mathcal{M} constructively is equivalent to having

$$\max_{x \in [m]} \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_x \geq \max_{x' \in [m']} \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{q}_{x'}. \quad (\text{A19})$$

for any $\mathbf{s} \in \text{Prob}^\downarrow(n)$, where $\mathbf{p}_x := \mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle x|)$ for each $x \in [m]$ and $\mathbf{q}_{x'} := \mathcal{M}(|x'\rangle\langle x'|)$ for each $x' \in [m']$.

The strategy is to show that having $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{N}) \geq \text{Pr}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{M})$ for all \mathbf{t} -games is equivalent to (A19). First, we establish the relation between the predictability function and the winning probability of a \mathbf{t} -game. By definition of conditional probability, $t_{k|w} = t_{wk}/t_{|w}$. Applying this to equation (13) simplifies the expression for the winning probability to be

$$\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{N}) = \sum_{w \in [l]} \max_{x \in [m]} \sum_{k \in [n]} t_{wk} \|\mathbf{p}_x\|_{(k)}. \quad (\text{A20})$$

The expression inside the summation simplifies to

$$\sum_{k \in [n]} t_{wk} \|\mathbf{p}_x\|_{(k)} = \sum_{k \in [n]} \sum_{y \in [k]} t_{wk} \mathbf{p}_{y|x}^\downarrow \quad (\text{A21})$$

$$= \sum_{y \in [n]} \sum_{k=y}^n t_{kw} \mathbf{p}_{y|x}^\downarrow. \quad (\text{A22})$$

Defining $s_{yw} := \sum_{k=y}^n t_{kw}$ and $\mathbf{s}_w := \sum_{y \in [n]} s_{yw} \mathbf{e}_y$, we have

$$\max_{x \in [m]} \sum_{k \in [n]} t_{wk} \|\mathbf{p}_x\|_{(k)} = \max_{x \in [m]} \sum_{y \in [n]} s_{yw} \mathbf{p}_{y|x}^\downarrow = \max_{x \in [m]} \mathbf{s}_w \cdot \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow = \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{s}_w). \quad (\text{A23})$$

The winning probability can then be written in terms of the predictability function:

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{N}) = \sum_{w \in [l]} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{s}_w). \quad (\text{A24})$$

Now, let us restate explicitly what we want to show:

$$\forall \mathbf{t} \in \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Prob}(n\ell) \quad \Pr_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{N}) \geq \Pr_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{M}) \iff \forall \mathbf{s} \in \text{Prob}^\downarrow(n) \quad \max_{x \in [m]} \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow \geq \max_{x' \in [m']} \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{q}_{x'}^\downarrow. \quad (\text{A25})$$

For the left to right implication, consider $\mathbf{t} \in \text{Prob}^\downarrow(n)$ and use equation (A24) to get

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{N}) = \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{s})$$

where \mathbf{s} is defined by $s_y = \sum_{k=y}^n t_k$. We apply the same idea to the winning chance associated with \mathcal{M} . Since the relation holds for all $t \in \text{Prob}^\downarrow(n)$, it must also hold for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n,\downarrow}$ as well.

In the converse of (A25), recall that $\mathbf{s}_w = (s_{yw})$ is defined as

$$s_{yw} := \sum_{k=y}^n t_{kw}, \quad (\text{A26})$$

which is not in $\text{Prob}(n)$ but is in $\mathbb{R}_+^{\downarrow,n}$. However, since $\|\mathbf{s}_w\| > 0$, the vector $\mathbf{s}_w / \|\mathbf{s}_w\|$ is in $\text{Prob}^\downarrow(n)$ and

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{s}_w) = \max_{x \in [m]} \mathbf{s}_w \cdot \mathbf{p}_x \geq \max_{x' \in [m']} \mathbf{s}_w \cdot \mathbf{q}_{x'} = \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{s}_w). \quad (\text{A27})$$

This leads to $\Pr_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{N}) \geq \Pr_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{M})$, for any $\mathbf{t} \in \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Prob}(n\ell)$. This completes the proof. \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 4. From the lemma 22, the mixing operations defined in the constructive approach are of the same set as in those in the axiomatic approach, and by the lemma 23, the existence of the mixing operation monotonically implies the inequality in the game of chance. \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 6

Lemma 24. Let \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} be classical channels with transition matrices $[\mathbf{p}_1 \cdots \mathbf{p}_m] \in \text{STOCH}(n, m), [\mathbf{p}_1 \cdots \mathbf{p}_{m-1}] \in \text{STOCH}(n, m-1)$ respectively. If there exists $\mathbf{t} \in \text{Prob}(m-1)$ such that

$$\sum_{x \in [m-1]} t_x \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow \succ \mathbf{p}_m \quad (\text{A28})$$

then $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{s})$ on all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n,\downarrow}$.

Proof. The predictability function can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{s}) = \max_{x \in [m]} \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow = \max_{\mathbf{t} \in \text{Prob}(m)} \sum_{x \in [m]} t_x \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow \quad (\text{A29})$$

for each $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, since the maximum of the convex hull of $\{\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow\}_{x \in [m]}$ occurs on one of the $\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow$. For any

$\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \text{Prob}(n)$, if $\mathbf{p} \succ \mathbf{q}$ then

$$\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}^\downarrow = L^T \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{p}^\downarrow = \mathbf{r} \cdot L\mathbf{p}^\downarrow = \sum_{k \in [n]} r_k \|\mathbf{p}\|_{(k)} \geq \sum_{k \in [n]} r_k \|\mathbf{q}\|_{(k)} = \mathbf{r} \cdot L\mathbf{q}^\downarrow = L^T \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{q}^\downarrow = \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{q}^\downarrow \quad (\text{A30})$$

for any $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \downarrow}$, where \mathbf{r} is given by $r_j = s_j - s_{j+1}$ for each $j \in [n-1]$ and $r_n = s_n$, which implies that $r_k \geq 0$ for all $k \in [n]$, from which the inequality follows. So from the hypothesis we have

$$\max_{\mathbf{t}' \in \text{Prob}(m-1)} \sum_{x \in [m-1]} t'_x \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow \geq \mathbf{s} \cdot \sum_{x \in [m-1]} t_x \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow \geq \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_m^\downarrow \quad (\text{A31})$$

for each $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \downarrow}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{s}) &= \max_{\mathbf{t} \in \text{Prob}(m)} \sum_{x \in [m]} t_x \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow \\ &= \max_{\mathbf{t} \in \text{Prob}(m)} \sum_{x \in [m-1]} t_x \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow + t_m \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_m^\downarrow \\ &= \max_{\mathbf{t} \in \text{Prob}(m)} (1 - t_m) \sum_{x \in [m-1]} \frac{t_x}{1 - t_m} \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow + t_m \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_m^\downarrow \\ &= \max_{\lambda \in [0,1]} \max_{\mathbf{t}' \in \text{Prob}(m-1)} (1 - \lambda) \sum_{x \in [m-1]} t'_x \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow + \lambda \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_m^\downarrow \\ &= \max_{\mathbf{t}' \in \text{Prob}(m-1)} \sum_{x \in [m-1]} t'_x \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow \\ &= \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{s}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A32})$$

for each $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \downarrow}$, where the second to last equality follows since the maximization over all convex combinations of two real numbers is simply given by the larger of those two numbers. Hence $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{N}} = \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}$ on all real vectors of non-negative, non-increasing entries. \blacksquare

Lemma 25. Every channel is equivalent to its standard form under channel majorization.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(X \rightarrow Y)$ have a transition matrix $N := [\mathbf{p}_1 \cdots \mathbf{p}_m] \in \text{STOCH}(n, m)$, and recall the predictability function

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{s}) = \max_{x \in [m]} \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow. \quad (\text{A33})$$

It follows from Theorem 8 that the two channels \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N} are equivalent under channel majorization if $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{s})$ for all $\mathbf{s} \in \text{Prob}^\downarrow(n)$.

