

ISOMETRIES OF THE QUBIT STATE SPACE WITH RESPECT TO QUANTUM WASSERSTEIN DISTANCES

RICHÁRD SIMON AND DÁNIEL VIROSZTEK

ABSTRACT. In this paper we study isometries of quantum Wasserstein distances and divergences on the quantum bit state space. We describe isometries with respect to the symmetric quantum Wasserstein divergence d_{sym} , the divergence induced by all of the Pauli matrices. We also give a complete characterization of isometries with respect to D_z , the quantum Wasserstein distance corresponding to the single Pauli matrix σ_z .

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Motivation and main results. Even though the classical problem of transporting mass in an optimal way was already formulated in the 18th century by Monge, the theory of classical optimal transport (OT) became an intensively researched topic of analysis only in the last couple of decades with strong relations to mathematical physics [14, 31, 32], the theory of partial differential equations [1, 21, 34], and probability [2, 3, 28]. One could also mention the several applications in artificial intelligence, image processing, and various other fields of applied sciences. See e.g. [20, 36, 37] and the references therein.

The quantum counterpart of the classical theory has just emerged in the recent years. As usual, the correspondence between the classical world and the quantum world is not one-to-one. The non-commutative counterpart of optimal transport theory is a flourishing research field these days with various different approaches such as that of Biane and Voiculescu [4], Carlen, Maas, Datta, and Rouzé [9–13], Caglioti, Golse, Mouhot, and Paul [7, 8, 24–27], De Palma and Trevisan [15–17], Życzkowski and his collaborators [5, 22, 40, 41], and Duvenhage [18, 19]. Separable quantum Wasserstein distances have also been introduced recently [39].

In this paper, we follow the approach of De Palma and Trevisan involving quantum channels, which is closely related to the quantum optimal transport concept of Caglioti, Golse, Mouhot, and Paul based on quantum couplings. A common feature of both the channel-based De Palma-Trevisan approach and the coupling-based Caglioti-Golse-Mouhot-Paul approach is that the induced optimal transport distances are not genuine metrics. In particular, states can have strictly positive self-distances. On the one hand, this is coherent with our picture of quantum mechanics, on the other hand it can lead to some unexpected consequences. For

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 49Q22; 81Q99. Secondary: 54E40.

Key words and phrases. quantum optimal transport, isometries, preservers.

R. Simon is supported by the New National Excellence Program (grant no. ÚNKP-23-3). D. Virosztek is supported by the Momentum Program of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences under grant agreement no. LP2021-15/2021, and partially supported by the ERC Synergy Grant no. 810115.

example, there exist non-surjective and even non-injective quantum Wasserstein isometries (distance preserving maps) — see [23]. None of these could occur in a genuine metric setting. As a response to this phenomenon, De Palma and Trevisan introduced quantum Wasserstein divergences [17], which are appropriately modified versions of quantum Wasserstein distances, to eliminate self-distances — see (4) for a precise definition. They conjectured that the divergences defined this way are genuine metrics on quantum state spaces [17], and this conjecture has been recently justified under a certain additional assumption [6].

The theory of isometries on structures of operators and functions is a well-established, active field of research in analysis and linear algebra. See, for example, [29, 30, 33, 35] for some of the recent advances in the field. In [23], the second author and his collaborators characterized the isometry group of the qubit state space with respect to the Wasserstein distance D_{sym} , the quantum Wasserstein distance induced by all three Pauli matrices. They obtained a Wigner-type result, showing that the isometry group consists of unitary and anti-unitary conjugations. They also gave lower and upper bounds on the isometry group of D_{xz} , the quantum Wasserstein distance induced by the Pauli operators σ_x and σ_z .

The complete description of the isometry group of D_{sym} obtained in [23] encouraged us to study the isometries of the corresponding divergence d_{sym} , which is more challenging for at least two reasons. First, the fact that the isometries of quantum Wasserstein distances preserve the self-distances of states provides us with a useful grab on isometries of distances — we completely lose this tool when turning to divergences as $d(\rho, \rho) = 0$ for any divergence d and state ρ . Second, the squared Wasserstein distances are convex, and hence the maximal distances are realized by extremal, that is, pure states. This fact is also useful when determining the structure of isometries, and we cannot use it in the case of Wasserstein divergences, as squared divergences are not convex in general.

The surprising phenomenon that the structure of the D_{xz} -isometries turned out to be much richer and much more flexible than that of the D_{sym} -isometries motivated us to go one step further and remove also σ_x from the generators of the quantum Wasserstein distance and consider D_z — we recall that we get D_{xz} from D_{sym} by removing σ_y . We expected that the structure of D_z -isometries on qubits shows even more flexibility, and that turned out to be the case — see Theorem 2 for the details.

According to the above considerations, the goal of this paper is to describe isometries of the quantum Wasserstein divergence d_{sym} , and to characterize the isometries with respect to D_z , the Wasserstein distance induced by the single Pauli operator σ_z . We describe our main results in an informal way below — see Theorem 1 and 2 for the precise statements.

