

SEQUENTIAL PRODUCTS OF QUANTUM MEASUREMENTS

Stan Gudder
Department of Mathematics
University of Denver
Denver, Colorado 80208
sgudder@du.edu

Abstract

Our basic structure is a finite-dimensional complex Hilbert space H . We point out that the set of effects on H form a convex effect algebra. Although the set of operators on H also form a convex effect algebra, they have a more detailed structure. We introduce sequential products of effect and operations. Although these have already been studied, we introduce the new concept of sequential products of effects with operations and operations with effects. We then consider various special types of operations. After developing properties of these concepts, the results are generalized to include observables and instruments. In particular, sequential products of observables with instruments and instruments with observables are developed. Finally, we consider conditioning and coexistence of observables and instruments.

1 Basic Definitions

Let H be a finite-dimensional complex Hilbert space. The basic concepts of the present version of quantum measurement theory are the sets of effects $\mathcal{E}(H)$, states $\mathcal{S}(H)$ and operations $\mathcal{O}(H)$ on H [1, 8, 10, 13]. Denoting the set of linear operators on H by $\mathcal{L}(H)$, we define $\mathcal{E}(H) = \{a \in \mathcal{L}(H) : 0 \leq a \leq I\}$ where $0, I$ are the zero and identity operators, respectively. An effect $a \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ corresponds to a two-valued *yes-no* experiment. The effect $a' = I - a$

has the value *yes* if a has the value *no* and we call a' the *complement* of a . If $a, b \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ and $a + b \in \mathcal{E}(H)$, then we write $a \perp b$. When $a \perp b$, we interpret $a + b \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ as the parallel sum of the effects a and b . The effect 0 always has value *no* and I always has value *yes*. The fact that $a \perp a'$ and $a + a' = I$ indicates that either a or a' has the value *yes* but not both. An element $\rho \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ that satisfies $\text{tr}(\rho) = 1$ is called a *state*. States describe the initial condition of a quantum system. If $a \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$, then the *probability* that a has value *yes* when the system is in state ρ is given by $\mathcal{P}_\rho(a) = \text{tr}(\rho a)$. It is clear that $\mathcal{P}_\rho(0) = 0$, $\mathcal{P}_\rho(I) = 1$ and if $a \perp b$, then $\mathcal{P}_\rho(a + b) = \mathcal{P}_\rho(a) + \mathcal{P}_\rho(b)$.

A linear map $\mathcal{I}: \mathcal{L}(H) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(H)$ is *completely positive* if $\mathcal{I} \otimes I: H \otimes K \rightarrow H \otimes K$ is positive for every auxiliary finite dimensional Hilbert space K . We call $\mathcal{I}: \mathcal{L}(H) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(H)$ an *operation* if \mathcal{I} is completely positive and $\text{tr}[\mathcal{I}(\rho)] \leq \text{tr}(\rho)$ for every positive $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ [1, 8, 10, 13]. An operation \mathcal{I} is called a *channel* if $\text{tr}[\mathcal{I}(\rho)] = \text{tr}(\rho)$ for every positive $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(H)$. In particular, if $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ then $\text{tr}[\mathcal{I}(\rho)] = 1$. Any $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$ has a *Kraus decomposition* $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^n A_i \rho A_i^*$ where $A_i \in \mathcal{L}(H)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ [1, 8, 10, 13]. The Kraus operators A_i need not be unique. Since $\text{tr}[\mathcal{I}(\rho)] \leq \text{tr}(\rho)$ we have that

$$\text{tr}(\rho \sum A_i^* A_i) = \sum \text{tr}(\rho A_i^* A_i) = \sum \text{tr}(A_i \rho A_i^*) = \text{tr}[\mathcal{I}(\rho)] \leq \text{tr}(\rho I) \quad (1.1)$$

for every positive ρ . It follows that $\sum A_i^* A_i \leq I$. An operation is thought of as an apparatus \mathcal{I} that can be employed to measure an effect $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$. We define the *probability* that \mathcal{I} has value *yes* in the state ρ to be $\mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{I}) = \text{tr}[\mathcal{I}(\rho)]$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ is the unique effect satisfying $\text{tr}(\rho \widehat{\mathcal{I}}) = \mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{I})$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ and say that \mathcal{I} *measures* $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$. Although every $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$ measures a unique $\widehat{\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{E}(H)$, an effect is measured by many operations. That is, many apparatuses can be employed to measure an effect a . Moreover, \mathcal{I} gives more information than $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ because $\mathcal{I}(\rho)/\text{tr}[\mathcal{I}(\rho)]$ is the updated state after \mathcal{I} (or $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$) is measured (assuming $\text{tr}[\mathcal{I}(\rho)] \neq 0$). One way to specify $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ is the following: If \mathcal{I} has Kraus decomposition $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \sum A_i \rho A_i^*$, then by (1.1) we have that $\widehat{\mathcal{I}} = \sum A_i^* A_i$. This also shows that if $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \sum B_j \rho B_j^*$ is another Kraus decomposition for \mathcal{I} , then $\sum B_j^* B_j = \sum A_i^* A_i$.

We now consider the mathematical structures of $\mathcal{E}(H)$ and $\mathcal{O}(H)$. Let (V, \leq) be a finite-dimensional ordered real linear space [8, 13] and let $u \in V$

satisfy $u > 0$. Letting E be the ordered interval

$$E = [0, u] = \{x \in V : 0 \leq x \leq u\}$$

we call $(E, 0, u)$ a *convex effect algebra* [7]. For $x, y \in E$ we write $x \perp y$ if $x + y \in E$. It is easy to check that E satisfies the effect algebra axioms:

- (1) If $x \perp y$, then $y \perp x$ and $x + y = y + x$.
- (2) If $y \perp z$ and $x \perp (y + z)$, then $x \perp y$, $z \perp (x + y)$ and we have $x + (y + z) = (x + y) + z$.
- (3) For every $x \in E$ there exists a unique $x' \in E$ such that $x \perp x'$ and $x + x' = u$.
- (4) If $x \perp u$, then $x = 0$.

Moreover, E is *convex* because if $x_1, \dots, x_n \in E$ and $\lambda_i \geq 0$ with $\sum \lambda_i = 1$, then $\sum \lambda_i x_i \in E$. Indeed, we have that

$$0 \leq \sum \lambda_i x_i \leq \sum \lambda_i u = u$$

We call the element x' in (3) the *complement* of x . If $E = [0, u]$ and $F = [0, v]$ are convex effect algebras, a map $J: E \rightarrow F$ is an *isomorphism* if J is an order-preserving bijection, $J(u) = v$, $J(x + y) = J(x) + J(y)$ whenever $x \perp y$ and $J(\sum \lambda_i x_i) = \sum \lambda_i J(x_i)$ whenever $\lambda_i \geq 0$, $\sum \lambda_i = 1$.

Notice that $\mathcal{E}(H)$ is a convex effect algebra because $\mathcal{E}(H) = [0, I] \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}(H)$ where $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}(H)$ is the real linear span of $\mathcal{E}(H)$. In a similar way, letting V be the real linear span of $\mathcal{O}(H)$ we have that $\mathcal{O}(H) = [0, I] \subseteq V$ where 0 and I are the zero and identity operations, respectively, so $\mathcal{O}(H)$ is also a convex effect algebra. However, this convex effect algebra does not specify the detailed probabilistic structure of $\mathcal{O}(H)$. Although $I \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ is the unique certain effect, the identity $I \in \mathcal{O}(H)$ is not the unique certain operation. If \mathcal{C} is a channel, then for any $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ we have that $\mathcal{P}_{\rho}(\mathcal{C}) = \text{tr} [\mathcal{C}(\rho)] = 1$ so \mathcal{C} has value *yes* for any state so \mathcal{C} is certainly *yes*. Similarly, if $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{I}} = \widehat{\mathcal{J}}$ then

$$\mathcal{P}_{\rho}(\mathcal{I}) = \text{tr} [\mathcal{I}(\rho)] = \text{tr} (\rho \widehat{\mathcal{I}}) = \text{tr} (\rho \widehat{\mathcal{J}}) = \text{tr} [\mathcal{J}(\rho)] = \mathcal{P}_{\rho}(\mathcal{J})$$

for every $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ so we cannot distinguish \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{J} probabilistically. For $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$ we write $\mathcal{I} \approx \mathcal{J}$ if $\widehat{\mathcal{I}} = \widehat{\mathcal{J}}$. It is clear that \approx is an equivalence

relation in $\mathcal{O}(H)$. We denote the equivalence class containing \mathcal{I} by $[\mathcal{I}]$ and the set of equivalence classes by $\mathcal{O}(H)/\approx$. We write $[\mathcal{I}]^\wedge = \widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ and it is clear that this is well-defined.

Theorem 1.1. $\mathcal{O}(H)/\approx$ is a convex effect algebra and $^\wedge: \mathcal{O}(H)/\approx \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(H)$ is an isomorphism.