1. $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{N}}$ is invariant under permutations of the components of each \mathbf{p}_x for any choice of $x \in [m]$, and therefore under replacement of each \mathbf{p}_x with \mathbf{p}_x^\downarrow .
2. By Lemma 24, $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{N}}$ is invariant under removal of columns of N that are majorized by convex combinations of other columns of N .
3. $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{N}}$ is invariant under permutations of columns N .

Therefore \mathcal{N} is equivalent to its standard form. \blacksquare

Theorem 6. Using the above notations, $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y} \sim \mathcal{M}^{X' \rightarrow Y}$ if and only if $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y} = \mathcal{M}^{X' \rightarrow Y}$ (in particular, $X \cong X'$).

Proof. Let $N := [\mathbf{p}_1 \cdots \mathbf{p}_m] \in \text{STOCH}(n, m)$ and $M := [\mathbf{q}_1 \cdots \mathbf{q}_{m'}] \in \text{STOCH}(n, m')$ be the transition matrices of \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} , respectively. From the condition $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y} \sim \mathcal{M}^{X' \rightarrow Y}$ it follows that $\mathcal{N} \succ \mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M} \succ \mathcal{N}$, so from Theorem 8 there exists an $m \times m'$ stochastic matrix $S = (s_{x|w})$ such that

$$\sum_{x \in [m]} s_{x|w} \mathbf{p}_x \succ \mathbf{q}_w \quad \forall w \in [m'] \quad (\text{A34})$$

and an $m' \times m$ stochastic matrix $T = (t_{w|x})$ such that

$$\sum_{w \in [m']} t_{w|x} \mathbf{q}_w \succ \mathbf{p}_x \quad \forall x \in [m]. \quad (\text{A35})$$

Put in another way, there exists a stochastic matrix $S \in \text{STOCH}(m, m')$ such that $LNS \geq LM$, and a stochastic matrix $T \in \text{STOCH}(m', m)$ such that $LMT \geq LN$. Combining the two conditions together we get that the matrix $R := ST \in \text{STOCH}(m, m)$ satisfies

$$LNR = LNST \geq LMT \geq LN. \quad (\text{A36})$$

Similarly, the matrix $R' := TS \in \text{STOCH}(m', m')$ satisfies $LMR' \geq LM$. The condition above implies that $LN\mathbf{r}_1 \geq L\mathbf{p}_1$ which can be written as

$$\sum_{x=2}^m r_{x|1} L\mathbf{p}_x \geq (1 - r_{1|1}) L\mathbf{p}_1. \quad (\text{A37})$$

Therefore, if $r_{1|1} < 1$ then we get that a convex combination of $\mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m$ majorizes \mathbf{p}_1 in contradiction with the assumption that \mathcal{N} is given in its standard form. We therefore conclude that $r_{1|1} = 1$. Similarly, for all $x \in [m]$, we must have $r_{x|x} = 1$ and since R is column stochastic we conclude that $R = I_m$. Using the same argument for R' we conclude that also $R' = I_{m'}$. Hence, $m = m'$ and the stochastic matrices S and T satisfies

$$ST = TS = I_m. \quad (\text{A38})$$

That is, $T = S^{-1}$. Since the only stochastic matrix whose inverse is also a stochastic matrix is a permutation matrix we conclude that N and M can only differ by a permutation of their columns but since they are given in their standard form this implies that $N = M$. ■

Expression for the optimal upper bound of probability vectors

Given a set S of probability vectors of the same dimension, its optimal upper bound with respect to vector majorization can be computed as follows [20]:

Lemma 26. The optimal upper bound of $S \subset \text{Prob}(n)$ in $\text{Prob}^\downarrow(n)$ is given by \mathbf{w} with components

$$w_k = \frac{\sup_{\mathbf{p} \in S} \|\mathbf{p}\|_{(k_j)} - \sup_{\mathbf{p} \in S} \|\mathbf{p}\|_{(k_{j-1})}}{k_j - k_{j-1}} \quad (\text{A39})$$

for each positive integer $k_{j-1} < k \leq k_j$, where the $\{k_j\}$ are defined inductively by $k_0 := 0$ and

$$k_j := \max \left(\underset{\substack{k_{j-1} < \ell \leq n \\ \ell \in \mathbb{N}}}{\text{argmax}} \frac{\sup_{\mathbf{p} \in S} \|\mathbf{p}\|_{(\ell)} - \sup_{\mathbf{p} \in S} \|\mathbf{p}\|_{(k_{j-1})}}{\ell - k_{j-1}} \right). \quad (\text{A40})$$

for each $j \in [J]$ where J is the positive integer for which $k_J = n$.

Proof of Theorem 8

Theorem 8. The following are equivalent:

1. $\mathcal{N} \succ \mathcal{M}$.
2. $\text{Conv}(\mathcal{N}) \succ \text{Conv}(\mathcal{M})$.
3. There exists an $m \times m'$ stochastic matrix $S = (s_{x|w})$ such that

$$\sum_{x \in [m]} s_{x|w} \mathbf{p}_x \succ \mathbf{q}_w \quad \forall w \in [m']. \quad (\text{A41})$$

4. For all $\mathbf{s} \in \text{Prob}^\downarrow(n)$

$$\max_{x \in [m]} \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_x \geq \max_{w \in [m']} \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{q}_w. \quad (\text{A42})$$

5. For all $\mathbf{t} \in \text{Prob}(n)$ and all $w \in [m']$

$$\max_{x \in [m]} \sum_{k \in [n]} t_k \frac{\|\mathbf{p}_x\|_{(k)}}{\|\mathbf{q}_w\|_{(k)}} \geq 1. \quad (\text{A43})$$

Remark. 5. is not in the main text.

Proof. 1. \implies 3.

$\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y} \succ \mathcal{M}^{X' \rightarrow Y'}$ if and only if there exists a random permutation superchannel Θ such that $\mathcal{M}^{X' \rightarrow Y'} = \Theta[\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}]$. Consider the action of this output channel in the standard form of superchannel,

$$\Theta[\mathcal{N}](\mathbf{e}_w) = \sum_{x \in [m]} \sum_{y \in [m']} \mathcal{D}_{xy} \circ \mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y} \circ \mathcal{S}_{xy}(\mathbf{e}_w) \quad (\text{A44})$$

$$= \sum_{x \in [m]} \sum_{y \in [m']} \delta_{yw} s_{x|y} \mathcal{D}_{xy} \circ \mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y}(\mathbf{e}_x) \quad (\text{A45})$$

$$= \sum_{x \in [m]} s_{x|w} \mathcal{D}_{xw} \mathbf{p}_x. \quad (\text{A46})$$

Now since $\mathbf{p}_x \succ \mathcal{D}_{xw}\mathbf{p}_x$ for any x, w , multiply both sides by $s_{x|w}$ and summing over x yield that for any w ,

$$\sum_{x \in [m]} s_{x|w} \mathbf{p}_x \succ \sum_{x \in [m]} s_{x|w} \mathcal{D}_{xw} \mathbf{p}_x = \mathbf{q}_w. \quad (\text{A47})$$

3. \implies 2. $\text{Conv}(\mathcal{N}) \succ \text{Conv}(\mathcal{M})$ if for all $\mathbf{q} \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{M})$ there exists $p \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{N})$ such that $\mathbf{p} \succ \mathbf{q}$. Any $\mathbf{q} \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{M})$ is a linear combination of \mathbf{q}_w ,

$$\mathbf{q} = \sum_{w \in [m']} c(w) \mathbf{q}_w, \quad c(w) \geq 0, \quad \sum_{w \in [m']} c(w) = 1. \quad (\text{A48})$$

In the premises, for all $w \in [m']$ there exists a linear combination of \mathbf{p}_x such that $\sum_x s(x|w) \mathbf{p}_x \succ \mathbf{q}_w$. In terms of a doubly stochastic matrix, this means

$$\mathbf{q}_w = D_w \sum_{x \in [m]} s(x|w) \mathbf{p}_x. \quad (\text{A49})$$

$\mathbf{q} \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{N})$ because a doubly-stochastic can be written as a convex combination of permutation matrices. Then, for any $\mathbf{q} \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{M})$, we have that $\mathbf{q} = \sum_{w \in [m']} c(w) \mathbf{q}_w$ is also in $\text{Conv}(\mathcal{N})$. Therefore, any $\mathbf{q} \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{M})$ has $\mathbf{p} \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{N})$ which is itself $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q}$ and trivially $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q} \succ \mathbf{q}$.