Main result. *The isometries of the symmetric quantum Wasserstein divergence d_{sym} , which map pure states to pure states, are exactly the Wigner symmetries, that is, the unitary and anti-unitary conjugations. In the Bloch ball model, the group of these transformations coincides with the orthogonal group $\mathbf{O}(3)$. Furthermore, a self-map of the quantum bit state space is an isometry of the quantum Wasserstein distance D_z if and only if it preserves the length of the Bloch vector of every state and either keeps the third (“z”) coordinate of the Bloch vectors fixed or sends them to their negative.*

1.2. Basic notions and notations. As our results concern quantum bits, we will review the basics of quantum optimal transport in the finite-dimensional setting to avoid technical difficulties that will not matter later. Let \mathcal{H} be a finite-dimensional complex Hilbert space, and let $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ stand for the set of linear operators acting on \mathcal{H} . Let $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})^{\text{sa}}$ denote the real linear vector space of self-adjoint linear operators on \mathcal{H} . We write $A \leq B$ for $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})^{\text{sa}}$ if $B - A$ is positive semidefinite, that is, if $\langle x, (B - A)x \rangle \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$. We will denote by $S(\mathcal{H})$ the set of quantum states, that is $S(\mathcal{H}) = \{\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \mid \rho \geq 0, \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}}[\rho] = 1\}$. The extremal points of $S(\mathcal{H})$ are called pure states and are rank-one projections, that is, if $\rho \in S(\mathcal{H})$ is pure, then there exists a vector $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\rho = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$. We denote the set of pure states by $\mathcal{P}_1(\mathcal{H})$. The transpose of a linear operator $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is a linear operator acting on \mathcal{H}^* , the (topological) dual of \mathcal{H} . It is denoted by A^T and defined by the identity

$$(A^T \varphi)(x) = \varphi(Ax) \quad (x \in \mathcal{H}, \varphi \in \mathcal{H}^*). \quad (1)$$

Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_N\}$ be a set of self-adjoint linear operators on \mathcal{H} . Then the *cost operator* $C_{\mathcal{A}}$ induced by \mathcal{A} is defined as

$$C_{\mathcal{A}} = \sum_{j=1}^N (A_j \otimes I^T - I \otimes A_j^T)^2. \quad (2)$$

The *Wasserstein distance* corresponding to \mathcal{A} is denoted by $D_{\mathcal{A}}(\cdot; \cdot)$ and defined by

$$D_{\mathcal{A}}^2(\rho, \omega) = \inf \{ \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}^*} [\Pi C_{\mathcal{A}}] \mid \Pi \in \mathcal{C}(\rho, \omega) \}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{C}(\rho, \omega)$ stands for the set of couplings of ρ and ω . According to the convention introduced by De Palma and Trevisan in [16] the set of quantum couplings of $\rho, \omega \in S(\mathcal{H})$ is given by

$$\mathcal{C}(\rho, \omega) = \{ \Pi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}^*) \mid \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}^*}[\Pi] = \omega, \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}}[\Pi] = \rho^T \}.$$

The *Wasserstein divergence* generated by the observables belonging to \mathcal{A} is denoted by $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\cdot; \cdot)$ and defined as follows:

$$d_{\mathcal{A}}(\rho, \omega) := \left(D_{\mathcal{A}}^2(\rho, \omega) - \frac{1}{2} (D_{\mathcal{A}}^2(\rho, \rho) + D_{\mathcal{A}}^2(\omega, \omega)) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (4)$$

Let us take a closer look at the two-dimensional complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^2$. Its state space has a particularly convenient description: elements of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ can be represented with vectors from \mathbb{R}^3 using the Bloch representation. The Bloch vector of a state ρ is defined as

$$\mathbb{R}^3 \ni \mathbf{b}_{\rho} = (\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}}[\sigma_j \rho])_{j=1}^3,$$

where σ_j refers to one of the Pauli matrices

$$\sigma_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \sigma_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \sigma_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

2. ISOMETRIES OF THE d_{sym} QUANTUM WASSERSTEIN DIVERGENCE

First, we consider the case when the transport cost is symmetric in the sense that it is generated by all three Pauli matrices. That is, $\mathcal{A} = \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3\}$. We

denote the corresponding cost operator by C_{sym} , and it is given by

$$C_{sym} = \sum_{j=1}^3 (\sigma_j \otimes I^T - I \otimes \sigma_j^T)^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 0 & 0 & -4 \\ 0 & 8 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 8 & 0 \\ -4 & 0 & 0 & 4 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

We denote the corresponding Wasserstein distance with $D_{sym}(\cdot, \cdot)$, and the corresponding Wasserstein divergence with $d_{sym}(\cdot, \cdot)$. The main result of this section reads as follows.

Theorem 1. *Let $\Phi : S(\mathbb{C}^2) \rightarrow S(\mathbb{C}^2)$ be an isometry of the quantum Wasserstein divergence corresponding to the symmetric cost operator C_{sym} , that is,*

$$d_{sym}(\Phi(\rho), \Phi(\omega)) = d_{sym}(\rho, \omega) \quad (\rho, \omega \in S(\mathbb{C}^2))$$

such that Φ maps pure states to pure states, that is $\Phi(\mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{C}^2)) \subset \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{C}^2)$. Then Φ is necessarily of the form of $\Phi(\rho) = U\rho U^$, where U is either a unitary or an anti-unitary operator on \mathbb{C}^2 . Conversely, unitary and anti-unitary conjugations are d_{sym} -isometries.*

Proof. The fact that maps of the form of $\Phi(\rho) = U\rho U^*$ are indeed isometries follows from the fact that D_{sym} is invariant under unitary and anti-unitary conjugations (see Lemma 1 in [23]) and from the definition of $d_{sym}(\rho, \omega)$. Indeed, $D_{sym}(U\rho U^*, U\omega U^*) = D_{sym}(\rho, \omega)$ and

$$d_{sym}(\rho, \omega)^2 = D_{sym}(\rho, \omega)^2 - \frac{1}{2} (D_{sym}(\rho, \rho)^2 + D_{sym}(\omega, \omega)^2),$$

from where we get that $d_{sym}(U\rho U^*, U\omega U^*) = d_{sym}(\rho, \omega)$. For the converse statement, let $\rho, \omega \in \mathcal{P}_1(\mathcal{H})$ be states of the form of