Proof. We write $0 = \{0\} = [0]$ and $u = [\mathcal{C}]$ where \mathcal{C} is a channel and we have that $\widehat{0} = 0$ and $\widehat{u} = I$. If $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$ with $\mathcal{I} \perp \mathcal{J}$ we define $[\mathcal{I}] + [\mathcal{J}] = [\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{J}]$ and if $\mathcal{I}_i \in \mathcal{O}(H)$, $\lambda_i \geq 0$ with $\sum \lambda_i = 1$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ we define

$$\sum_i \lambda_i [\mathcal{I}_i] = \left[\sum \lambda_i \mathcal{I}_i \right]$$

Moreover, we write $[\mathcal{I}] \leq [\mathcal{J}]$ if $\widehat{\mathcal{I}} \leq \widehat{\mathcal{J}}$. It is clear that these are well-defined. We then have that $0 \leq [\mathcal{I}] \leq u$ for all $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$. It is straightforward to show that $\mathcal{O}(H)/\approx = [0, u]$ is an order interval for a real ordered linear space V consisting of the linear span of $\mathcal{O}(H)/\approx$ and hence is a convex effect algebra. Since $[\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{J}]^\wedge = \widehat{\mathcal{I}} + \widehat{\mathcal{J}}$ and

$$\left(\sum \lambda_i [\mathcal{I}_i] \right)^\wedge = \left(\sum \lambda_i \mathcal{I}_i \right)^\wedge = \sum \lambda_i \widehat{\mathcal{I}_i}$$

we have that $^\wedge$ preserves $+$ and convex combinations. Clearly, $\widehat{u} = I$ and $^\wedge$ is order-preserving. If $a \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ we will show there exists an $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$ such that $\widehat{\mathcal{I}} = a$ so $^\wedge$ is surjective. To show that $^\wedge$ is injective, suppose that $[\mathcal{I}]^\wedge = [\mathcal{J}]^\wedge$. Then $\widehat{\mathcal{I}} = \widehat{\mathcal{J}}$ so $[\mathcal{I}] = [\mathcal{J}]$. Hence, $^\wedge: \mathcal{O}(H)/\approx \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(H)$ is an isomorphism. \square

Besides sums and convex combinations, there is another important way of combining effects and operations. For $a, b \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ we define their *sequential product* $a \circ b = a^{1/2} b a^{1/2}$ where $a^{1/2}$ is the unique positive square-root of a [3, 4]. It is easy to check that $a \circ b \leq a$ so we indeed have that $a \circ b \in \mathcal{E}(H)$. We interpret $a \circ b$ to be the effect resulting from first measuring a and then measuring b . Then $\mathcal{E}(H)$ has the mathematical structure of a convex, sequential effect algebra [6, 7]. Because of the sequential order of $a \circ b$, the measurement of a can influence (interfere) with the measurement of b but not vice versa. This is emphasized by the fact that $a \circ (b+c) = a \circ b + a \circ c$ and $a \circ (\sum \lambda_i b_i) = \sum \lambda_i a \circ b_i$. We then say that $a \circ b$ is *additive* and *affine* in the second variable. In general, $a \circ b$ is not additive or affine in the first variable.

Also, it can be shown that $a \circ b = b \circ a$ if and only if $ab = ba$ [4]. In a similar way, for $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$ we define their *sequential product* $\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J}(\rho) = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{I}(\rho))$ [5, 7]. Although we still retain the same influence interpretation, $\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J}$ is additive and affine in both variables. However, $\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J} \neq \mathcal{J} \circ \mathcal{I}$, in general. We say that $a \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ is *sharp* if a is a projection. It can be shown that a is sharp if and only if $a \wedge a' = 0$. That is if $b \leq a, a'$ then $b = 0$. An effect a is *atomic* if a is a one-dimensional projection. The next result pertains to additivity and commutativity of sharp and atomic effects.

Theorem 1.2. (i) *If a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n are sharp and $\sum a_i = I$, then $b = \sum a_i \circ b$ if and only if $ba_i = a_i b$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.* (ii) *If a and b are atomic and have the form $a = |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$, $b = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, then $\mathcal{P}_\rho(a \circ b) = \mathcal{P}_\rho(b \circ a)$ if and only if $\langle\phi, \rho\phi\rangle = \langle\psi, \rho\psi\rangle$ or $ab = 0$.*

Proof. (i) If $ba_i = a_i b$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, then

$$\sum a_i \circ b = \sum a_i b a_i = \sum a_i b = b$$

Conversely, suppose that $b = \sum a_i \circ b = \sum a_i b a_i$. Since $\sum a_i = I$, we obtain

$$a_j + \sum_{i \neq j} a_j a_i a_j = a_j$$

Hence, $\sum_{i \neq j} a_j a_i a_j = 0$ so that $a_j a_i a_j = 0$, $i \neq j$. Therefore,

$$(a_j a_i)(a_j a_i)^* = a_j a_i a_i a_j = a_j a_i a_j = 0$$

It follows that $a_j a_i = 0$ for $i \neq j$. But then

$$a_j b = a_j b a_j = b a_j$$

for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. (ii) We have that $\mathcal{P}_\rho(a \circ b) = \mathcal{P}_\rho(b \circ a)$ if and only if

$$\text{tr}(\rho|\phi\rangle\langle\phi||\psi\rangle\langle\psi||\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) = \text{tr}(\rho|\psi\rangle\langle\psi||\phi\rangle\langle\phi||\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$$

This is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle\phi, \psi\rangle|^2 \langle\phi, \rho\phi\rangle &= |\langle\phi, \psi\rangle|^2 \text{tr}(\rho|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) = |\langle\phi, \psi\rangle|^2 \text{tr}(\rho|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \\ &= |\langle\phi, \psi\rangle|^2 \langle\psi, \rho\psi\rangle \end{aligned}$$

Since $\langle\phi, \psi\rangle = 0$ if and only if $ab = 0$, then the result follows. \square

It is easy to check that $a \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ is atomic if and only if $b \leq a$ implies that $b = \lambda a$ for some $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

2 Bayes' Rules

First note that \mathcal{P}_ρ has the usual properties of a probability measure on $\mathcal{E}(H)$. That is, $0 \leq \mathcal{P}_\rho(a) \leq 1$ for all $a \in \mathcal{E}(H)$, $\mathcal{P}_\rho(I) = 1$ and if $a \perp b$, then $\mathcal{P}_\rho(a + b) = \mathcal{P}_\rho(a) + \mathcal{P}_\rho(b)$. This last equation shows that $a \perp b$ is the analogue of disjointness of events in classical probability theory. For $a, b \in \mathcal{E}(H)$, it is natural to define the *conditional probability*

$$\mathcal{P}_\rho(b | a) = \frac{\mathcal{P}_\rho(a \circ b)}{\mathcal{P}_\rho(a)} = \frac{\text{tr}(\rho a^{1/2} b a^{1/2})}{\text{tr}(\rho a)}$$

whenever $\mathcal{P}_\rho(a) \neq 0$. Although $\mathcal{P}_\rho(\cdot | a)$ satisfies the above three conditions for a probability measure, it does not satisfy Bayes' rules. Bayes' first rule says that if $a_1 + a_2 + \cdots + a_n = I$, then for all $b \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ we have that

$$\mathcal{P}_\rho(b) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{P}_\rho(a_i) \mathcal{P}_\rho(b | a_i) \quad (2.1)$$

If (2.1) holds for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ it follows that $b = \sum a_i \circ b$. But according to Theorem 1.2(i) this does not hold, in general.

Bayes' second rule says that

$$\mathcal{P}_\rho(b) \mathcal{P}_\rho(a | b) = \mathcal{P}_\rho(a) \mathcal{P}_\rho(b | a) \quad (2.2)$$

Now (2.2) is equivalent to $\mathcal{P}_\rho(a \circ b) = \mathcal{P}_\rho(b \circ a)$. If this holds for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$, it follows that $ab = ba$. Hence, Bayes' second rule does not hold, in general. When a and b are atomic, Theorem 1.2(ii) characterizes the $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ for which Bayes' second rule holds.