2. \implies 4.

From $\text{Conv}(\mathcal{N}) \succ \text{Conv}(\mathcal{M})$ we have that, for any \mathbf{q}_w there exists $\mathbf{p} \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{N})$ such that $\mathbf{p} \succ \mathbf{q}_w$. Since \mathbf{p} is in the convex hull $\text{Conv}(\mathcal{N})$, $\mathbf{p} = \sum_{x \in [m]} s(x|w) \mathbf{p}_x$. Notice that $\sum_{x \in [m]} s(x|w) = 1$ and $s(x|w) \geq 0$. Then, $S = (s(x|w))$ is a stochastic matrix. We have that $S \in \text{STOCH}(m, m')$ such that

$$\sum_x s_{x|w} \mathbf{p}_x \succ \mathbf{q}_w \quad \forall w \in [m']. \quad (\text{A50})$$

From the standard form, \mathbf{p}_x and \mathbf{q}_w are in $\text{Prob}^\downarrow(n)$. Therefore, we can express the condition in equation (A50) as

$$\sum_{x \in [m]} s_{x|w} L \mathbf{p}_x \geq L \mathbf{q}_w \quad \forall w \in [m'] \quad (\text{A51})$$

where L is the lower triangular matrix whose lower triangular has entries one. Let $\mathbf{s}_w = (s_{1|w}, \dots, s_{m|w})^T$, we have

$$LN \mathbf{s}_w \geq L \mathbf{q}_w \quad \forall w \in [m'], \quad (\text{A52})$$

where N is a stochastic matrix associated with the channel \mathcal{N} , i.e. $N = [\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m]$. The matrix S being stochastic $S \in \text{STOCH}(m, m')$ entails that $\mathbf{s}_w \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{s}_w = 1$ for all $w \in [m']$. Now we phrase the existence of convex combination with coefficient $s_{x|w}$ as the following feasibility problem:

$$-LN \mathbf{s}_w \leq -L \mathbf{q}_w \quad \forall w \in [m'], \quad (\text{A53})$$

$$\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{s}_w = 1 \quad (\text{A54})$$

$$\mathbf{s}_w \geq 0 \quad (\text{A55})$$

Note that if there exists such a vector \mathbf{s}_w , then such vector satisfies $\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{s}_w \leq 1$. Conversely, suppose there exists a vector that satisfies the problem (A53) but, instead of equality. In that case, we have $\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{s}_w \leq 1$ then rescaling \mathbf{s}_w by a positive constant to make it equality will not violate the first condition, $-LN \mathbf{s}_w \leq -L \mathbf{q}_w \quad \forall w \in [m']$. Therefore, we can replace the condition $\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{s}_w = 1$ with $\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{s}_w \leq 1$. This results in

equation (A53) being equivalent to the feasibility problem

$$P\mathbf{s}_w \leq \mathbf{b}_w \quad \forall w \in [m'] \quad \text{where} \quad P := \begin{bmatrix} -LN \\ \mathbf{1}_m^T \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{b} := \begin{bmatrix} -L\mathbf{q}_w \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{s}_w \geq 0 \quad (\text{A56})$$

From Farkas' lemma, there exists a vector $\mathbf{s}_w \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ such that $P\mathbf{s}_w \leq \mathbf{b}_w$ if and only if for all $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{t}^T \oplus \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$,

$$\mathbf{r}^T P \geq 0 \implies \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{b}_w \geq 0. \quad (\text{A57})$$

The premise of this implication is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \mathbf{1}_m^T &\geq \mathbf{t}^T LN \\ &= (L^T \mathbf{t})^T N = (L^T \mathbf{t}) \cdot N. \end{aligned}$$

The least λ satisfying this inequality is

$$\lambda_{\min} = \max_{x \in [m]} (L^T \mathbf{t}) \cdot \mathbf{p}_x. \quad (\text{A58})$$

The latter part of the equation (A57) is equivalent to

$$\lambda \geq (L^T \mathbf{t}) \cdot \mathbf{q}_w. \quad (\text{A59})$$

Notice that $L^T \mathbf{t}$ is a vector whose elements are in non-increasing order. Redefine it as $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \downarrow}$. Therefore, we have that $\mathbf{s}_w \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ exists if and only if for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \downarrow}$

$$\max_{x \in [m]} \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_x \geq \max_{w \in [m']} \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{q}_w. \quad (\text{A60})$$

4. \implies 1. For all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \downarrow}$ $\max_{x \in [m]} \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p}_x \geq \max_{w \in [m']} \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{q}_w$. This implies that there exists $S = (s_{x|w}) \in \text{STOCH}(m, m')$ such that $\sum_{x \in [m]} s_{x|w} \mathbf{p}_x \succ \mathbf{q}_w$ for all $w \in [m']$. This implies the existence of D_w such that

$$D_w \sum_{x \in [m]} s_{x|w} \mathbf{p}_x = \mathbf{q}_w. \quad (\text{A61})$$

Recall the definition of \mathbf{p}_x and \mathbf{q}_w , define \mathcal{D}_{xw} to have a corresponding matrix to be D_w , and define that of S to be S . The above equation becomes

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{e}_w) = \sum_{x \in [m]} s_{x|w} \mathcal{D}_{xw} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{e}_x) \quad (\text{A62})$$

$$= \sum_{x \in [m]} \mathcal{D}_{xw} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{e}_x) \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{e}_w). \quad (\text{A63})$$

This holds for all $w \in [m']$ and \mathcal{D}_{xw} are doubly stochastic. Therefore, there exists a random permutation superchannel Θ such that $\mathcal{N} = \Theta[\mathcal{M}]$.

3. \iff 5. Suppose that M_w is a matrix containing a ratio of Ky Fan norm between \mathbf{p}_x and \mathbf{q}_w ,

$$M_w := \sum_{x,k} \frac{\|\mathbf{p}_x\|_{(k)}}{\|\mathbf{q}_w\|_{(k)}} \mathbf{e}_x \mathbf{e}_k^T. \quad (\text{A64})$$

Propositions 3. and 5. can be paraphrased as

$$3. \text{ There exists } \mathbf{s}_w \in \text{Prob}(m) \text{ such that } \min_{k \in [n]} \mathbf{s}_w^T M_w \mathbf{e}_k \geq 1 \quad (\text{A65})$$

$$5. \text{ Every } \mathbf{t} \in \text{Prob}(n) \text{ satisfies } \max_{x \in [m]} \mathbf{e}_x^T M_w \mathbf{t} \geq 1. \quad (\text{A66})$$

The following propositions are equivalent to proposition 3:

$$\exists \mathbf{s}_w \in \text{Prob}(m) : \min_{k \in [n]} \mathbf{s}_w^T M_w \mathbf{e}_k \geq 1 \iff \min_{\mathbf{t} \in \text{Prob}(n)} \mathbf{s}_w^T M_w \mathbf{t} \geq 1 \quad (\text{A67})$$

$$\iff \max_{\mathbf{s} \in \text{Prob}(m)} \min_{\mathbf{t} \in \text{Prob}(n)} \mathbf{s}^T M_w \mathbf{t} \geq 1. \quad (\text{A68})$$

The following propositions are equivalent to proposition 5:

$$\forall \mathbf{t} \in \text{Prob}(n) : \max_{x \in [m]} \mathbf{e}_x^T M_w \mathbf{t} \geq 1 \iff \min_{\mathbf{t} \in \text{Prob}(n)} \max_{x \in [m]} \mathbf{e}_x^T M_w \mathbf{t} \geq 1 \quad (\text{A69})$$

$$\iff \min_{\mathbf{t} \in \text{Prob}(n)} \max_{\mathbf{s} \in \text{Prob}(m)} \mathbf{s}^T M_w \mathbf{t} \geq 1 \quad (\text{A70})$$

By the minimax theorem, the maximum and minimum can swap places, so the two propositions coincide. ■

Proof of Theorem 11

Theorem 11. The following are equivalent for a quantum superchannel Θ of the form (25)

1. Θ is completely uniformity preserving
2. The channel $\Theta[\mathbf{u}^B \otimes \text{id}^A] \in \text{CPTP}(A' \rightarrow AB)$ is marginally uniform with respect to B .
3. Θ is mixing.