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}(I + x\sigma_1 + y\sigma_2 + z\sigma_3) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1+z & x-yi \\ x+yi & 1-z \end{bmatrix} \quad (7)$$

and

$$\omega = \frac{1}{2}(I + u\sigma_1 + v\sigma_2 + w\sigma_3) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1+w & u-vi \\ u+vi & 1-w \end{bmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

where $|(x, y, z)| = 1$ and $|(u, v, w)| = 1$, where $|\cdot|$ denotes the Euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^3 . Then both ρ and ω are pure, and the only coupling between ρ and ω is the tensor product (or in other words, independent) coupling $\omega \otimes \rho^T$ and its cost is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}^*} [(\omega \otimes \rho^T) C_{sym}] &= \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}^*} \left[(\omega \otimes \rho^T) \left(6I \otimes I^T - 2 \sum_{j=1}^3 \sigma_j \otimes \sigma_j^T \right) \right] \\ &= 6 - 2 \sum_{j=1}^3 \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [\omega \sigma_j] \cdot \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}^*} [\rho^T \sigma_j^T] = 6 - 2(xu + yv + zw) = 6 - 2 \langle \mathbf{b}_\rho, \mathbf{b}_\omega \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\mathbf{b}_\rho = (x, y, z)$ and $\mathbf{b}_\omega = (u, v, w)$ are the Bloch vectors of ρ and ω , and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the Euclidean inner product on \mathbb{R}^3 . In the above formula (9), we replaced \mathbb{C}^2 by \mathcal{H} for notational convenience, and this will happen later as well when indicating the Hilbert space where the trace is taken. In particular, we can compute the distance of a pure state ρ from itself:

$$\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}^*} [(\rho \otimes \rho^T) C_{sym}] = 6 - 2(x^2 + y^2 + z^2) = 6 - 2 \langle \mathbf{b}_\rho, \mathbf{b}_\rho \rangle = 6 - 2|\mathbf{b}_\rho|^2 = 4. \quad (10)$$

Putting (9) and (10) together, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{sym}}^2(\rho, \omega) &= D_{\text{sym}}^2(\rho, \omega) - \frac{1}{2}(D_{\text{sym}}^2(\rho, \rho) + D_{\text{sym}}^2(\omega, \omega)) \\ &= 6 - 2 \langle \mathbf{b}_\rho, \mathbf{b}_\omega \rangle - 3 + |\mathbf{b}_\rho|^2 - 3 + |\mathbf{b}_\omega|^2 \\ &= |\mathbf{b}_\rho - \mathbf{b}_\omega|^2 \leq 4. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

By (11) d_{sym} coincides with the Euclidean distance of the Bloch vectors on $\mathcal{P}_1(\mathcal{H})$. Therefore the action of the d_{sym} isometry Φ on $\mathcal{P}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is described by an $O \in \mathbf{O}(3)$. By Proposition VII.5.7. in [38] for any orientation preserving $O_+ \in \mathbf{SO}(3)$ there is a $U \in \mathbf{SU}(2)$ such that the action $\rho \mapsto U\rho U^*$ is described by O_+ in the Bloch ball model. Similarly, for an orientation reversing $O_- \in \mathbf{O}(3)$ there is an anti-unitary operator V on \mathbb{C}^2 such that the action $\rho \mapsto V\rho V^*$ is described by O_- in the Bloch ball model. We have seen that unitary and anti-unitary conjugations are d_{sym} isometries. This together with the assumption $\Phi(\mathcal{P}_1(\mathcal{H})) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_1(\mathcal{H})$ means that we can assume without the loss of generality that $\Phi(\rho) = \rho$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_1(\mathcal{H})$. Consider the particular pure states $\rho_j = \frac{1}{2}(I + \sigma_j)$ for $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Then we have $D_{\text{sym}}^2(\rho_j, \omega) = 6 - 2(\mathbf{b}_\omega)_j$, and

$$D_{\text{sym}}^2(\Phi(\rho_j), \Phi(\omega)) = D_{\text{sym}}^2(\rho_j, \Phi(\omega)) = 6 - 2(\mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\omega)})_j.$$

From this, we get that

$$d_{\text{sym}}^2(\rho_j, \omega) = 6 - 2(\mathbf{b}_\omega)_j - 2 - \frac{1}{2}D_{\text{sym}}^2(\omega, \omega)$$

and

$$d_{\text{sym}}^2(\rho_j, \Phi(\omega)) = 6 - 2(\mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\omega)})_j - 2 - \frac{1}{2}D_{\text{sym}}^2(\Phi(\omega), \Phi(\omega)).$$

The preserver equation $d_{\text{sym}}^2(\rho_j, \omega) = d_{\text{sym}}^2(\rho_j, \Phi(\omega))$ yields to

$$\frac{1}{2}(D_{\text{sym}}^2(\Phi(\omega), \Phi(\omega)) - D_{\text{sym}}^2(\omega, \omega)) = (\mathbf{b}_\omega)_j - (\mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\omega)})_j.$$

By Proposition 3. in [6], the self-distance $D_{\text{sym}}^2(\rho, \rho)$ is

$$D_{\text{sym}}^2(\rho, \rho) = 2 \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{b}_\rho|^2} \right) \quad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2).$$

We get that

$$2 \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{b}_\omega|^2} \right) - 2 \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\omega)}|^2} \right) = (\mathbf{b}_\omega)_j - (\mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\omega)})_j \quad \forall j \in \{1, 2, 3\}.$$