In a similar way, for $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$ we have the *conditional probability*

$$\mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I}) = \frac{\mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J})}{\mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{I})} = \frac{\text{tr}[\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{I}(\rho))]}{\text{tr}[\mathcal{I}(\rho)]}$$

whenever $\mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{I}) \neq 0$. As before, we write $\mathcal{I} \perp \mathcal{J}$ if $\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$. We then obtain, $0 \leq \mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I}) \leq 1$, $\mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{I} | \mathcal{I}) = 1$ and more generally, if \mathcal{J} is a channel, then $\mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I}) = 1$. Also, if $\mathcal{J} \perp \mathcal{K}$, then $\mathcal{P}_\rho((\mathcal{J} + \mathcal{K}) | \mathcal{I}) = \mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I}) + \mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{K} | \mathcal{I})$. Similar to $\mathcal{E}(H)$, Bayes' first rule says that if $\mathcal{I}_1 + \mathcal{I}_2 + \cdots + \mathcal{I}_n = \mathcal{C}$, where \mathcal{C} is a channel, then

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{J}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{I}_i) \mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I}_i) \quad (2.3)$$

Notice that we used an arbitrary channel instead of just the trivial channel $I(\rho) = \rho$. The reason for this is that \mathcal{C} corresponds to a certain event because $\mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{C}) = \text{tr} [\mathcal{C}(\rho)] = 1$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$. Now (2.3) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr} [\mathcal{J}(\rho)] &= \mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{J}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{P}_\rho [\mathcal{I}_i \circ \mathcal{J}(\rho)] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{P}_\rho [\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{I}_i(\rho))] \\ &= \mathcal{P}_\rho \left[\mathcal{J} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}_i(\rho) \right) \right] = \mathcal{P}_\rho [\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{C}(\rho))] = \text{tr} [\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{C}(\rho))] \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

If $\mathcal{C} = I$ the trivial channel, then clearly (2.4) holds. However as we shall see in later examples, (2.4) does not hold in general.

For the purpose of examples and to better understand the structure of operations, we now consider some special types of operations. An operation \mathcal{I} is *sharp* if it has the form $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \sum a_i \rho a_i$ where a_i are projections and \mathcal{I} is *atomic* if it is sharp and the a_i are one-dimensional projections. As in the proof of Theorem 1.2(i), if $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \sum a_i \rho a_i$ is sharp then $a_i a_j = 0$ for $i \neq j$ so $\{a_i\}$ are mutually orthogonal projections. We say that $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$ is *Kraus* [10] if $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = A \rho A^*$ for some $A \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ with $A^* A \leq I$ and \mathcal{I} is *Lüders* [12] if $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = a \circ \rho = a^{1/2} \rho a^{1/2}$ for some $a \in \mathcal{E}(H)$. An operation \mathcal{I} is *semi-trivial* if it has the form $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \sum \text{tr}(\rho a_i) \alpha_i$ where $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ and $a_i \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ with $\sum a_i \leq I$. Notice that this \mathcal{I} is indeed an operation because

$$\text{tr} [\mathcal{I}(\rho)] = \text{tr} \left(\rho \sum a_i \right) \leq \text{tr}(\rho)$$

To be specific, we say that \mathcal{I} is semi-trivial with states α_i and effects a_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. An operation \mathcal{I} is *trivial* if \mathcal{I} is semi-trivial with one state α and one effect a . In this case $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho a) \alpha$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ [8].

If $\psi \in H$ is a unit vector we denote its corresponding projection operator by $P_\psi = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$.

Lemma 2.1. *An operation \mathcal{I} is atomic if and only if \mathcal{I} is semi-trivial with one-dimensional states P_{ψ_i} and corresponding effects P_{ψ_i}*

Proof. We have that \mathcal{I} is atomic if and only if there exists one-dimensional projections P_{ψ_i} such that $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \sum P_{\psi_i} \rho P_{\psi_i}$. But this is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \sum |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \rho |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| = \sum \langle\psi_i, \rho \psi_i\rangle |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| = \sum \text{tr}(\rho P_{\psi_i}) P_{\psi_i} \quad (2.5)$$

Now (2.5) is equivalent to \mathcal{I} being semi-trivial with states P_{ψ_i} and corresponding effects P_{ψ_i} . \square

Although the Kraus operators for Kraus and Lüders operations are obvious, this is not clear at all for semi-trivial or even trivial operations. This is treated in the next result.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{tr}(\rho a_i) \alpha_i$ be semi-trivial and let α_i have the spectral representation*

$$\alpha_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \lambda_{ij} |\phi_{ij}\rangle \langle \phi_{ij}| \quad (2.6)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Letting $A_{ijk} = \lambda_{ij}^{1/2} |\phi_{ij}\rangle \langle a_i^{1/2} \phi_{ik}|$, we have that $\{A_{ijk}\}$ is a set of Kraus operators for \mathcal{I} , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, $j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n_i$. Moreover, we have that $\widehat{\mathcal{I}} = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$.

Proof. Since (2.6) is a spectral representation, we conclude that $\{\phi_{ij} : j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i\}$ is an orthonormal basis for H , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $\lambda_{ij} \geq 0$ with $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \lambda_{ij} = 1$.

Summing over all applicable i, j, k , we obtain for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j,k} A_{ijk} \rho A_{ijk}^* &= \sum_{i,j,k} \lambda_{ij} |\phi_{ij}\rangle \langle a_i^{1/2} \phi_{ik} | \rho | a_i^{1/2} \phi_{ik} \rangle \langle \phi_{ij}| \\ &= \sum_{i,j,k} \lambda_{ij} \langle a_i^{1/2} \phi_{ik}, \rho a_i^{1/2} \phi_{ik} \rangle |\phi_{ij}\rangle \langle \phi_{ij}| \\ &= \sum_{i,j,k} \lambda_{ij} \langle \phi_{ik}, a_i^{1/2} \rho a_i^{1/2} \phi_{ik} \rangle |\phi_{ij}\rangle \langle \phi_{ij}| \\ &= \sum_{i,j} \lambda_{ij} \text{tr}(\rho a_i) |\phi_{ij}\rangle \langle \phi_{ij}| = \sum_i \text{tr}(\rho a_i) \alpha_i = \mathcal{I}(\rho) \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{I}} &= \sum_{i,j,k} A_{ijk}^* A_{ijk} = \sum_{i,j,k} \lambda_{ij} |a_i^{1/2} \phi_{ik}\rangle \langle \phi_{ij}| |\phi_{ij}\rangle \langle a_i^{1/2} \phi_{ik}| \\ &= \sum_{i,j,k} \lambda_{ij} |a_i^{1/2} \phi_{ik}\rangle \langle a_i^{1/2} \phi_{ik}| = \sum_{i,k} |a_i^{1/2} \phi_{ik}\rangle \langle a_i^{1/2} \phi_{ik}| \\ &= \sum_{i,k} a_i^{1/2} |\phi_{ik}\rangle \langle \phi_{ik}| a_i^{1/2} = \sum_i a_i \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 2.3. *If $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho a) \alpha$ is a trivial operation and α has spectral representation $\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |\phi_i\rangle \langle \phi_i|$, then $A_{ij} = \lambda_i^{1/2} |\phi_i\rangle \langle a^{1/2} \phi_j|$, $i, j =$*

$1, 2, \dots, n$, gives a set of Kraus operators for \mathcal{I} . Moreover, we have that $\widehat{\mathcal{I}} = a$.

It can be shown directly that $\widehat{\mathcal{I}} = \sum a_i$ in Theorem 2.2. Indeed, we have that

$$\text{tr} [\mathcal{I}(\rho)] = \sum \text{tr} (\rho a_i) = \text{tr} \left[\rho \sum a_i \right]$$

Moreover, Corollary 2.3 shows that the trivial operation $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho a)\alpha$ measures the effect a . Letting α vary, we obtain an infinite number of different operations that measure a . Also, the Lüders operation $\mathcal{L}^a(\rho) = a^{1/2}\rho a^{1/2}$ measures a because

$$\text{tr} [\mathcal{L}^a(\rho)] = \text{tr} (a^{1/2}\rho a^{1/2}) = \text{tr} (\rho a)$$

for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$. We now employ these special operations to show that Bayes' rules do not hold for operations.

Example 1. Let $0 < a < I$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ and let $\mathcal{I}_1 = \text{tr}(\rho a)\alpha$ be a trivial operation. Also, let \mathcal{I}_2 be the trivial operation

$$\mathcal{I}_2(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho a')\alpha = [1 - \text{tr}(\rho a)]\alpha$$

Then $\mathcal{C}(\rho) = (\mathcal{I}_1 + \mathcal{I}_2)(\rho) = \alpha$ is a constant channel. Now (2.4) becomes

$$\text{tr} [\mathcal{J}(\rho)] = \text{tr} [\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{C}(\rho))] = \text{tr} [\mathcal{J}(\alpha)] \quad (2.7)$$

Equation (2.7) does not hold, in general. For example, letting $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}_1$, (2.7) becomes

$$\text{tr}(\rho a) = \text{tr} [\mathcal{I}_1(\rho)] = \text{tr} [\mathcal{I}_1(\alpha)] = \text{tr}(\alpha a) \quad (2.8)$$

If $\rho \neq \alpha$, then there exists an $a \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ for which (2.8) fails. \square

We now give another example for which (2.4) fails.