Proof. Characterization (2) follows directly from the property of complete uniformity since $\mathbf{u}^B \otimes \text{id}^A$ is marginally uniform. To prove the implication (2 \Rightarrow 3) we translate the assumption that

$$\Theta[\mathbf{u}^B \otimes \text{id}^A] = \mathcal{E}^{RB \rightarrow B} \circ (\mathbf{u}^B \otimes \text{id}^A) \circ \mathcal{V}^{A' \rightarrow RA} = \mathcal{E}^{RB \rightarrow B} \circ (\mathbf{u}^B \otimes \mathcal{V}^{A' \rightarrow RA}) \quad (\text{A71})$$

is marginally uniform to the condition:

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{u}^B}^{R \rightarrow B} \circ \mathcal{V}^{TA} = \mathcal{R}^{R \rightarrow B} \circ \mathcal{V}^{TA}, \quad (\text{A72})$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{u}^B}^{R \rightarrow B}(\omega^R) := \mathcal{E}^{RB \rightarrow B}(\omega^R \otimes \mathbf{u}^B)$ and \mathcal{V}^{TA} the partial transpose of \mathcal{V} : $\mathcal{V}^{TA}(\rho^A \otimes \omega^{A'}) := \text{Tr}_A[\rho^T \mathcal{V}(\omega)]$. Because the realization is minimal, \mathcal{V}^{TA} maps operators on the composite system AA' to operators on the reference system R surjectively [24] and could therefore be eliminated from both sides of the equation.

The implication (3 \Rightarrow 1) is almost trivial: Given a marginally uniform channel $\mathcal{N}^{AC_0 \rightarrow BC_1} = \mathbf{u}^B \otimes \mathcal{N}^{AC_0 \rightarrow C_1}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta[\mathcal{N}^{AC_0 \rightarrow BC_1}] &= \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{u}^B}^{R \rightarrow B} \circ \mathcal{N}^{AC_0 \rightarrow C_1} \circ \mathcal{V}^{A' \rightarrow RA} \\ &= \mathbf{u}^B \otimes \left(\mathcal{N}^{AC_0 \rightarrow C_1} \circ \text{Tr}_R \circ \mathcal{V}^{A' \rightarrow RA} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A73})$$

where the second inequality follows from the conditional unitality of \mathcal{E} . ■

Proof of Theorem A

Theorem A. Let $\mathcal{V} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$, $\mathcal{U} \in \text{CPTP}(C \rightarrow D)$ be isometry channels, and let A', B', C', D' be systems such that $BB' \cong DD'$, then

$$\mathcal{V}^{A \rightarrow B} \otimes \mathcal{R}^{A' \rightarrow B'} \sim \mathcal{U}^{C \rightarrow D} \otimes \mathcal{R}^{C' \rightarrow D'}, \quad (\text{A74})$$

if and only if $|AB| = |CD|$.

This is a stronger version of Thm. that implies it directly but also demonstrates the maximality of isometry channels with respect to majorization. We divide Thm. A into two lemmas corresponding to the “if” and the “only if” directions of the statement:

Lemma 27. If $|AB| \geq |CD|$, then $\mathcal{V}^{A \rightarrow B} \otimes \mathcal{R}^{A' \rightarrow B'} \succ \mathcal{M}^{C \rightarrow D} \otimes \mathcal{R}^{C' \rightarrow D'}$ for every channel $\mathcal{M} \in \text{CPTP}(C \rightarrow D)$.

If we look at the case $|AB| = |CD|$ and substitute \mathcal{M} with the isometry channel \mathcal{U} we get the desired equivalence. Moreover, this lemma demonstrates the maximality of isometry channels in $\text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$.

Proof. By Thm. A we need to find a superchannel that sends $\mathcal{V}^{A \rightarrow B} \otimes \mathcal{R}^{A' \rightarrow B'}$ to $\mathcal{M}^{C \rightarrow D} \otimes \mathcal{R}^{C' \rightarrow D'}$ and $\mathbf{u}^{BB'} \otimes \text{id}^{AA' \rightarrow R}$ to some marginally uniform channel with respect to BD . However, it is enough to find a superchannel Θ that maps $\mathcal{V}^{A \rightarrow B}$ to $\mathcal{U}^{C \rightarrow D}$ and $\mathbf{u}^B \otimes \text{id}^{A \rightarrow R}$ to some marginally uniform channel with respect to D , since we can add and discard uniform channels without changing the form of the input and the marginally uniformity of the output. Let m and n be the dimensions of A and B , respectively, abbreviate $\mathcal{R} := \mathcal{R}^{A \rightarrow B}$ and $\mathcal{R}' := \mathcal{R}^{C \rightarrow D}$ consider the following supermap:

$$\Theta[\mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B}] := \text{Tr}_{AB} \left[\frac{1}{m^2} J_{\mathcal{V}} J_{\mathcal{N}} \right] \otimes \mathcal{M} + \text{Tr}_{AB} \left[\left(\frac{n}{m} J_{\mathcal{R}} - \frac{1}{m^2} J_{\mathcal{V}} \right) J_{\mathcal{N}} \right] \otimes \frac{mn\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{M}}{mn - 1}. \quad (\text{A75})$$

Here,

$$J_{\mathcal{N}} := \sum_{x, y \leq m} |x\rangle\langle y|^A \mathcal{N}^{\bar{A} \rightarrow B} (|x\rangle\langle y|^{\bar{A}})$$

is the Choi matrix of a channel $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$, and $\{|x\rangle_A\}_{x \leq m}$ denotes a basis of A .

Given $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ note that

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{m^2} \text{Tr}_{AB} [J_{\mathcal{V}} J_{\mathcal{N}}] \leq 1 \quad (\text{A76})$$

and

$$\frac{n}{m} \text{Tr}_{AB} [J_{\mathcal{R}} J_{\mathcal{N}}] = \frac{n}{m} \text{Tr}_{AB} [\mathbf{1}^A \otimes \mathbf{u}^B J_{\mathcal{N}}] = \frac{1}{m} \text{Tr}_{AB} [J_{\mathcal{N}}] = 1 \quad (\text{A77})$$

where in the first equality we have used the fact that the Choi-matrix of $\mathcal{R} = \mathbf{u}^B \circ \text{Tr}_A$ is $\mathbf{1}^A \otimes \mathbf{u}^B$. Therefore $\text{Tr}_{AB} \left[\frac{1}{m^2} J_{\mathcal{V}} J_{\mathcal{N}} \right]$ and $\text{Tr}_{AB} \left[\left(\frac{n}{m} J_{\mathcal{R}} - \frac{1}{m^2} J_{\mathcal{V}} \right) J_{\mathcal{N}} \right]$ form a probability vector for every input channel \mathcal{N} .

$|CD|\mathcal{R}' - \mathcal{M}$ is completely positive, so by the assumption that $mn \geq |CD|$, the map

$$\frac{mn\mathcal{R}' - \mathcal{M}}{mn - 1}$$

is a quantum channel. We conclude that Θ is a measure-prepare superchannel.

Moreover, since \mathcal{V} is an isometry channel, $J_{\mathcal{V}}$ is a pure (unnormalized) state, hence $\frac{1}{m^2} \text{Tr}_{AB} [J_{\mathcal{V}}^2] = 1$, which means $\Theta[\mathcal{V}] = \mathcal{M}$.