Let $\alpha = 2 \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{b}_\omega|^2} \right) - 2 \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\omega)}|^2} \right)$. Then we have the following vector equation

$$\mathbf{b}_\omega = \mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\omega)} + \alpha(1, 1, 1).$$

Consider another orthonormal basis in \mathbb{C}^2 with corresponding unitary U , and let $\tilde{\sigma}_j = U\sigma_j U^*$. It is easy to verify that $\tilde{\sigma}_j$ is self-adjoint, unitary and of order two, similarly to σ_j for each $j = 1, 2, 3$. We choose this new basis in a way that the corresponding $O \in \mathbf{O}(3)$ in the Bloch vector model does not map the vector $(1, 1, 1)$ to itself. Next, we show that the cost operator generated by the observables $\{\tilde{\sigma}_j\}_{j=1}^3$ coincides with the cost generated by the observables $\{\sigma_j\}_{j=1}^3$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{C}_{\text{sym}} &= \sum_{j=1}^3 (\tilde{\sigma}_j \otimes I^T - I \otimes \tilde{\sigma}_j^T)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^3 (\tilde{\sigma}_j)^2 \otimes I^T + I \otimes (\tilde{\sigma}_j^T)^2 - 2\tilde{\sigma}_j \otimes (\tilde{\sigma}_j)^T \\
&= 6I \otimes I^T - 2 \sum_{j=1}^3 U \sigma_j U^* \otimes (U \sigma_j U^*)^T \\
&= 6I \otimes I^T - (U \otimes (U^*)^T) \sum_{j=1}^3 \sigma_j \otimes \sigma_j^T (U^* \otimes U^T) \\
&= (U \otimes (U^*)^T) C_{\text{sym}} (U^* \otimes U^T).
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

According to Lemma 1 in [23], C_{sym} is invariant under unitary conjugations, that is, $(U \otimes (U^*)^T) C_{\text{sym}} (U^* \otimes U^T) = C_{\text{sym}}$. We consider the distinguished pure states $\tilde{\rho}_j := \frac{1}{2}(I + \tilde{\sigma}_j)$. Then $D_{\mathcal{C}}^2(\tilde{\rho}_j, \omega) = 6 - 2\langle \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_\omega, e_j \rangle = \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\omega_j}$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_\omega$ denotes the Bloch vector of ω in the new basis, that is, $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_\omega = (\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [\tilde{\sigma}_j \omega])_{j=1}^3$. The latter equality holds because the symmetric cost operator is invariant under unitary conjugations, see Lemma 1 in [23]. Thus the preserver equation $d_{\text{sym}}^2(\tilde{\rho}_j, \omega) = d_{\text{sym}}^2(\tilde{\rho}_j, \Phi(\omega))$ yields to

$$\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_\omega = \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\Phi(\omega)} + \alpha(1, 1, 1).$$

Let $(1, 1, 1) \neq \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ be the image of $(1, 1, 1)$ under O . Then applying O to both sides of the equation

$$\mathbf{b}_\omega = \mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\omega)} + \alpha(1, 1, 1)$$

yields to

$$0 = \alpha \cdot ((1, 1, 1) - \mathbf{v}).$$

Since $\mathbf{v} \neq (1, 1, 1)$, we conclude that $\alpha = 0$. This means that $\Phi(\rho) = \rho$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, which concludes the proof. \square

3. ISOMETRIES OF THE D_z QUANTUM WASSERSTEIN DISTANCE

In this section, we consider the cost operator C_z generated by the single observable $\sigma_z := \sigma_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$, that is,

$$C_z = (\sigma_z \otimes I^T - I \otimes \sigma_z^T)^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{13}$$

Then the corresponding Wasserstein distance is given by

$$D_z^2(\rho, \omega) = \inf\{\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}^*} [C_z \Pi] \mid \Pi \in C(\rho, \omega)\}.$$

The main result of this section is the complete classification of the isometries of the qubit state space which reads as follows.

Theorem 2. *Let D_z denote the quantum Wasserstein distance defined by the cost operator C_z introduced in (13), and let $\Phi : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ be a map. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) *The map Φ is a quantum Wasserstein isometry with respect to D_z , that is, $D_z(\Phi(\rho), \Phi(\omega)) = D_z(\rho, \omega)$ for all $\rho, \omega \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$.*

- (2) The map Φ leaves the Euclidean length of the Bloch vector of a state invariant, that is, $|\mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\rho)}| = |\mathbf{b}_\rho|$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$, and either $(\mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\rho)})_3 = (\mathbf{b}_\rho)_3$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$, or $(\mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\rho)})_3 = -(\mathbf{b}_\rho)_3$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$.

Proof. Let us consider the direction (1) \implies (2) first.

Step 1: the D_z -diameter of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ is 2 and it is realized if and only if

$$\{\rho, \omega\} = \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(I + \sigma_z), \frac{1}{2}(I - \sigma_z) \right\}.$$

Indeed, let ρ and ω be arbitrary states, then the cost of the trivial coupling $\omega \otimes \rho^T$ is an upper bound of $D_z^2(\rho, \omega)$, that is,

$$D_z^2(\rho, \omega) \leq \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}^*} [\omega \otimes \rho^T \cdot (2I \otimes I^T - 2\sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z^T)] = 2 - 2(b_\rho)_3 \cdot (b_\omega)_3. \quad (14)$$