Example 2. Let a be a projection and define sharp Lüders operations $\mathcal{I}_1(\rho) = a\rho a$, $\mathcal{I}_2(\rho) = a'\rho a'$. Then $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{I}_1 + \mathcal{I}_2$ is a channel because for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ we obtain

$$\text{tr} [\mathcal{C}(\rho)] = \text{tr} (a\rho a + a'\rho a') = \text{tr} (\rho a + \rho a') = \text{tr} (\rho) = 1$$

Let $b \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ and define the Lüders operation $\mathcal{J}(\rho) = b \circ \rho = b^{1/2} \rho b^{1/2}$. Then (2.4) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(\rho b) &= \text{tr}[\mathcal{J}(\rho)] = \text{tr}[\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{C}(\rho))] = \text{tr}[\mathcal{J}(a\rho a)] + \text{tr}[\mathcal{J}(a'\rho a')] \\ &= \text{tr}(b^{1/2} a \rho a b^{1/2}) + \text{tr}(b^{1/2} a' \rho a' b^{1/2}) = \text{tr}(\rho a b a) + \text{tr}(\rho a' b a') \\ &= \text{tr}[\rho(aba + a'ba')] \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Now (2.9) holds for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ if and only if $b = aba + a'ba'$. Hence, $ab = aba = ba$. Thus, if a and b do not commute, then (2.9) does not hold for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$. \square

As for effects, Bayes' second rule for operations becomes $\mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J}) = \mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{J} \circ \mathcal{I})$. This is equivalent to

$$\text{tr}[\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{I}(\rho))] = \text{tr}[\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{J}(\rho))] \quad (2.10)$$

Example 3. Let $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho a)\alpha$ and $\mathcal{J}(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho a)\beta$ be trivial operations. Then

$$\text{tr}[\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{I}(\rho))] = \text{tr}(\rho a)\text{tr}[\mathcal{J}(\alpha)] = \text{tr}(\rho a)\text{tr}(\alpha a)$$

and similarly, $\text{tr}[\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{J}(\rho))] = \text{tr}(\rho a)\text{tr}(\beta a)$. These are not the same so (2.10) fails, in general. As another example, let $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = a^{1/2} \rho a^{1/2}$, $\mathcal{J}(\rho) = b^{1/2} \rho b^{1/2}$ be Lüders operations. We then obtain

$$\text{tr}[\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{I}(\rho))] = \text{tr}(b^{1/2} a^{1/2} \rho a^{1/2} b^{1/2}) = \text{tr}(\rho a \circ b)$$

and similarly, $\text{tr}[\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{J}(\rho))] = \text{tr}(\rho b \circ a)$. These are equal if and only if $ab = ba$ so again (2.10) fails, in general. \square

We close this section by considering complements of operations. For $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$, we write $\mathcal{I} \leq \mathcal{J}$ if $\mathcal{I}(\rho) \leq \mathcal{J}(\rho)$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$. If $\mathcal{I} \leq \mathcal{C}$ where \mathcal{C} is a channel, we call $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{C}} = \mathcal{C} - \mathcal{I}$ the \mathcal{C} -complement of \mathcal{I} . Then $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{C}}$ is the unique operation satisfying $\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{C}} = \mathcal{C}$. An operation other than I can have many complements. For example, any channel is a complement of 0. We frequently say, for short, that \mathcal{J} is a complement of \mathcal{I} instead of \mathcal{J} is a \mathcal{C} -complement of \mathcal{I} .

Example 4. Let $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$ with Kraus decomposition $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \sum A_i \rho A_i^*$. Letting $b = \sum A_i^* A_i$ we have that $b \in \mathcal{E}(H)$. Then the Lüders operation $\mathcal{J}(\rho) = (I - b)^{1/2} \rho (I - b)^{1/2}$ is a complement of \mathcal{I} because

$$(\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{J})(\rho) = \mathcal{I}(\rho) + \mathcal{J}(\rho) = \sum A_i \rho A_i^* + (I - b)^{1/2} \rho (I - b)^{1/2}$$

and since $\sum A_i^* A_i + I - b = I$, we conclude that $\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{J}$ is a channel. This shows that any operation has a unique Lüders operation complement. \square

Example 5. Let $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = a \circ \rho = a^{1/2} \rho a^{1/2}$ be a Lüders operation with $a \in \mathcal{E}(H)$. Then $\mathcal{J}(\rho) = a' \circ \rho$ is a complement of \mathcal{I} because $\mathcal{I}(\rho) + \mathcal{J}(\rho) = a \circ \rho + a' \circ \rho$ is a channel. Moreover, if $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho a) \alpha$ is trivial, then $\mathcal{J}(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho a') \alpha$ is a complement of \mathcal{I} because

$$(\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{J})(\rho) = \mathcal{I}(\rho) + \mathcal{J}(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho a) \alpha + \text{tr}(\rho a') \alpha = \text{tr}(\rho) \alpha = \alpha$$

is a channel. \square

Theorem 2.4. (i) \mathcal{J} is a complement of \mathcal{I} if and only if $\widehat{\mathcal{J}} = (\widehat{\mathcal{I}})'$. (ii) If \mathcal{I} is sharp, then $\mathcal{I} \wedge \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{C}} = 0$ for some channel \mathcal{C} .

Proof. (i) Suppose that \mathcal{J} is a \mathcal{C} -complement of \mathcal{I} so $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{C}} = \mathcal{C} - \mathcal{I}$. Then

$$\widehat{\mathcal{J}} = \widehat{\mathcal{C}} - \widehat{\mathcal{I}} = I - \widehat{\mathcal{I}} = (\widehat{\mathcal{I}})'$$

Conversely, if $\widehat{\mathcal{J}} = (\widehat{\mathcal{I}})'$ then

$$\text{tr}[\mathcal{J}(\rho) + \mathcal{I}(\rho)] = \text{tr}(\rho \mathcal{J}) + \text{tr}(\rho \widehat{\mathcal{I}}) = \text{tr}(\rho) = 1$$

for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$. Hence, $\mathcal{J} + \mathcal{I}$ is a channel so \mathcal{J} is a complement of \mathcal{I} .

(ii) . Let $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \sum a_i \rho a_i$ where a_i are projections and let $\mathcal{J}(\rho) = b' \rho b'$ where $b = \sum a_i$. Then letting

$$\mathcal{C}(\rho) = \mathcal{I}(\rho) + \mathcal{J}(\rho) = \sum a_i \rho a_i + b' \rho b'$$

we have that

$$\text{tr}[\mathcal{C}(\rho)] = \text{tr} \left[\rho \left(\sum a_i + b' \right) \right] = \text{tr}(\rho) = 1$$

for every $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ so \mathcal{C} is a channel. Hence, $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{C}}$. To show that $\mathcal{I} \wedge \mathcal{J} = 0$, let $\mathcal{K} \leq \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}$. Then $\widehat{\mathcal{K}} \leq \widehat{\mathcal{I}} = \sum a_i$ and

$$\widehat{\mathcal{K}} \leq \widehat{\mathcal{J}} = b' = I - \sum a_i$$

It follows that $\widehat{\mathcal{K}} = 0$ so $\mathcal{K} = 0$. \square

3 Observables and Instruments

We now extend our previous work to observables and instruments. An *observable* is a finite set $A = \{a_x : x \in \Omega_A\} \subseteq \mathcal{E}(H)$ satisfying $\sum_{x \in \Omega_A} a_x = I$ [1, 2, 8, 13]. We call Ω_A the *outcome set* and $x \in \Omega_A$ is an *outcome* for A . We think of A as an experiment with possible outcomes $x \in \Omega_A$ and a_x is the effect that is *yes* when A has outcome x . The *probability* that A has outcome x when the system is in state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ is $\mathcal{P}_\rho(x) = \text{tr}(\rho a_x)$ and we call $\Phi_\rho^A(x) = \mathcal{P}_\rho(x)$ the *distribution* of A . If $\Delta \subseteq \Omega_A$, we define the probability of Δ in the state ρ by

$$\Phi_\rho^A(\Delta) = \mathcal{P}_\rho(\Delta) = \sum \{\mathcal{P}_\rho(x) : x \in \Delta\} = \sum \{\text{tr}(\rho a_x) : x \in \Delta\}$$

We see that $\Delta \mapsto \sum_{x \in \Delta} A_x$ is an effect-valued measure on 2^{Ω_A} . We denote the set of observables on H by $\text{Ob}(H)$.