To complete the proof, it is left to show that $\Theta[\mathbf{u}^B \otimes \text{id}^{A \rightarrow R}]$ is marginally uniform with respect to D . Note that for any two channels, $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$, we have

$$\text{Tr}_{AB} [J_{\mathcal{N}} J_{\mathcal{E}}] = \sum_{x, y \leq |A|} \text{Tr}_B [\mathcal{E}(|x\rangle\langle y|_A)^* \mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle y|_A)] , \quad (\text{A78})$$

and therefore, for every channel \mathcal{N}

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}_{AB} \left[J_{\mathcal{N}} J_{(\mathbf{u}^B \otimes \text{id}^{A \rightarrow R})} \right] &= \sum_{x, y \leq |A|} \text{Tr}_B \left[\mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle y|_A)^* \left(\mathbf{u}^B \otimes \text{id}^{A \rightarrow R}(|x\rangle\langle y|_A) \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{x, y \leq |A|} \text{Tr}_B \left[\mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle y|_A)^* \mathbf{u}^B \right] |x\rangle\langle y|_R \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x, y \leq |A|} \text{Tr}_B \left[\mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle y|_A)^* \right] |x\rangle\langle y|_R \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x, y \leq |A|} \delta_{xy} |x\rangle\langle y|_R = \frac{m}{n} \mathbf{u}^R , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A79})$$

where in the fourth equality we have used the fact that \mathcal{N} is trace preserving. Substituting this in the definition of Θ amounts to:

$$\Theta[\mathbf{u}^B \otimes \text{id}^{A \rightarrow R}] = \frac{1}{mn} \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathbf{u}^R + \left(1 - \frac{1}{mn} \right) \frac{mn\mathcal{R}' - \mathcal{M}}{mn - 1} \otimes \mathbf{u}^R = \mathcal{R}' \otimes \mathbf{u}^R . \quad (\text{A80})$$

■

We move on to prove the “only if” part which we state in a similar fashion:

Lemma 28. If $|AB| > |CD|$ then $\mathcal{V}^{A \rightarrow B} \otimes \mathcal{R}^{A' \rightarrow B'} \not\prec \mathcal{M}^{C \rightarrow D} \otimes \mathcal{R}^{C' \rightarrow D'}$ for every channel $\mathcal{M} \in \text{CPTP}(C \rightarrow D)$.

Proof. By Lemma 27, without loss of generality we can assume that $A = C = \mathbb{C}$, so that the isometry channels, \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{U} are pure states ψ^B, ϕ^D and clearly we can assume that $A' = C' = \mathbb{C}$. Since, $|B| > |D|$ and $|BB'| = |DD'|$ we deduce $|B'| < |D|$. In that case, from what we know about state majorization, we have:

$$\psi^B \otimes \mathbf{u}^{B'} \sim \mathbf{u}^{B'} \not\prec \mathbf{u}^{D'} \sim \phi^D \otimes \mathbf{u}^{D'} .$$

■

Proof of Theorem 14

Theorem 14. The channel $\mathcal{N}^{A'B \rightarrow AB}$ is a conditionally mixing operation if and only if it has the form (36), where $\mathcal{E}^{RB \rightarrow B}$ is a conditionally unital channel.

Proof. Suppose first that \mathcal{E}_τ is doubly stochastic for every density matrix τ^R . Then, since every Hermitian matrix η^R can be expressed as $\eta^R = a\tau_1^R - b\tau_2^R$, where $a, b \geq 0$ are non negative real numbers and τ_1 and τ_2 are two density matrices, we get from linearity that $\mathcal{E}_\eta^{A \rightarrow A}(\cdot) := \mathcal{E}^{RA \rightarrow A}(\eta^R \otimes (\cdot))$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{E}_\eta^{A \rightarrow A}(\mathbf{u}^A) = \text{Tr}[\eta^R] \mathbf{u}^A. \quad (\text{A81})$$

Now, let ρ^B be a state and denote by

$$\omega^{RB'} := \mathcal{V}^{B \rightarrow RB'}(\rho^B). \quad (\text{A82})$$

Thus, from (36) we get

$$\mathcal{N}^{AB \rightarrow AB'}(\mathbf{u}^A \otimes \rho^B) = \mathcal{E}^{RA \rightarrow A}(\mathbf{u}^A \otimes \omega^{RB'}). \quad (\text{A83})$$

Decomposing $\omega^{RB'} = \sum_{j \in [k]} \eta_j^R \otimes \omega_j^{B'}$ with η_j and ω_j being hermitian matrices, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}^{AB \rightarrow AB'}(\mathbf{u}^A \otimes \rho^B) &= \sum_{j \in [k]} \mathcal{E}^{RA \rightarrow A}(\mathbf{u}^A \otimes \eta_j^R) \otimes \omega_j^{B'} \\ (\text{A81}) \rightarrow &= \mathbf{u}^A \otimes \sum_{j \in [k]} \text{Tr}[\eta_j^R] \omega_j^{B'} \\ &= \mathbf{u}^A \otimes \omega^{B'}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A84})$$

Thus, $\mathcal{N}^{AB \rightarrow AB'}$ is conditional unital.

Conversely, suppose $\mathcal{N}^{AB \rightarrow AB'}$ is a conditionally mixing operation. Since $\mathcal{N}^{AB \rightarrow \bar{A}B'}$ is conditionally unital, one of the marginals of its Choi matrix satisfies (see Lemma 7.1.1. in [])

$$J_{\mathcal{N}}^{B\bar{A}B'} = J_{\mathcal{N}}^{BB'} \otimes \mathbf{u}^{\bar{A}}. \quad (\text{A85})$$

Since \mathcal{N} is also $A \not\rightarrow B'$ signalling, we get from (36) that

$$J_{\mathcal{N}}^{B\bar{A}B'} = |AB| \mathcal{E}^{RA \rightarrow \bar{A}}(\mathbf{u}^A \otimes \phi^{BB'R}) \quad (\text{A86})$$

where

$$\phi^{BB'R} = \mathcal{V}^{\bar{B} \rightarrow RB'}(\Phi^{B\bar{B}}) \quad (\text{A87})$$

and $\Phi^{B\bar{B}}$ is a maximally entangled state. Combining this with (A85) and denoting by $\sigma^{BB'} := \text{Tr}_r[\phi^{BB'R}]$ gives

$$\mathcal{E}^{RA \rightarrow A}(\mathbf{u}^A \otimes \phi^{BB'R}) = \mathbf{u}^A \otimes \sigma^{BB'}. \quad (\text{A88})$$

Since R has the same dimension as the support of $\sigma^{BB'}$ we can embed σ in R . Thus, conjugating both sides of the equation above by $\sigma^{-1/2}(\cdot)\sigma^{-1/2}$ gives

$$\mathcal{E}^{RA \rightarrow A}(\mathbf{u}^A \otimes \Omega^{\tilde{R}R}) = \mathbf{u}^A \otimes I^{\tilde{R}}, \quad (\text{A89})$$

where we restricted $\sigma^{BB'}$ to its support $\tilde{R} := \text{supp}(\sigma^{BB'})$. Finally, multiplying both sides by a density matrix $(\tau^{\tilde{R}})^T$ and taking the traces gives

$$\mathcal{E}^{RA \rightarrow A}(\mathbf{u}^A \otimes \tau^R) = \mathbf{u}^A. \quad (\text{A90})$$

Since τ^R was arbitrary, this completes the proof. ■

Proof of Theorem 15

Theorem 15. Using the same notation, $\mathcal{N}^{X \rightarrow Y} \succ \mathcal{M}^{X' \rightarrow Y}$ if and only if there exist $\mathbf{p} \in \text{Prob}(m)$ and $\mathbf{q} \in \text{Prob}(m')$ such that $\sum_x p_x \mathbf{e}_x \otimes \mathbf{p}_x \succ_Y \sum_w q_w \mathbf{e}_w \otimes \mathbf{q}_w$.

Proof. Denote $|X| = m$, $|X'| = m'$, $|Y| = n$ and assume $\sum_x p_x \mathbf{e}_x \otimes \mathbf{p}_x \succ_Y \sum_w q_w \mathbf{e}_w \otimes \mathbf{q}_w$. Then, as shown in chapter 4 of [13]), it is equivalent to the existence of $R = (r_{w|x}) \in \text{STOCH}(m', m)$ such that

$$\sum_{x \in [m]} r_{w|x} p_x \mathbf{p}_x^X \succ q_w \mathbf{q}_w^X \quad \forall w \in [m'] \quad (\text{A91})$$

or

$$\sum_{x \in [m]} \frac{r_{w|x} p_x}{q_w} \mathbf{p}_x^X \succ \mathbf{q}_w^X \quad \forall w \in [m'] \quad (\text{A92})$$

The LHS of (A92) is a convex combination (as can be seen by taking the sum of all elements on both sides), and so $N^{Y \rightarrow X} \succ M^{Y' \rightarrow X}$ according to 8.