It follows that $\text{diam}(S(\mathcal{H}), D_z^2) \leq 4$ and $D_z^2(\rho, \omega) = \text{diam}(S(\mathcal{H}), D_z^2)$ if and only if $\rho = \frac{1}{2}(I + \sigma_z)$ and $\omega = \frac{1}{2}(I - \sigma_z)$, or the other way around, since if $|(b_\rho)_3| < 1$ or $|(b_\omega)_3| < 1$, then $2 - 2(b_\rho)_3 \cdot (b_\omega)_3 < 4$. Therefore, $\Phi(\frac{1}{2}(I \pm \sigma_z)) = \frac{1}{2}(I \pm \sigma_z)$ or $\Phi(\frac{1}{2}(I \pm \sigma_z)) = \frac{1}{2}(I \mp \sigma_z)$, that is, Φ either leaves both $\frac{1}{2}(I + \sigma_z)$ and $\frac{1}{2}(I - \sigma_z)$ fixed, or it switches them. Consider the map $T : S(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow S(\mathcal{H})$ where $T(\rho) = \sigma_x \rho \sigma_x^*$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$. Then T is an isometry of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ with respect to the quantum Wasserstein distance D_z such that $T(\frac{1}{2}(I + \sigma_z)) = \frac{1}{2}(I - \sigma_z)$ and $T(\frac{1}{2}(I - \sigma_z)) = \frac{1}{2}(I + \sigma_z)$. Indeed,

$$T\left(\frac{1}{2}(I + \sigma_z)\right) = \sigma_x \left(\frac{1}{2}(I + \sigma_z)\right) \sigma_x^* = \frac{1}{2}(I + \sigma_x \sigma_z \sigma_x^*) = \frac{1}{2}(I - \sigma_z). \quad (15)$$

Similarly, $T(\frac{1}{2}(I - \sigma_z)) = \frac{1}{2}(I + \sigma_z)$. To see that T is isometric, it is sufficient to show that for all ρ, ω in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ and for all couplings π in $\mathcal{C}(\rho, \omega)$ there exists a coupling $\tilde{\pi}$ in $\mathcal{C}(T(\rho), T(\omega))$ such that $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}^*}[\tilde{\pi} C_z] = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}^*}[\pi C_z]$, and the other way around: for all $\tilde{\pi}$ in $\mathcal{C}(T(\rho), T(\omega))$ there is a coupling $\pi \in \mathcal{C}(\rho, \omega)$ with the same cost. The desired bijection between $\mathcal{C}(\rho, \omega)$ and $\mathcal{C}(T(\rho), T(\omega))$ reads as follows: for a given $\pi \in \mathcal{C}(\rho, \omega)$ we define $\tilde{\pi}$ by $\tilde{\pi} = (\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x^T) \pi (\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x^T)$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}^*}[\tilde{\pi} C_z] &= \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}^*}[(\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x^T) \pi (\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x^T) (\sigma_z \otimes I^T - I \otimes \sigma_z^T)^2] \\ &= \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}^*}[\pi (\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x^T) (2I - 2\sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z^T) (\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x^T)] \\ &= \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}^*}[\pi (2I - 2\sigma_x \sigma_z \sigma_x \otimes (\sigma_x \sigma_z \sigma_x)^T)] \\ &= \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}^*}[\pi (2I - 2(-\sigma_z) \otimes (-\sigma_z)^T)] = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}^*}[\pi C_z]. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Therefore, we can assume, without loss of generality, that if Φ is a D_z -Wasserstein isometry, then $\Phi(\frac{1}{2}(I + \sigma_z)) = \frac{1}{2}(I + \sigma_z)$ and $\Phi(\frac{1}{2}(I - \sigma_z)) = \frac{1}{2}(I - \sigma_z)$.

Step 2: Consequently, $(\mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\rho)})_3 = (\mathbf{b}_\rho)_3$ as

$$D_z\left(\Phi(\rho), \Phi\left(\frac{1}{2}(I + \sigma_z)\right)\right) = D_z\left(\Phi(\rho), \frac{1}{2}(I + \sigma_z)\right) = D_z\left(\rho, \frac{1}{2}(I + \sigma_z)\right).$$

From this, we have that

$$2 - 2(\mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\rho)})_3 \cdot 1 = 2 - 2(\mathbf{b}_\rho)_3 \cdot 1. \quad (17)$$

It follows that $(\mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\rho)})_3 = (\mathbf{b}_\rho)_3$.

Step 3: Next we utilise that Φ preserves the self-distances, that is, $D_z(\Phi(\rho), \Phi(\rho)) = D_z(\rho, \rho)$ for all ρ in $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$. According to Corollary 1. in [16] the self-distance is realised by the canonical purification of the state:

$$D_z^2(\rho, \rho) = \langle\langle \sqrt{\rho} \| C_z \| \sqrt{\rho} \rangle\rangle. \quad (18)$$

Here, and in the sequel, we use the following notational convention originally introduced in [16]. For an operator $X \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2)$, the symbol $\|X\rangle\rangle$ stands for the linear map

$$\mathbb{C} \ni z \mapsto ze(X) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes (\mathbb{C}^2)^*$$

where $e : \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes (\mathbb{C}^2)^*$ is the canonical linear isometry between $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ and $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes (\mathbb{C}^2)^*$. The symbol $\langle\langle X \|$ denotes the linear functional

$$\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes (\mathbb{C}^2)^* \ni Y \mapsto \text{tr}_{\mathbb{C}^2} [X^* e^{-1}(Y)] \in \mathbb{C}.$$