If $A = \{a_x : x \in \Omega_A\}$ and $B = \{b_y : y \in \Omega_B\}$ are observables, we define their *sequential product* [5, 6, 7]

$$(A \circ B)_{(x,y)} = \{a_x \circ b_y : (x,y) \in \Omega_A \times \Omega_B\}$$

with outcome set $\Omega_{A \circ B} = \Omega_A \times \Omega_B$. Notice that $A \circ B$ is indeed an observable because

$$\sum_{(x,y) \in \Omega_{A \circ B}} (A \circ B)_{(x,y)} = \sum_{x,y} (a_x \circ b_y) = \sum_x a_x \circ \sum_y b_y = \sum_x a_x = I$$

We also have the observable B *conditioned by* the observable A defined as [5]

$$(B | A)_y = \sum_{x \in \Omega_A} (A \circ B)_{(x,y)} = \sum_{x \in \Omega_A} (a_x \circ b_y)$$

where $\Omega_{(B|A)} = \Omega_B$. Again, $(B | A)$ is an observable because

$$\sum_{y \in \Omega_B} (B | A)_y = \sum_{x,y} (a_x \circ b_y) = I$$

Just as for effects, Bayes' rule

$$\mathcal{P}_\rho(b_y) = \sum_x \mathcal{P}_\rho(a_x) \mathcal{P}_\rho(b_y | a_x)$$

does not hold. However, we do have the result

$$\mathcal{P}_\rho[(B | A)_y] = \sum_x \mathcal{P}_\rho(a_x) \mathcal{P}_\rho(b_y | a_x)$$

Indeed, for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_\rho[(B | A)_y] &= \text{tr} [\rho(B | A)_y] = \text{tr} \left[\rho \sum_x (a_x \circ b_y) \right] = \sum_x \text{tr} (\rho a_x \circ b_y) \\ &= \sum_x \text{tr} (a_x^{1/2} \rho a_x^{1/2} b_y) = \sum_x \text{tr} (\rho a_x) \mathcal{P}_\rho(b_y | a_x) \\ &= \sum_x \mathcal{P}_\rho(a_x) \mathcal{P}_\rho(b_y | a_x) \end{aligned}$$

Also, notice that $y \mapsto \mathcal{P}_\rho(b_y | a_x)$ is additive so it is a real-valued measure.

An *instrument* [1, 8, 13] is a finite set $\mathcal{I} = \{\mathcal{I}_x : x \in \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(H)$ satisfying $\bar{\mathcal{I}} = \sum_{x \in \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}} \mathcal{I}_x$ is a channel. We call $\Omega_{\mathcal{I}}$ the *outcome set* and $x \in \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}$ is an *outcome* for \mathcal{I} . The *probability* that \mathcal{I} has outcome x when the system is in state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ is $\mathcal{P}_\rho(x) = \text{tr} [\mathcal{I}_x(\rho)]$ and we call $\Phi_\rho^{\mathcal{I}}(x) = \mathcal{P}_\rho(x)$ the *distribution* of \mathcal{I} . If $\Delta \subseteq \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}$, we define the probability of Δ in the state ρ by

$$\Phi_\rho^{\mathcal{I}}(\Delta) = \mathcal{P}_\rho(\Delta) = \sum \{\mathcal{P}_\rho(x) : x \in \Delta\} = \sum \{\text{tr} [\mathcal{I}_x(\rho)] : x \in \Delta\}$$

Then $\Delta \mapsto \sum_{x \in \Delta} \mathcal{I}_x$ is an operation-valued measure on $2^{\Omega_{\mathcal{I}}}$. We denote the set of instruments on H by $\text{In}(H)$. We say that $\mathcal{I} \in \text{In}(H)$ *measures* $A \in \text{Ob}(H)$ if $\Omega_A = \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}$ and $\Phi_\rho^A(x) = \Phi_\rho^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$ for all $x \in \Omega_A$, $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$. Since this is equivalent to $\hat{\mathcal{I}}_x = a_x$, we have that \mathcal{I} measures a unique $\hat{\mathcal{I}} \in \text{Ob}(H)$ given by $\hat{\mathcal{I}} = \{\hat{\mathcal{I}}_x : x \in \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}\}$. We think of \mathcal{I} as an apparatus that is employed to measure the observable $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$. Although \mathcal{I} measures the unique $\hat{\mathcal{I}} \in \text{Ob}(H)$, as we shall see, an observable is measured by many instruments.

If $\mathcal{I} = \{\mathcal{I}_x : x \in \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}\}$ and $\mathcal{J} = \{\mathcal{J}_y : y \in \Omega_{\mathcal{J}}\}$ are instruments, we define their *sequential product* [5, 6, 7]

$$(\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J})_{(x,y)} = \{\mathcal{I}_x \circ \mathcal{J}_y : (x, y) \in \Omega_{\mathcal{I}} \times \Omega_{\mathcal{J}}\}$$

with outcome set $\Omega_{\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J}} = \Omega_{\mathcal{I}} \times \Omega_{\mathcal{J}}$. We see that $\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J}$ is indeed an instrument because

$$\sum_{(x,y) \in \Omega_{\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J}}} (\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J})_{(x,y)} = \sum_{x,y} \mathcal{I}_x \circ \mathcal{J}_y = \sum_x \mathcal{I}_x \circ \sum_y \mathcal{J}_y = \bar{\mathcal{I}} \circ \bar{\mathcal{J}}$$

which is a channel. We also have the instrument \mathcal{J} *conditioned by* \mathcal{I} defined as

$$(\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I})_y(\rho) = \sum_x (\mathcal{I}_x \circ \mathcal{J}_y)(\rho) = \sum_x \mathcal{J}_y [\mathcal{I}_x(\rho)] = \mathcal{J}_y \left[\sum_x \mathcal{I}_x(\rho) \right] = \mathcal{J}_y [\bar{\mathcal{I}}(\rho)]$$

We have that $(\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I})$ is indeed an instrument with outcome space $\Omega_{\mathcal{J}}$ because

$$\sum_y (\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I})_y = \sum_y \mathcal{J}_y [\bar{\mathcal{I}}(\rho)] = \bar{\mathcal{J}} [\bar{\mathcal{I}}(\rho)]$$

which is a channel. As with observables, we have that

$$\mathcal{P}_\rho [(\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I})_y] = \sum_x \mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{I}_x) \mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{J}_y | \mathcal{I}_x)$$

because

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_\rho [(\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I})_y] &= \text{tr} [(\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I})_y] = \text{tr} \left\{ \sum_x \mathcal{J}_y [\mathcal{I}_x(\rho)] \right\} \\ &= \sum_x \text{tr} \{ [\mathcal{I}_x(\rho)] \mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{J}_y | \mathcal{I}_x) \} = \sum_x \mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{I}_x) \mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{J}_y | \mathcal{I}_x) \end{aligned}$$

Also notice that $y \mapsto \mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{J}_y | \mathcal{I}_x)$ is additive and a probability measure because

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_y \mathcal{P}_\rho(\mathcal{J}_y | \mathcal{I}_x) &= \frac{1}{\text{tr} [\mathcal{I}_x(\rho)]} \text{tr} \left\{ \sum_y \mathcal{J}_y [\mathcal{I}_x(\rho)] \right\} = \frac{1}{\text{tr} [\mathcal{I}_x(\rho)]} \text{tr} [\bar{\mathcal{J}} (\mathcal{I}_x(\rho))] \\ &= \text{tr} \left[\bar{\mathcal{J}} \left(\frac{\mathcal{I}_x(\rho)}{\text{tr} (\mathcal{I}_x(\rho))} \right) \right] = 1 \end{aligned}$$

As with operations, Bayes' rules do not hold for instruments.

We now consider various types of instruments. A general instrument $\mathcal{I} = \{\mathcal{I}_x : x \in \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}\}$ has a Kraus decomposition $\mathcal{I}_x(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_x} A_i^x \rho (A_i^x)^*$ with $\hat{\mathcal{I}}_x = \sum_{i=1}^{n_x} (A_i^x)^* A_i^x \leq I$ and $\bar{\mathcal{I}}(\rho) = \sum_x \sum_{i=1}^{n_x} A_i^x \rho (A_i^x)^*$ with $\sum_x \sum_{i=1}^{n_x} (A_i^x)^* A_i^x = I$. We say that \mathcal{I} is *sharp* if A_i^x are projections for all i, x . We then have that $\sum_{x,i} A_i^x = I$ and it follows that $A_i^x A_j^y = 0$ if $(x, i) \neq (y, j)$. We say that \mathcal{I} is *atomic* if A_i^x are one-dimensional projections for all i, x . An instrument \mathcal{I} is *Kraus* [10] if it has Kraus decompositions $\mathcal{I}_x(\rho) = A_x \rho A_x^*$ for all $x \in \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}$

in which case $\sum_x A_x^* A_x = I$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{I}} = \{A_x^* A_x : x \in \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}\}$. An instrument \mathcal{I} is *Lüders* [12] if it is Kraus and has decomposition

$$\mathcal{I}_x(\rho) = a_x \circ \rho = a_x^{1/2} \rho a_x^{1/2}$$

for every $x \in \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}$ where $a_x \in \mathcal{E}(H)$. In this case $\sum_x a_x = I$ and we obtain the observable $\widehat{\mathcal{I}} = \{a_x : x \in \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}\}$. We then use the notation $A = \widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ and write $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{L}^A$. It follows that $(\mathcal{L}^A)^\wedge = A$. An instrument \mathcal{I} is *trivial* if there exists an observable $A = \{a_x : x \in \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}\}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ such that $\mathcal{I}_x(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho a_x) \alpha$ for all $x \in \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}$. In this case $\mathcal{I}_x = a_x$ so \mathcal{I} measures A . We then say that \mathcal{I} is trivial with observable A and state α . More generally, we say that \mathcal{I} is *semi-trivial* with observable $A = \{a_x : x \in \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}\}$ and states α_x if $\mathcal{I}_x(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho a_x) \alpha_x$. We again have that $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_x = a_x$ so \mathcal{I} measures A . These last three types illustrate that an observable can be measured by many different instruments