For the other direction, we will do the reverse process. Assume $\mathcal{N} \succ \mathcal{M}$. Then according to 8 there exists $\tilde{R} = (\tilde{r}_{x|w}) \in \text{STOCH}(m, m')$ such that

$$\sum_{x \in [m]} \tilde{r}_{x|w} \mathbf{p}_x^X \succ \mathbf{q}_w^X \quad \forall w \in [m']. \quad (\text{A93})$$

Choose any $\mathbf{q} \in \text{Prob}(m')$ and define $\mathbf{p} \in \text{Prob}(m)$ according to

$$p_x := \sum_{w \in [m']} \tilde{r}_{x|w} q_w \quad \forall x \in [m]. \quad (\text{A94})$$

Define $S = (s_{w|x}) \in \text{STOCH}(m', m)$ via $s_{w|x} := \tilde{r}_{x|w} \frac{q_w}{p_x}$ and from (A93) get

$$\sum_{x \in [m]} \frac{s_{w|x} p_x}{q_w} \mathbf{p}_x^X \succ \mathbf{q}_w^X \quad \forall w \in [m'] \quad (\text{A95})$$

or

$$\sum_{x \in [m]} s_{w|x} p_x \mathbf{p}_x^X \succ q_w \mathbf{q}_w^X \quad \forall w \in [m'] \quad (\text{A96})$$

which finishes the proof. ■

Normalization of a Channel Entropy

Lemma 29. Let \mathbb{H} be an unnormalized non-zero entropy of a channel and denote the uniform qubit state by $\mathbf{u}_2 \in \mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$. Then $\mathbb{H}(\mathbf{u}_2) > 0$.

Proof. Note that $\mathbf{u}_2 \succ \mathbf{u}_2^{\otimes 2}$ (since \mathbf{u}_2 can be embedded in \mathbb{C}^4 where $\mathbf{u}_2^{\otimes 2}$ is minimal) and therefore $\mathbb{H}(\mathbf{u}_2) \leq 2\mathbb{H}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ so $\mathbb{H}(\mathbf{u}_2) \geq 0$. We need to show that this inequality is strict. By assumption, there exists a channel $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ of non-zero entropy. Without loss of generality, using a post-processing isometry channel, we can assume $B = \mathbb{C}^{2^m}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Minimality of the uniform state tells us that $\mathcal{N} \succ \mathbf{u}^B = \mathbf{u}_2^{\otimes m}$ and because of additivity, if the entropy of \mathcal{N} is positive, so is that of \mathbf{u}_2 . We therefore proceed assuming $\mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} < 0$.

By the additivity axiom, the state 1 on the trivial system \mathbb{C} must have zero entropy. Again by invariance under post-processing isometry channels so does any other pure state. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2^k > |AB|$. By Lemma 27 any pure state ψ on \mathbb{C}^{2^k} satisfies $\psi \succ \mathcal{N} \otimes \mathbf{u}^R$ for a system R of dimension $2^k - |B|$. But as before, we have $\mathcal{N} \otimes \mathbf{u}^R \succ \mathcal{N} \otimes \mathbf{u}_2^{\otimes k}$, which by additivity means that $\mathbb{H}(\mathbf{u}_2) = -\mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}}/k > 0$. \blacksquare

Equivalence between Definitions of the Min Entropy of Channels

Lemma 30. The definitions of the min-entropy of channels in Eq. (53) and Eq. (54) are equivalent.

Proof. Note that $\mathcal{R}^{A \rightarrow B}(\psi^{AR}) = \psi^R \otimes \mathbf{u}^B$ for all $\psi \in \text{Pure}(RA)$, hence it is enough to show that

$$D_{\max}(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{R}) = \max_{\psi \in \text{Pure}(RA)} D_{\max}(\mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B}(\psi^{RA}) \parallel \mathcal{R}^{A \rightarrow B}(\psi^{RA})) .$$

The proof is almost immediate from Choi's characterization of completely positive maps. First, note that by definition, if $t\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{N}$ is completely positive then $(t\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{N})^{A \rightarrow B}(\psi^{AR}) \geq 0$ for every pure state ψ^{AR} , so we conclude

$$D_{\max}(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{R}) \geq \max_{\psi \in \text{Pure}(RA)} D_{\max}(\mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B}(\psi^{RA}) \parallel \mathcal{R}^{A \rightarrow B}(\psi^{RA})) .$$

On the other hand, by Choi's characterization $(t\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{N})$ is completely positive whenever its application on the maximally entangled state, $(t\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{N})^{A \rightarrow B}(\Phi^{RA}) = t\mathbf{u}^{RB} - \mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B}(\Phi^{RA})$ is positive. Hence,

$$D_{\max}(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{R}) = D_{\max}(\mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B}(\Phi^{RA}) \parallel \mathcal{R}^{A \rightarrow B}(\Phi^{RA})) \leq \max_{\psi \in \text{Pure}(RA)} D_{\max}(\mathcal{N}^{A \rightarrow B}(\psi^{RA}) \parallel \mathcal{R}^{A \rightarrow B}(\psi^{RA})) .$$

\blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 18

Theorem 18. Let \mathbb{H} be an entropy of a quantum channel. For all $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$

$$\mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} \geq H_{\min}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}}. \tag{A97}$$

Proof. Assume to the contrary, that is, assume that there exist systems A, B and a channel $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A \rightarrow B)$ such that $\mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} < H_{\min}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}}$. First, we will manipulate the channel \mathcal{N} to translate this separation and ensure it contains a positive rational. Then we will inflate it to include a natural number, and only then will we get the contradiction. From additivity, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{H}(B \otimes \mathbb{C}^{2^k} | A)_{\mathcal{N} \otimes \mathbf{u}_2^{\otimes k}} = \mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} + k < H_{\min}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} + k = H_{\min}(B \otimes \mathbb{C}^{2^k} | A)_{\mathcal{N} \otimes \mathbf{u}_2^{\otimes k}} , \tag{A98}$$

where \mathbf{u}_2 is the uniform qubit state. Specifically, because k is arbitrarily large we can assume that $\mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} > 0$ without loss of generality (by renaming \mathcal{N}). Therefore, there exists a positive rational number $t = \frac{m}{n}$ that

satisfies $\mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} < t < H_{\min}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}}$. Furthermore, in such case,

$$\mathbb{H}(B^n|A^n)_{\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}} = n\mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} < m < nH_{\min}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} = H_{\min}(B^n|A^n)_{\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}} \quad (\text{A99})$$

so by renaming \mathcal{N} again, we may actually assume that $t = m \in \mathbb{N}$.

We shall now prove that $\mathbf{u}_2^{\otimes t} \succ \mathcal{N}$ leading to $t = \mathbb{H}(\mathbf{u}_2^{\otimes t}) \leq \mathbb{H}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}}$ which is a contradiction. Define $l = 2^t$ and note that

$$\log l = t < H_{\min}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}} \leq H_{\min}(\mathbf{u}^B) = \log n ,$$

where n is the dimension of B . We can therefore identify $\mathbf{u}_l := \mathbf{u}_2^{\otimes t}$ with its image under an isometry channel in CPTP($\mathbb{C}^l \rightarrow B$) (by adding zeros) and write $\mathbf{u}_l \in \mathfrak{D}(B)$. Define Θ to be the supermap taking operators on B to superoperators on $(A \rightarrow B)$ in the following way:

$$\Theta[\rho] := \text{Tr}(\Lambda\rho)\mathcal{N} + (1 - \text{Tr}(\Lambda\rho)) \frac{n\mathcal{R} - l\mathcal{N}}{n-l} , \quad (\text{A100})$$

Where Λ is the projection in B on the support of \mathbf{u}_l and $\mathcal{R} := \mathcal{R}^{A \rightarrow B}$. By definition $\text{Tr}(\Lambda\mathbf{u}_l) = 1$, so Θ takes \mathbf{u}_l to \mathcal{N} , hence, we will be done once we prove that Θ is a mixing superchannel.