A spectral decomposition of C_z is

$$\begin{aligned} C_z &= 4 \left(\frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= 4 \left(\frac{1}{2} \|\sigma_1\rangle\rangle \langle\langle \sigma_1 \| + \frac{1}{2} \|\sigma_2\rangle\rangle \langle\langle \sigma_2 \| \right), \end{aligned}$$

and if $\rho \neq \frac{1}{2}I$ then

$$\sqrt{\rho} = \sqrt{\lambda} \frac{1}{2} \left(I + \frac{\mathbf{b}_\rho}{|\mathbf{b}_\rho|} \cdot \underline{\sigma} \right) + \sqrt{1-\lambda} \frac{1}{2} \left(I - \frac{\mathbf{b}_\rho}{|\mathbf{b}_\rho|} \cdot \underline{\sigma} \right),$$

where $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}(1 + |\mathbf{b}_\rho|)$ and $\underline{\sigma}$ is the vector formed by the Pauli matrices defined in (5). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle\langle \sqrt{\rho} \| C_z \| \sqrt{\rho} \rangle\rangle = \\ &= \left(\sqrt{\lambda} \frac{1}{2} \left(\langle\langle \sigma_0 \| + \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{(\mathbf{b}_\rho)_j}{|\mathbf{b}_\rho|} \langle\langle \sigma_j \| \right) + \sqrt{1-\lambda} \frac{1}{2} \left(\langle\langle \sigma_0 \| - \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{(\mathbf{b}_\rho)_j}{|\mathbf{b}_\rho|} \langle\langle \sigma_j \| \right) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \cdot (2\|\sigma_1\rangle\rangle \langle\langle \sigma_1 \| + 2\|\sigma_2\rangle\rangle \langle\langle \sigma_2 \|) \cdot \\ &\quad \left. \cdot \left(\sqrt{\lambda} \frac{1}{2} \left(\|\sigma_0\rangle\rangle + \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{(\mathbf{b}_\rho)_j}{|\mathbf{b}_\rho|} \|\sigma_j\rangle\rangle \right) + \sqrt{1-\lambda} \frac{1}{2} \left(\|\sigma_0\rangle\rangle - \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{(\mathbf{b}_\rho)_j}{|\mathbf{b}_\rho|} \|\sigma_j\rangle\rangle \right) \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Note that $\langle\langle \sigma_i \| \sigma_j \rangle\rangle = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}}[\sigma_i^* \sigma_j] = 2\delta_{ij}$. Therefore, the above formula (19) greatly simplifies, and by (18) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} D_z^2(\rho, \rho) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - 2\sqrt{\lambda(1-\lambda)} \right) \frac{(\mathbf{b}_\rho)_1^2 + (\mathbf{b}_\rho)_2^2}{|\mathbf{b}_\rho|^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{b}_\rho|^2} \right) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{(\mathbf{b}_\rho)_3^2}{|\mathbf{b}_\rho|^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

From the preserver equation $D_z^2(\Phi(\rho), \Phi(\rho)) = D_z^2(\rho, \rho)$ we get that

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\rho)}|^2} \right) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{(\mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\rho)})_3^2}{|\mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\rho)}|^2} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{b}_\rho|^2} \right) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{(\mathbf{b}_\rho)_3^2}{|\mathbf{b}_\rho|^2} \right).$$

Note that we already deduced in Step 2 that $(\mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\rho)})_3^2 = (\mathbf{b}_\rho)_3^2$, and the map $t \mapsto (1 - \sqrt{1-t}) \cdot (1 - \frac{c}{t})$ is strictly monotone increasing on the domain $t \in [0, 1]$ for any fixed $c \in [0, 1]$. Therefore, $|\mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\rho)}| = |\mathbf{b}_\rho|$ which completes the proof of the direction (1) \implies (2).

Now we consider the direction (2) \implies (1).

Consider the case $(\mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\rho)})_3 \equiv (\mathbf{b}_\rho)_3$. This equation and the invariance of the length of the Bloch vector $|\mathbf{b}_{\Phi(\rho)}| = |\mathbf{b}_\rho|$ implies that for each ρ there is some $t(\rho) \in \mathbb{R}$ (which depends on ρ !) such that

$$\Phi(\rho) = U_z(t(\rho))\rho U_z(t(\rho))^*$$

where $U_z(t) = e^{it\sigma_z}$.

Now the couplings of $\Phi(\rho)$ and $\Phi(\omega)$ take the following form:

$$\mathcal{C}(\Phi(\rho), \Phi(\omega)) = \{\mathcal{U}\Pi\mathcal{U}^* \mid \Pi \in \mathcal{C}(\rho, \omega)\} \quad (21)$$