Theorem 3.1. (i) For any $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J} \in \text{In}(H)$ we have

$$\overline{(\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J})} = \overline{(\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I})} = \overline{\mathcal{I}} \circ \overline{\mathcal{J}}$$

(ii) If $A \in \text{Ob}(H)$ and $\mathcal{I} \in \text{In}(H)$, then

$$(\mathcal{L}^A \circ \mathcal{I})^\wedge = (\mathcal{L}^A)^\wedge \circ \widehat{\mathcal{I}} = A \circ \widehat{\mathcal{I}}$$

(iii) If $A, B \in \text{Ob}(H)$, then

$$(\mathcal{L}^A \circ \mathcal{L}^B)^\wedge = (\mathcal{L}^A)^\wedge \circ (\mathcal{L}^B)^\wedge = A \circ B$$

Proof. (i) We have that

$$\overline{(\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J})} = \sum_{x,y} (\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J})_{(x,y)} = \sum_{x,y} \mathcal{I}_x \circ \mathcal{J}_y = \sum_x \mathcal{I}_x \circ \sum_y \mathcal{J}_y = \overline{\mathcal{I}} \circ \overline{\mathcal{J}}$$

Moreover,

$$\overline{(\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I})} = \sum_y (\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I})_y = \sum_y \sum_x \mathcal{I}_x \circ \mathcal{J}_y = \overline{\mathcal{I}} \circ \overline{\mathcal{J}}$$

(ii) Letting $A = \{a_x : x \in \Omega_A\}$ we obtain

$$\text{tr} \left[\rho (\mathcal{L}^A \circ \mathcal{I})_{(x,y)}^\wedge \right] = \text{tr} \left[(\mathcal{L}^A \circ \mathcal{I})_{(x,y)}(\rho) \right] = \text{tr} \left[(\mathcal{L}_x^A \circ \mathcal{I}_y)(\rho) \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \text{tr} \left[\mathcal{I}_y(a_x^{1/2} \rho a_x^{1/2}) \right] = \text{tr} \left[a_x^{1/2} \rho a_x^{1/2} \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_y \right] \\
&= \text{tr} (\rho a_x^{1/2} \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_y a_x^{1/2}) = \text{tr} (\rho a_x \circ \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_y) = \text{tr} \left[\rho (A \circ \widehat{\mathcal{I}})_{(x,y)} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$. Hence, $(\mathcal{L}^A \circ \mathcal{I})_{(x,y)}^\wedge = (A \circ \widehat{\mathcal{I}})_{(x,y)}$ for all $(x, y) \in \Omega_A \times \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}$. We conclude that $(\mathcal{L}^A \circ \mathcal{I})^\wedge = A \circ \widehat{\mathcal{I}} = (\mathcal{L}^A)^\wedge \circ \widehat{\mathcal{I}}$. (iii) follows from (ii). \square

Example 6. Unlike Theorem 3.1(ii) we show that $(\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{L}^A)^\wedge \neq \widehat{\mathcal{I}} \circ A$, in general. Let $\mathcal{I}_x(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho b_x) \alpha$ be a trivial instrument. Letting $A = \{a_y : y \in \Omega_A\}$ we have

$$(\widehat{\mathcal{I}} \circ A)_{(x,y)} = \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_x \circ a_y = b_x \circ a_y = b_x^{1/2} a_y b_x^{1/2}$$

On the other hand, since

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{tr} \left[\rho (\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{L}^A)_{(x,y)}^\wedge \right] &= \text{tr} \left[(\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{L}^A)_{(x,y)}(\rho) \right] = \text{tr} \left[(\mathcal{I}_x \circ \mathcal{L}_y^A)(\rho) \right] \\
&= \text{tr} \left[a_y^{1/2} \mathcal{I}_x(\rho) a_y^{1/2} \right] = \text{tr}(\rho b_x) \text{tr}(a_y^{1/2} \alpha a_y^{1/2}) \\
&= \text{tr}(\rho b_x) \text{tr}(\alpha a_y) = \text{tr}[\rho \text{tr}(\alpha a_y) b_x]
\end{aligned}$$

we have that $(\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{L}^A)_{(x,y)}^\wedge = \text{tr}(\alpha a_y) b_x$ it is clear that $b_x^{1/2} a_y b_x^{1/2} \neq \text{tr}(\alpha a_y) b_x$, in general. \square

Example 7. Let $A = \{a_x : x \in \Omega_A\}$, $B = \{b_y : y \in \Omega_B\}$ be observable and let $\mathcal{I}_x(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho a_x) \alpha$, $\mathcal{J}_y(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho b_y) \beta$ be trivial instruments. We show that $(\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J})^\wedge \neq \widehat{\mathcal{I}} \circ \widehat{\mathcal{J}}$, in general. We have that

$$\text{tr} \left[\rho (\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J})_{(x,y)}^\wedge \right] = \text{tr} \left[(\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J})_{(x,y)}(\rho) \right] = \text{tr} \left[\mathcal{J}_y(\mathcal{I}_x(\rho)) \right] = \text{tr}(\rho a_x) \text{tr}(\alpha b_y)$$

However, $\text{tr}(\rho \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_x \circ \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_y) = \text{tr}(\rho a_x b_y)$ and these do not agree, in general. For example, if $a_x = |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$, $b_y = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ where $|\langle\phi, \psi\rangle|^2 \neq \langle\psi, \alpha\psi\rangle$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{tr} \left[\rho (\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J})_{(x,y)}^\wedge \right] &= \langle\phi\rho\phi\rangle\langle\psi, \alpha\psi\rangle \neq |\langle\phi, \psi\rangle|^2 \langle\phi, \rho\phi\rangle \\
&= |\langle\phi, \psi\rangle|^2 \text{tr}(\rho|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) = \text{tr}(\rho|\phi\rangle\langle\phi| |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) \\
&= \text{tr}(\rho a_x \circ b_y)
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\widehat{\mathcal{I}} \circ \widehat{\mathcal{J}} = A \circ B \neq (\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J})^\wedge$. \square

Example 8. We give another example in which $(\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J})^\wedge \neq \widehat{\mathcal{I}} \circ \widehat{\mathcal{J}}$. Let $\mathcal{I}_x(\rho) = A_x \rho A_x^*$, $\mathcal{J}_y(\rho) = B_y \rho B_y^*$ be Kraus instruments. Then

$$\text{tr} [(\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J})_{(x,y)}(\rho)] = \text{tr} [\mathcal{J}_y(\mathcal{I}_x(\rho))] = \text{tr} [B_y(A_x \rho A_x^*)B_y^*] = \text{tr} (\rho A_x^* B_y^* B_y A_x)$$

Hence, $(\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J})_{(x,y)}^\wedge = A_x^* B_y^* B_y A_x$. On the other hand,

$$(\widehat{\mathcal{I}} \circ \widehat{\mathcal{J}})_{(x,y)} = \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_x \circ \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_y = (A_x^* A_x) \circ (B_y^* B_y) = (A_x^* A_x)^{1/2} B_y^* B_y (A_x^* A_x)^{1/2}$$

and these are not equal, in general. \square

Lemma 3.2. (i) If \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{J} are semi-trivial with states α_x , observable $A = \{a_x\}$ and states β_y , observable $B = \{b_y\}$, respectively, then $\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J}$ is semi-trivial with states β_y and observable $\{\text{tr}(\alpha_x b_y) a_x\}$. Also, $(\mathcal{J} \mid \mathcal{I})$ is semi-trivial with states β_y and observable $\left\{ \sum_x \text{tr}(\alpha_x \beta_y) a_x \right\}$. (ii) If \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{J} are trivial with state α , observable $\{a_x\}$ and state β , observable $\{b_y\}$, respectively, the $\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J}$ is trivial with state β and observable $\{\text{tr}(\alpha b_y) a_x\}$. Also, $(\mathcal{J} \mid \mathcal{I})$ is trivial with state β and observable $\{\text{tr}(\alpha b_y) I\}$.