First, since Θ is a measurement-prepare supermap, in order to prove that Θ is indeed a superchannel it is enough to show that $\frac{n\mathcal{R} - l\mathcal{N}}{n-l}$ is a quantum channel. It is trace preserving as an affine combination of channels. To see complete positivity, observe that

$$l = 2^t \leq 2^{H_{\min}(B|A)_{\mathcal{N}}} = \frac{n}{\min\{s \mid s\mathcal{R} \geq \mathcal{N}\}} ,$$

so

$$n \geq \min\{ls \mid s\mathcal{R} \geq \mathcal{N}\} = \min\{s \mid s\mathcal{R} \geq l\mathcal{N}\} ,$$

which means $n\mathcal{R} \geq l\mathcal{N}$.

Since the inputs of Θ are states, in order to check that it is mixing, we only need to check that it takes the uniform state to the uniform channel. Indeed, note that $\text{Tr}(\Lambda\mathbf{u}^B) = \frac{l}{n}$ so

$$\Theta[\mathbf{u}^B] = \frac{l}{n}\mathcal{N} + \frac{n-l}{n} \cdot \frac{n\mathcal{R} - l\mathcal{N}}{n-l} = \mathcal{R} . \quad (\text{A101})$$

■

Proof of Theorem 19

Theorem 19. Using the same notations as above,

$$\overline{\mathbb{H}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} = \min_{x \in [m]} \mathbb{H}(\mathbf{p}_x) \quad (\text{A102})$$

for any quasiconcave classical entropy function \mathbb{H} .

Proof. By definition, the maximal extension $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$ of classical entropy function \mathbb{H} is given by

$$\overline{\mathbb{H}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} = \inf\{\mathbb{H}(\mathbf{q}) : \mathcal{N} \succ \mathbf{q}\} \quad (\text{A103})$$

where the infimum is among all probability vectors \mathbf{q} of any dimension.

A probability vector \mathbf{q} satisfies $\mathcal{N} \succ \mathbf{q}$ if and only if there exists a convex combination of \mathbf{p}_x which majorizes \mathbf{q} ; that is, $\sum_{x \in [m]} \lambda_x \mathbf{p}_x \succ \mathbf{q}$ for some $\lambda_x \geq 0$ such that $\sum_{x \in [m]} \lambda_x = 1$. It follows from the Schur-concavity of \mathbb{H} that

$$\mathbb{H}\left(\sum_{x \in [m]} \lambda_x \mathbf{p}_x\right) \leq \mathbb{H}(\mathbf{q}). \quad (\text{A104})$$

Since \mathbb{H} is quasiconcave, we have

$$\min_{x \in [m]} \mathbb{H}(\mathbf{p}_x) \leq \mathbb{H}\left(\sum_{x \in [m]} \lambda_x \mathbf{p}_x\right) \leq \mathbb{H}(\mathbf{q}), \quad (\text{A105})$$

which shows that $\min\{\mathbb{H}(\mathbf{p}_x) : x \in [m]\}$ is a lower bound for $\{\mathbb{H}(\mathbf{q}) : \mathcal{N} \succ \mathbf{q}\}$. This lower bound is attained since $\mathcal{N} \succ \mathbf{p}_{x_0}$, where $x_0 \in [m]$ such that $\mathbb{H}(\mathbf{p}_{x_0}) = \min\{\mathbb{H}(\mathbf{p}_x) : x \in [m]\}$. This completes the proof. \blacksquare

Lemma 31. The maximal extension of a quasiconcave classical entropy \mathbb{H} is additive.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(X \rightarrow Y)$ and $\mathcal{M} \in \text{CPTP}(X' \rightarrow Y')$, and denote $|X| = m, |X'| = m'$. Then using the form for the maximal extension of a quasiconcave classical entropy function \mathbb{H} , we have

$$\overline{\mathbb{H}}(YY'|XX')_{\mathcal{N} \otimes \mathcal{M}} = \min_{z \in [mm']} \mathbb{H}((\mathcal{N} \otimes \mathcal{M})(|z\rangle\langle z|)) \quad (\text{A106})$$

$$= \min_{x \in [m], x' \in [m']} \mathbb{H}((\mathcal{N} \otimes \mathcal{M})(|x\rangle\langle x| \otimes |x'\rangle\langle x'|)) \quad (\text{A107})$$

$$= \min_{x \in [m], x' \in [m']} \mathbb{H}(\mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle x|) \otimes \mathcal{M}(|x'\rangle\langle x'|)) \quad (\text{A108})$$

$$= \min_{x \in [m], x' \in [m']} [\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle x|)) + \mathbb{H}(\mathcal{M}(|x'\rangle\langle x'|))] \quad (\text{A109})$$

$$= \min_{x \in [m]} \mathbb{H}(\mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle x|)) + \min_{x' \in [m']} \mathbb{H}(\mathcal{M}(|x'\rangle\langle x'|)) \quad (\text{A110})$$

$$= \overline{\mathbb{H}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} + \overline{\mathbb{H}}(Y'|X')_{\mathcal{M}}. \quad (\text{A111})$$

Therefore $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$ is additive. \blacksquare

Lemma 32. The minimal extension of the entropy function \mathbb{H} to the domain of classical channels is given by

$$\underline{\mathbb{H}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} = \mathbb{H}(\mathbf{q}) \quad (\text{A112})$$

where \mathbf{q} is the optimal upper bound of $\{\mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle x|)\}_{x \in [X]}$ with respect to majorization.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(X \rightarrow Y)$, and denote $|X| = m, |Y| = n$. The minimal extension of $\underline{\mathbb{H}}$ is given by

$$\underline{\mathbb{H}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} = \sup_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \in \bigcup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Prob}(N)}} \{\mathbb{H}(\mathbf{p}) \mid \mathbf{p} \succ \mathcal{N}\} \quad (\text{A113})$$

$$= \sup_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \in \bigcup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Prob}(N)}} \{\mathbb{H}(\mathbf{p}) \mid \forall x \in [m] : \mathbf{p} \succ \mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle x|)\} \quad (\text{A114})$$

$$= \sup_{\mathbf{p} \in \text{Prob}(n)} \{\mathbb{H}(\mathbf{p}) \mid \forall x \in [m] : \mathbf{p} \succ \mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle x|)\} \quad (\text{A115})$$

$$= \mathbb{H}(\mathbf{q}) \quad (\text{A116})$$

where \mathbf{q} is the optimal upper bound of $\{\mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle x|)\}_{x \in [m]}$; that is, \mathbf{q} is the unique vector in $\text{Prob}^\downarrow(n)$ for which $\mathbf{q} \succ \mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle x|)$ for all $x \in [m]$, and $\mathbf{p} \succ \mathbf{q}$ for any $\mathbf{p} \succ \mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle x|)$ for all $x \in [m]$.

The third equality follows from how if $\mathbf{p} \in \text{Prob}(N)$ for $N > n$, then $\mathbf{p} \succ N(|x\rangle\langle x|) \in \text{Prob}(n)$ for each $x \in [m]$, so

$$1 = \|N(|x\rangle\langle x|)\|_{(n)} = \|N(|x\rangle\langle x|) \oplus \mathbf{0}\|_{(n+k)} \leq \|\mathbf{p}\|_{(n+k)} \leq 1 \quad (\text{A117})$$

which implies $p_{n+k}^\downarrow = 0$ for any $k \in [N-n]$. Therefore it is sufficient to consider the infimum over probability vectors of dimension n .

The final equality follows from H being an antitone of the majorization preorder, and any collection of probability vectors of the same dimension having an optimal upper bound.