where $\mathcal{U} = U_z(t(\omega)) \otimes (U_z(t(\rho)))^*$. Indeed, let $\Pi = \sum_{k=1}^K A_k \otimes B_k^T$ be a decomposition of a coupling $\Pi \in \mathcal{C}(\rho, \omega)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}\Pi\mathcal{U}^* &= \sum_{k=1}^K U_z(t(\omega)) \otimes (U_z(t(\rho)))^* (A_k \otimes B_k^T) U_z(t(\omega))^* \otimes (U_z(t(\rho)))^T \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K U_z(t(\omega)) A_k U_z(t(\omega))^* \otimes (U_z(t(\rho))) B_k U_z(t(\rho))^* \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}^*}[\mathcal{U}\Pi\mathcal{U}^*] &= \sum_{k=1}^K U_z(t(\omega)) A_k U_z(t(\omega))^* \cdot \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}}[B_k] \\ &= U_z(t(\omega)) \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}}[B_k] \cdot A_k \right) U_z(t(\omega))^* \\ &= U_z(t(\omega)) \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}^*}[\Pi] U_z(t(\omega))^* = U_z(t(\omega)) \omega U_z(t(\omega))^* \\ &= \Phi(\omega). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Similarly, $\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}}[\mathcal{U}\Pi\mathcal{U}^*] = \Phi(\rho)^T$. This shows that $\{\mathcal{U}\Pi\mathcal{U}^* \mid \Pi \in \mathcal{C}(\rho, \omega)\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\Phi(\rho), \Phi(\omega))$. For the reversed inclusion, a computation very similar to (23) shows that if $\tilde{\Pi}$ is a coupling of $\Phi(\rho)$ and $\Phi(\omega)$, then $\mathcal{U}^* \tilde{\Pi} \mathcal{U}$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}(\rho, \omega)$. It is a crucial observation that \mathcal{U} commutes with C_z for all $t(\rho), t(\omega) \in \mathbb{R}$. Indeed, $\mathcal{U} = e^{it(\omega)\sigma_z} \otimes (e^{it(\rho)\sigma_z})^T$ and $C_z = (\sigma_z \otimes I^T - I \otimes \sigma_z^T)^2$. All terms can be obtained from the continuous function calculus of σ_z , therefore $[\mathcal{U}, C_z] = 0$. Finally, by (21) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} D_z^2(\Phi(\rho), \Phi(\omega)) &= \inf\{\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}^*}[\tilde{\Pi} C_z] \mid \tilde{\Pi} \in \mathcal{C}(\Phi(\rho), \Phi(\omega))\} = \\ &= \inf\{\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}^*}[\mathcal{U}\Pi\mathcal{U}^* C_z] \mid \Pi \in \mathcal{C}(\rho, \omega)\} = \\ &= \inf\{\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}^*}[\Pi\mathcal{U}^* \mathcal{U} C_z] \mid \Pi \in \mathcal{C}(\rho, \omega)\} = \\ &= D_z^2(\rho, \omega). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

which completes the proof of the direction (2) \implies (1). \square

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Ambrosio, L. A. Caffarelli, Y. Brenier, G. Buttazzo, and C. Villani. *Optimal transportation and applications*, volume 1813 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin; Centro Internazionale Matematico Estivo (C.I.M.E.), Florence, 2003. Lectures from the C.I.M.E. Summer School held in Martina Franca, September 2–8, 2001. doi:10.1007/b12016.
- [2] J. Backhoff-Veraguas and G. Pammer. Stability of martingale optimal transport and weak optimal transport. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 32(1):721–752, 2022.
- [3] Mathias Beiglböck and Nicolas Juillet. On a problem of optimal transport under marginal martingale constraints. *Ann. Probab.*, 44(1):42–106, 2016. doi:10.1214/14-AOP966.
- [4] Philippe Biane and Dan Voiculescu. A free probability analogue of the Wasserstein metric on the trace-state space. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 11(6):1125–1138, 2001. doi:10.1007/s00039-001-8226-4.
- [5] Rafał Bistroni, Michał Eckstein, and Karol Życzkowski. Monotonicity of the quantum 2-Wasserstein distance, 2022. arXiv:2204.07405.
- [6] Gergely Bunth, József Pitrik, Tamás Titkos, and Dániel Virosztek. Metric property of quantum wasserstein divergences. *Phys. Rev. A*, 110:022211, Aug 2024. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.110.022211>, doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.110.022211.
- [7] Emanuele Caglioti, François Golse, and Thierry Paul. Quantum optimal transport is cheaper. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 181(1):149–162, 2020. doi:10.1007/s10955-020-02571-7.
- [8] Emanuele Caglioti, François Golse, and Thierry Paul. Towards optimal transport for quantum densities, 2021. arXiv:2101.03256.
- [9] Eric A. Carlen and Jan Maas. Gradient flow and entropy inequalities for quantum Markov semigroups with detailed balance. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 273(5):1810–1869, 2017. doi:10.1016/j.jfa.2017.05.003.
- [10] Eric A. Carlen and Jan Maas. Correction to: Non-commutative calculus, optimal transport and functional inequalities in dissipative quantum systems. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 181(6):2432–2433, 2020. doi:10.1007/s10955-020-02671-4.
- [11] Eric A. Carlen and Jan Maas. Non-commutative calculus, optimal transport and functional inequalities in dissipative quantum systems. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 178(2):319–378, 2020. doi:10.1007/s10955-019-02434-w.
- [12] Nilanjana Datta and Cambyse Rouzé. Concentration of quantum states from quantum functional and transportation cost inequalities. *J. Math. Phys.*, 60(1):012202, 22, 2019. doi:10.1063/1.5023210.
- [13] Nilanjana Datta and Cambyse Rouzé. Relating relative entropy, optimal transport and Fisher information: a quantum HWI inequality. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 21(7):2115–2150, 2020. doi:10.1007/s00023-020-00891-8.
- [14] Giuseppe Bruno De Luca, Nicolò De Ponti, Andrea Mondino, and Alessandro Tomasiello. Gravity from thermodynamics: optimal transport and negative effective dimensions. *SciPost Phys.*, 15(2):Paper No. 039, 55, 2023. doi:10.21468/scipostphys.15.2.039.
- [15] Giacomo De Palma, Milad Marvian, Dario Trevisan, and Seth Lloyd. The quantum Wasserstein distance of order 1. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 67(10):6627–6643, 2021. doi:10.1109/TIT.2021.3076442.
- [16] Giacomo De Palma and Dario Trevisan. Quantum optimal transport with quantum channels. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 22(10):3199–3234, 2021. doi:10.1007/s00023-021-01042-3.
- [17] Giacomo De Palma and Dario Trevisan. Quantum optimal transport: quantum channels and qubits. In Jan Maas, Simone Rademacher, Tamás Titkos, and Dániel Virosztek, editors, *Optimal Transport on Quantum Structures*. Springer Nature, 2024. arXiv:2307.16268.
- [18] Rocco Duvenhage. Optimal quantum channels. *Phys. Rev. A*, 104(3):Paper No. 032604, 8, 2021. doi:10.1103/physreva.104.032604.
- [19] Rocco Duvenhage, Samuel Skosana, and Machiel Snyman. Extending quantum detailed balance through optimal transport, 2022. arXiv:2206.15287.
- [20] Sira Ferradans, Nicolas Papadakis, Gabriel Peyré, and Jean-François Aujol. Regularized discrete optimal transport. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 7(3):1853–1882, 2014. doi:10.1137/130929886.