Proof. (i) Since

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J})_{(x,y)}(\rho) &= \mathcal{J}_y[\mathcal{I}_x(\rho)] = \mathcal{J}_y[\text{tr}(\rho a_x) \alpha_x] = \text{tr}(\rho a_x) \text{tr}(\alpha_x b_y) \beta_y \\ &= \text{tr}[\rho \text{tr}(\alpha_x b_y) a_x] \beta_y \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J}$ is semi-trivial with states β_y and observable $\text{tr}(\alpha_x b_y) a_x$. Moreover, since

$$(\mathcal{J} \mid \mathcal{I})_y(\rho) = \mathcal{J}_y[\overline{\mathcal{I}}(\rho)] = \mathcal{J}_y \left[\sum_x \text{tr}(\rho a_x) \alpha_x \right] = \text{tr} \left[\rho \sum_x \text{tr}(\alpha_x b_y) a_x \right] \beta_y$$

we conclude that $(\mathcal{J} \mid \mathcal{I})$ is semi-trivial with states β_y and observable $\left\{ \sum_x \text{tr}(\alpha_x \beta_y) a_x \right\}$. (ii) follows from (i). \square

We have seen that the sequential product of trivial (semi-trivial) instruments is trivial (semi-trivial). Also, the sequential product of two Kraus instruments $\mathcal{I}_x(\rho) = A_x \rho A_x^*$ and $\mathcal{J}_y(\rho) = B_y \rho B_y^*$ is Kraus because

$$\mathcal{I}_x \circ \mathcal{J}_y(\rho) = \mathcal{J}_y(\mathcal{I}_x(\rho)) = B_y A_x \rho A_x^* B_y^* = B_y A_x \rho (B_y A_x)^*$$

so the Kraus operator for $\mathcal{I}_x \circ \mathcal{J}_y$ is $B_y A_x$. However, the sequential product of two Lüders instruments $\mathcal{I}_x(\rho) = a_x^{1/2} \rho a_x^{1/2}$, $\mathcal{J}_y(\rho) = b_y^{1/2} \rho b_y^{1/2}$ given by

$$\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J}_y = a_x^{1/2} b_y^{1/2} \rho b_y^{1/2} a_x^{1/2}$$

need not be Lüders.

Lemma 3.3. *If $A = \{a_x: x \in \Omega_A\}$ and $B = \{b_y: y \in \Omega_B\}$ are observables, then*

$$(\mathcal{L}^B | \mathcal{L}^A)^\wedge = ((\mathcal{L}^B)^\wedge | (\mathcal{L}^A)^\wedge) = (B | A)$$

Proof. For all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr} [\rho(\mathcal{L}^B | \mathcal{L}^A)_y^\wedge] &= \text{tr} [(\mathcal{L}^B | \mathcal{L}^A)_y(\rho)] = \text{tr} \left[\mathcal{L}_y^B \left(\overline{\mathcal{L}^A}(\rho) \right) \right] = \text{tr} \left[\mathcal{L}_y^B \left(\sum_x a_x^{1/2} \rho a_x^{1/2} \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_x \text{tr} \left[\mathcal{L}_y^B (a_x^{1/2} \rho a_x^{1/2}) \right] = \sum_x \text{tr} (b_y^{1/2} a_x^{1/2} \rho a_x^{1/2} b_y^{1/2}) \\ &= \sum_x \text{tr} (\rho a_x \circ b_y) = \text{tr} \left[\sum_x (a_x \circ b_y) \right] = \text{tr} [\rho(B | A)_y] \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $(\mathcal{L}^B | \mathcal{L}^A)_y^\wedge = (B | A)_y$ as hence, the result holds. \square

Example 9. This example shows that $(\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I})^\wedge \neq (\widehat{\mathcal{J}} | \widehat{\mathcal{I}})$, in general. Letting $\mathcal{I}_x(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho a_x) \alpha$, $\mathcal{J}_y(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho b_y) \beta$ be trivial instruments, we obtain

$$\text{tr} [\rho(\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I})_y^\wedge] = \text{tr} [\mathcal{J}_y(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(\rho))] = \text{tr} [\text{tr}(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(\rho) b_y) \beta] = \text{tr} [\overline{\mathcal{I}}(\rho) b_y] = \text{tr} (\alpha b_y)$$

On the other hand,

$$\text{tr} [\rho(\widehat{\mathcal{J}} | \widehat{\mathcal{I}})_y] = \text{tr} [\rho(B | A)_y] = \text{tr} \left[\rho \sum_x (a_x \circ b_y) \right]$$

These do not agree, in general. For example, if $\Omega_{\mathcal{I}} = \{x\}$ so that $\mathcal{I}_x(\rho) = \alpha$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$, then we obtain

$$\text{tr} [\rho(\widehat{\mathcal{J}} | \widehat{\mathcal{I}})_y] = \text{tr} (\rho b_y) \neq \text{tr} (\alpha b_y)$$

in general. \square

4 Mixed Sequential Products and Coexistence

We have defined sequential products of effects (observables) and of operations (instruments). We now define mixed sequential products for effects with operations and observables with instruments. If $a \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ and $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$, we define $a \circ \mathcal{I} = \mathcal{L}^a \circ \mathcal{I}$. Thus, $a \circ \mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$ and $(a \circ \mathcal{I})(\rho) = \mathcal{I}(a^{1/2}\rho a^{1/2})$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$. Notice that $a \circ I = \mathcal{L}^a$ and $I \circ \mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}$. Also, it is easy to check that $a \circ \mathcal{I}$ is additive and affine in the second argument but is not in the first. If $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$ has Kraus decomposition $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \sum B_i \rho B_i^*$ and $a \in \mathcal{E}(H)$, we define $\mathcal{I} \circ a \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ by $\mathcal{I} \circ a = \sum B_i^* a B_i$. This definition does not depend on the particular Kraus operators because if \mathcal{I} also has the decomposition $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \sum C_i \rho C_i^*$, then for every $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr} \left(\rho \sum B_i^* a B_i \right) &= \sum \text{tr} (\rho B_i^* a B_i) = \sum \text{tr} (B_i \rho B_i^* a) = \text{tr} \left(\sum B_i \rho B_i^* a \right) \\ &= \text{tr} \left(\sum C_i \rho C_i^* a \right) = \text{tr} \left(\rho \sum C_i^* a C_i \right) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\sum B_i^* a B_i = \sum C_i^* a C_i$. It is easy to check that $\mathcal{I} \circ a$ is additive and affine in both variables.

We now extend these definitions to observables and instruments. If $A = \{a_x : x \in \Omega_A\}$ is an observable and $\mathcal{I} \in \text{In}(H)$, we define $A \circ \mathcal{I} \in \text{In}(H)$ to have outcome space $\Omega_{A \circ \mathcal{I}} = \Omega_A \times \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}$ and

$$(A \circ \mathcal{I})_{(x,y)}(\rho) = (a_x \circ \mathcal{I}_y)(\rho) = (\mathcal{L}^{a_x} \circ \mathcal{I}_y)(\rho) = \mathcal{I}_y(\mathcal{L}^{a_x}(\rho)) = \mathcal{I}_y(a_x^{1/2} \rho a_x^{1/2})$$

It is then natural to define $(\mathcal{I} | A) \in \text{In}(H)$ to have $\Omega_{(\mathcal{I}|A)} = \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{I} | A)_y(\rho) &= \sum_x (A \circ \mathcal{I})_{(x,y)}(\rho) = \sum_x \mathcal{I}_y(a_x^{1/2} \rho a_x^{1/2}) = \mathcal{I}_y \left(\sum_x a_x^{1/2} \rho a_x^{1/2} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{I}_y \left(\overline{\mathcal{L}^A}(\rho) \right) = \left(\overline{\mathcal{L}^A} \circ \mathcal{I}_y \right) (\rho) \end{aligned}$$

We thus define $(\mathcal{I} | A)_y = \overline{\mathcal{L}^A} \circ \mathcal{I}_y$. If $\mathcal{I} \in \text{In}(H)$ has Kraus decomposition $\mathcal{I}_x(\rho) = \sum B_i^x \rho (B_i^x)^*$ and $A = \{a_x : x \in \Omega_A\} \in \text{Ob}(H)$ we define $\mathcal{I} \circ A \in \text{Ob}(H)$ to have outcome space $\Omega_{\mathcal{I} \circ A} = \Omega_{\mathcal{I}} \times \Omega_A$ and

$$(\mathcal{I} \circ A)_{(x,y)} = \mathcal{I}_x \circ a_y = \sum (B_i^x)^* a_y B_i^x$$

It is then natural to define $(A | \mathcal{I}) \in \text{Ob}(H)$ to have $\Omega_{(A|\mathcal{I})} = \Omega_A$ and

$$(A | \mathcal{I})_y = \sum_x (\mathcal{I} \circ A)_{(x,y)} = \sum_{x,i} (B_i^x)^* a_y B_i^x = \overline{\mathcal{I}} \circ a_y$$

Theorem 4.1. (i) If $a \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ and $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$, then $(a \circ \mathcal{I})^\wedge = a \circ \widehat{\mathcal{I}}$. (ii) If $A \in \text{Ob}(H)$ and $\mathcal{I} \in \text{In}(H)$, then $(A \circ \mathcal{I})_{(x,y)}^\wedge = a_x \circ \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_y = (A \circ \widehat{\mathcal{I}})_{(x,y)}$. (iii) If $A \in \text{Ob}(H)$, $\mathcal{I} \in \text{In}(H)$, then $(\mathcal{I} | A)^\wedge = (\widehat{\mathcal{I}} | A)$.