We add that the optimal upper bound \mathbf{q} of $\{\mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle x|)\}_{x \in [m]}$ can be computed directly from Lemma 26 as follows:

$$q_k = \frac{\Pr_{k_j}(\mathcal{N}) - \Pr_{k_{j-1}}(\mathcal{N})}{k_j - k_{j-1}} \quad (\text{A118})$$

for each positive integer $k_{j-1} < k \leq k_j$, where the $\{k_j\}$ are defined inductively by $k_0 := 0$ and

$$k_j := \max \left(\underset{\substack{k_{j-1} < \ell \leq n \\ \ell \in \mathbb{N}}}{\text{argmax}} \frac{\Pr_\ell(\mathcal{N}) - \Pr_{k_{j-1}}(\mathcal{N})}{\ell - k_{j-1}} \right) \quad (\text{A119})$$

for each $j \in [J]$ where J is the positive integer given by $k_J = n$ and

$$\Pr_k(\mathcal{N}) := \max_{x \in [m]} \|\mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle x|)\|_{(k)} \quad (\text{A120})$$

for each $k \in [n]$. ■

Proof of Theorem 20

Theorem 20. Let \mathbb{H} be a channel entropy that reduces to the Shannon entropy of probability vectors. Then for every classical channel \mathcal{N} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} &= \underline{H}^{\text{reg}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} \\ &= \overline{H}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} \\ &= \min_{x \in [m]} H(\mathbf{p}_x). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A121})$$

The proof of this theorem proceeds nearly identically to the proof of Theorem 4 in [29]. Denote by

$$\bigvee_{x \in [m]} \mathbf{a}_x \quad (\text{A122})$$

the unique optimal upper bound of $\{\mathbf{a}_x\}_{x \in [m]} \subset \text{Prob}(n)$ in $\text{Prob}^\downarrow(n)$. We first prove the following lemma:

Lemma 33. Let $\ell, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m \in \text{Prob}(n)$, and $\mathbf{s} \in \text{Prob}(\ell)$. Then

$$H\left(\bigvee_{x \in [m]} (\mathbf{p}_x \otimes \mathbf{s})\right) \leq \log(\ell) + H\left(\bigvee_{x \in [m]} \mathbf{p}_x\right). \quad (\text{A123})$$

Proof. Observe that since $\mathbf{s} \succ \mathbf{u}^{(\ell)}$, we have $\mathbf{p}_x \otimes \mathbf{s} \succ \mathbf{p}_x \otimes \mathbf{u}^{(\ell)}$ for any $x \in [m]$. Therefore, $\bigvee_{x \in [m]} (\mathbf{p}_x \otimes \mathbf{s}) \succ \bigvee_{x \in [m]} (\mathbf{p}_x \otimes \mathbf{u}^{(\ell)})$, from which the Schur-concavity of H implies

$$H\left(\bigvee_{x \in [m]} (\mathbf{p}_x \otimes \mathbf{s})\right) \leq H\left(\bigvee_{x \in [m]} (\mathbf{p}_x \otimes \mathbf{u}^{(\ell)})\right). \quad (\text{A124})$$

Letting $\mathbf{t} := \bigvee_{x \in [m]} (\mathbf{p}_x \otimes \mathbf{u}^{(\ell)})$ and \mathbf{v} be the marginal of \mathbf{t} obtained by $v_y = \sum_{z=1}^{\ell} t_{(y-1)\ell+z}$ for each $y \in [n]$, we have

$$\|\mathbf{p}_x\|_{(\beta)} = \|\mathbf{p}_x \otimes \mathbf{u}^{(\ell)}\|_{(\beta\ell)} \leq \|\mathbf{t}\|_{(\beta\ell)} = \|\mathbf{v}\|_{(\beta)} \quad (\text{A125})$$

for each $x \in [m]$ and $\beta \in [n]$, so $\mathbf{v} \succ \mathbf{p}_x$ for each $x \in [m]$, hence $\mathbf{v} \succ \bigvee_{x \in [m]} \mathbf{p}_x$. Now, observe that

$$(\mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{u}^{(\ell)})_k = \sum_{k' \in [n\ell]} D_{kk'} t_{k'} \quad (\text{A126})$$

for each $k \in [n\ell]$, where $D_{kk'}$ is a doubly stochastic matrix given by

$$D_{(y-1)\ell+z, (y'-1)\ell+z'} := \frac{\delta_{yy'}}{\ell} \quad (\text{A127})$$

for each $y, y' \in [n]$, $z, z' \in [\ell]$. This implies that

$$\mathbf{t} \succ \mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{u}^{(\ell)}, \quad (\text{A128})$$

and it follows from the Schur-concavity of H that

$$H\left(\bigvee_{x \in [m]} (\mathbf{p}_x \otimes \mathbf{s})\right) = H(\mathbf{t}) \leq H(\mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{u}^{(\ell)}) = H(\mathbf{u}^{(\ell)}) + H(\mathbf{v}) \leq \log(\ell) + H\left(\bigvee_{x \in [m]} \mathbf{p}_x\right), \quad (\text{A129})$$

completing the proof. ■

We are now ready to prove the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 20. Denote by $m := |X|$ and $n := |Y|$, and for each $x \in [m]$ denote $\mathbf{p}_x := \mathcal{N}(|x\rangle\langle x|) \in \text{Prob}(n)$. Given $x \in [m^k]$, write $x = x_1 + \sum_{j \in [k-1]} (x_{j+1} - 1)m^j$, where $x_j \in [m]$ for each $j \in [k]$, from which we get $|x\rangle\langle x| = \otimes_{j=1}^k |x_j\rangle\langle x_j|$. Letting $\mathbf{t} := (t_1, \dots, t_m)$ be the type of the sequence $\mathbf{x} := (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in [m]^k$,

and $\mathfrak{T}_{m,k}$ the set of all types of sequences in $[m]^k$, we have

$$\underline{H}(Y^k|X^k)_{\mathcal{N}^{\otimes k}} := H\left(\bigvee_{x \in [m]^k} \mathcal{N}^{\otimes k}(|x\rangle\langle x|)\right) = H\left(\bigvee_{x \in [m]^k} \mathcal{N}^{\otimes k}\left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^k |x_j\rangle\langle x_j|\right)\right) \quad (\text{A130})$$

$$= H\left(\bigvee_{x \in [m]^k} \bigotimes_{j=1}^k \mathcal{N}(|x_j\rangle\langle x_j|)\right) = H\left(\bigvee_{\mathbf{x} \in [m]^k} \bigotimes_{j=1}^k \mathbf{P}_{x_j}\right) \quad (\text{A131})$$

$$= H\left(\bigvee_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathfrak{T}_{m,k}} \bigotimes_{x=1}^m \mathbf{P}_x^{\otimes kt_x}\right) \quad (\text{A132})$$

$$\geq -\log((n^\kappa)^m) + H\left(\bigvee_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathfrak{T}_{m,k}} \left(\bigotimes_{x=1}^m \mathbf{P}_x^{\otimes kt_x} \otimes \bigotimes_{x=1}^m \mathbf{P}_x^{\otimes \kappa}\right)\right) \quad (\text{A133})$$

$$= -\kappa m \log(n) + H\left(\bigvee_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathfrak{T}_{m,k}} \left(\bigotimes_{x=1}^m \mathbf{P}_x^{\otimes kt_x + \kappa}\right)\right) \quad (\text{A134})$$

where κ is an integer $1 \leq \kappa \leq k$, and the inequality follows from Lemma 33.

Following the same line of reasoning as the proof of Theorem 4 in the supplemental material section of [29] shows that

$$\underline{H}^{\text{reg}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \underline{H}(Y^k|X^k)_{\mathcal{N}^{\otimes k}} \geq \min_{x \in [m]} H(\mathbf{p}_x) = \overline{H}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} \quad (\text{A135})$$

where the last equality follows from Theorem 19 and the quasiconcavity of the Shannon entropy. Combining this with the properties of regularization and the expression for the maximal extension of \mathbb{H} we get

$$\overline{H}^{\text{reg}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} = \overline{H}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} \leq \underline{H}^{\text{reg}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} \leq \mathbb{H}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} \leq \overline{H}^{\text{reg}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} \quad (\text{A136})$$

where in the first equality we used the additivity of \overline{H} as shown in Lemma 31. Therefore, all the inequalities above must be equalities so that $\mathbb{H}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} = \underline{H}^{\text{reg}}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} = \overline{H}(Y|X)_{\mathcal{N}} = \min_{x \in [m]} H(\mathbf{p}_x)$. \blacksquare