- [21] Alessio Figalli. *The Monge-Ampère equation and its applications*. Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2017. doi:10.4171/170.
- [22] Shmuel Friedland, Michał Eckstein, Sam Cole, and Karol Życzkowski. Quantum Monge-Kantorovich Problem and Transport Distance between Density Matrices. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 129(11):Paper No. 110402, 2022. doi:10.1103/physrevlett.129.110402.
- [23] György Pál Gehér, József Pitrik, Tamás Titkos, and Dániel Virosztek. Quantum Wasserstein isometries on the qubit state space. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 522:126955, 2023.
- [24] François Golse, Clément Mouhot, and Thierry Paul. On the mean field and classical limits of quantum mechanics. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 343(1):165–205, 2016. doi:10.1007/s00220-015-2485-7.
- [25] François Golse and Thierry Paul. The Schrödinger equation in the mean-field and semiclassical regime. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 223(1):57–94, 2017. doi:10.1007/s00205-016-1031-x.
- [26] François Golse and Thierry Paul. Wave packets and the quadratic Monge-Kantorovich distance in quantum mechanics. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 356(2):177–197, 2018. doi:10.1016/j.crma.2017.12.007.
- [27] François Golse and Thierry Paul. Empirical measures and quantum mechanics: applications to the mean-field limit. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 369(3):1021–1053, 2019. doi:10.1007/s00220-019-03357-z.
- [28] M. Hairer, J. C. Mattingly, and M. Scheutzow. Asymptotic coupling and a general form of Harris’ theorem with applications to stochastic delay equations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 149(1-2):223–259, 2011.
- [29] Maliheh Hosseini and A. Jiménez-Vargas. Approximate local isometries on spaces of absolutely continuous functions. *Results Math.*, 76(2):Paper No. 72, 16, 2021. doi:10.1007/s00025-021-01384-8.
- [30] Dijana Ilićević and Bojan Kuzma. On square roots of isometries. *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 67(9):1898–1921, 2019. doi:10.1080/03081087.2018.1474847.
- [31] Richard Jordan, David Kinderlehrer, and Felix Otto. The variational formulation of the Fokker-Planck equation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 29(1):1–17, 1998. doi:10.1137/S0036141096303359.
- [32] John Lott. Some geometric calculations on Wasserstein space. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 277(2):423–437, 2008. doi:10.1007/s00220-007-0367-3.
- [33] Lajos Molnár. Busch-Gudder metric on the cone of positive semidefinite operators and its isometries. *Integral Equations Operator Theory*, 90(2):Paper No. 20, 20, 2018. doi:10.1007/s00020-018-2443-9.
- [34] Carlo Orrieri, Alessio Porretta, and Giuseppe Savaré. A variational approach to the mean field planning problem. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 277(6):1868–1957, 2019. doi:10.1016/j.jfa.2019.04.011.
- [35] Antonio M. Peralta. Preservers of triple transition pseudo-probabilities in connection with orthogonality preservers and surjective isometries. *Results Math.*, 78(2):Paper No. 51, 23, 2023. doi:10.1007/s00025-022-01827-w.
- [36] Filippo Santambrogio. *Optimal transport for applied mathematicians*, volume 87 of *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications*. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2015. Calculus of variations, PDEs, and modeling. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-20828-2.
- [37] Morgan A. Schmitz, Matthieu Heitz, Nicolas Bonneel, Fred Ngolè, David Coeurjolly, Marco Cuturi, Gabriel Peyré, and Jean-Luc Starck. Wasserstein dictionary learning: optimal transport-based unsupervised nonlinear dictionary learning. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 11(1):643–678, 2018. doi:10.1137/17M1140431.
- [38] Barry Simon. *Representations of finite and compact groups*, volume 10 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996. doi:10.1038/383266a0.
- [39] Géza Tóth and József Pitrik. Quantum Wasserstein distance based on an optimization over separable states. *Quantum*, 7:1143, October 2023. doi:10.22331/q-2023-10-16-1143.
- [40] Karol Życzkowski and Wojciech Słomczyński. The Monge metric on the sphere and geometry of quantum states. *J. Phys. A*, 34(34):6689–6722, 2001. doi:10.1088/0305-4470/34/34/311.
- [41] Karol Życzkowski and Wojciech Słomczyński. The Monge distance between quantum states. *J. Phys. A*, 31(45):9095–9104, 1998. doi:10.1088/0305-4470/31/45/009.

RICHÁRD SIMON, DEPARTMENT OF ANALYSIS, INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, BUDAPEST UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND ECONOMICS, MŰEGYETEM RKP. 3., H-1111 BUDAPEST, HUNGARY.

Email address: `sr570063@gmail.com`; `simonr@math.bme.hu`

DÁNIEL VIROSZTEK, ALFRÉD RÉNYI INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, REÁLTANODA U. 13-15., BUDAPEST H-1053, HUNGARY

Email address: `virosztek.daniel@renyi.hu`