Proof. (i) For all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr} [\rho(a \circ \mathcal{I})^\wedge] &= \text{tr} [(a \circ \mathcal{I})(\rho)] = \text{tr} [\mathcal{I}(a^{1/2} \rho a^{1/2})] = \text{tr} (a^{1/2} \rho a^{1/2} \widehat{\mathcal{I}}) \\ &= \text{tr} (\rho a^{1/2} \widehat{\mathcal{I}} a^{1/2}) = \text{tr} (\rho a \circ \widehat{\mathcal{I}}) \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows. (ii) Since $(A \circ \mathcal{I})_{(x,y)} = a_x \circ \mathcal{I}_y$, by (i) we obtain

$$(A \circ \mathcal{I})_{(x,y)}^\wedge = (a_x \circ \mathcal{I}_y)^\wedge = a_x \circ \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_y = (A \circ \widehat{\mathcal{I}})_{(x,y)}$$

(iii) Applying Theorem 3.1(ii) we have for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr} [\rho(\mathcal{I} | A)_y^\wedge] &= \text{tr} [(\mathcal{I} | A)_y(\rho)] = \text{tr} [(\overline{\mathcal{L}}^A \circ \mathcal{I}_y)(\rho)] = [\rho(\mathcal{L}^A \circ \mathcal{J}_y)^\wedge] \\ &= \text{tr} \left[\rho \left(\sum_x \mathcal{L}^{a_x} \circ \mathcal{I}_y \right)^\wedge \right] = \sum_x \text{tr} [\rho(\mathcal{L}^{a_x} \circ \mathcal{I}_y)^\wedge] \\ &= \sum_x \text{tr} [\rho(a_x \circ \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_y)] = \text{tr} \left[\rho \sum_x (a_x \circ \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_y) \right] = \text{tr} [\rho(\widehat{\mathcal{I}} | A)_y] \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $(\mathcal{I} | A)^\wedge = (\widehat{\mathcal{I}} | A)$. \square

We have seen that if $A, B \in \text{Ob}(H)$, then $A \circ \mathcal{L}^B = \mathcal{L}^A \circ \mathcal{L}^B$. On the other hand

$$(\mathcal{L}^A \circ B)_{(x,y)} = \mathcal{L}_x^A \circ b_y = a_x^{1/2} b_y a_x^{1/2} = a_x \circ b_y = (A \circ B)_{(x,y)}$$

Hence, $\mathcal{L}^A \circ B = A \circ B$. We now treat trivial and semi-trivial instruments.

Theorem 4.2. (i) Let $a \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ and let \mathcal{I} be a trivial operation $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho b)\alpha$. Then $\mathcal{I} \circ A = \text{tr}(\alpha a)b$ and $a \circ \mathcal{I}$ is trivial with state α and effect $a \circ b$. (ii) Let $A = \{a_x : x \in \Omega_A\}$ be an observable and let \mathcal{I} be semi-trivial with states α_y and observable B . Then $(\mathcal{I} \circ A)_{(x,y)} = \text{tr}(\alpha_x a_y) b_x$ and $A \circ \mathcal{I}$ is semi-trivial with states α_y and observable $A \circ B$. (iii) Let $A = \{a_x : x \in \Omega_A\}$ be an observable and let \mathcal{I} be trivial with state α and observable B . Then $(\mathcal{I} \circ a)_{(x,y)} = \text{tr}(\alpha a_y) b_x$ and $A \circ \mathcal{I}$ is trivial with state α and observable $A \circ B$.

Proof. (i) Letting \mathcal{I} have Kraus decomposition $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \sum A_i \rho A_i^*$ with $\sum A_i^* A_i \leq I$ we have for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(\rho \mathcal{I} \circ a) &= \text{tr} \left(\rho \sum A_i^* a A_i \right) = \sum \text{tr}(\rho A_i^* a A_i) = \sum \text{tr}(A_i \rho A_i^* a) \\ &= \text{tr} \left(\sum A_i \rho A_i^* a \right) = \text{tr}[\mathcal{I}(\rho) a] = \text{tr}[\text{tr}(\rho b) \alpha a] \\ &= \text{tr}(\rho b) \text{tr}(\alpha a) = \text{tr}[\rho \text{tr}(\alpha a) b] \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\mathcal{I} \circ a = \text{tr}(\alpha a) b$. Moreover, for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (a \circ \mathcal{I})(\rho) &= \mathcal{I}(a^{1/2} \rho a^{1/2}) = \text{tr}(a^{1/2} \rho a^{1/2} b) \alpha = \text{tr}(\rho a^{1/2} b a^{1/2}) \alpha \\ &= \text{tr}(\rho a \circ b) \alpha \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $a \circ \mathcal{I}$ is trivial with state α and effect $a \circ b$.

(ii) Letting \mathcal{I}_x have Kraus decomposition $\mathcal{I}_x(\rho) = \sum A_i^x \rho (A_i^x)^*$, we have from (i) that

$$\text{tr}[\rho(\mathcal{I} \circ A)_{(x,y)}] = \text{tr}(\rho \mathcal{I}_x \circ a_y) = \text{tr}[\text{tr}(\alpha_x a_y) b_x]$$

Therefore, $(\mathcal{I} \circ A)_{(x,y)} = \text{tr}(\alpha_x a_y) b_x$. Moreover, by (i) we have for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ that

$$(A \circ \mathcal{I})_{(x,y)}(\rho) = (a_x \circ \mathcal{I}_y)(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho a_x \circ b_y) \alpha_y$$

Hence, $A \circ \mathcal{I}$ is semi-trivial with states α_y and observable $(A \circ B)_{(x,y)} = a_x \circ b_y$. (iii) follows from (ii). \square

Let $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$ be a Kraus with $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = S \rho S^*$ and let $a \in \mathcal{E}(H)$. Then $\mathcal{I} \circ a = S^* a S$ and

$$(a \circ \mathcal{I})(\rho) = \mathcal{I}(a^{1/2} \rho a^{1/2}) = S a^{1/2} \rho a^{1/2} S^*$$

Thus, $a \circ \mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$ is Kraus with Kraus operator $S a^{1/2}$. More generally, if $\mathcal{I} \in \text{In}(H)$ is Kraus with $\mathcal{I}_x(\rho) = S_x \rho S_x^*$ and $A = \{a_y : y \in \Omega_A\} \in \text{Ob}(H)$, then

$$(\mathcal{I} \circ A)_{(x,y)} = \mathcal{I}_x \circ a_y = S_x^* a_y S_x$$

and

$$(A \circ \mathcal{I})_{(x,y)}(\rho) = (a_y \circ \mathcal{I}_x)(\rho) = \mathcal{I}_x(a_y^{1/2} \rho a_y^{1/2}) = S_x a_y^{1/2} \rho a_y^{1/2} S_x^*$$

Thus, $A \circ \mathcal{I} \in \text{In}(H)$ is Kraus with Kraus operators $S_x a_y^{1/2}$.

Example 10. If $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{O}(H)$ is a channel, it is easy to check that $J(a) = \mathcal{I} \circ a$ is a convex, effect algebra morphism on $\mathcal{E}(H)$. We now show that J need not be a monomorphism. That is, if $J(a) \perp J(b)$, then we need not have $a \perp b$. Let $\{\psi_1, \psi_2\}$ be an orthonormal basis for \mathbb{C}^2 and let $a_1 = |\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1|$, $a_2 = |\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2|$. Then $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = a_1\rho a_1 + a_2\rho a_2$ is a channel. Letting $d = |\psi_1 + \psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_1 + \psi_2|$ we have that

$$d = 2 \left| \frac{\psi_1 + \psi_2}{\sqrt{2}} \right\rangle \left\langle \frac{\psi_1 + \psi_2}{\sqrt{2}} \right|$$

Hence, d is twice a one-dimensional projection so $d \not\leq I$. Letting $a = b = \frac{1}{2}d$ we have that $a, b \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ and $a + b = d \not\leq I$ so $a \not\perp b$. However,

$$\begin{aligned} J(a) + J(b) &= J(d) \\ &= |\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| |\psi_1 + \psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_1 + \psi_2| |\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| \\ &\quad + |\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2| |\psi_1 + \psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_1 + \psi_2| |\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2| \\ &= |\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| + |\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2| = I \end{aligned}$$

so $J(a) \perp J(b)$. □

An observable $B = \{b_y : y \in \Omega_B\}$ is *part* [2] of an observable $A = \{a_x : x \in \Omega_A\}$ if there exists a surjection $f : \Omega_A \rightarrow \Omega_B$ such that

$$b_y = A_{f^{-1}(y)} = \sum \{a_x : f(x) = y\}$$

We then write $B = f(A)$. Two observables B, C *coexist* [1, 8, 9] if there exists an observable A such that $B = f(A)$, $C = g(A)$. Thus, B and C coexist if they can be measured by applying a single observable A . If $A, B \in \text{Ob}(H)$ with $A = \{a_x : x \in \Omega_A\}$, $B = \{b_y : y \in \Omega_B\}$, define $f : \Omega_A \times \Omega_B \rightarrow \Omega_B$ by $f(x, y) = y$. Then

$$(B | A)_y = \sum_x a_x \circ b_y = \sum_x (A \circ B)_{(x,y)} = \sum \{(A \circ B)_{(x,y)} : f(x, y) = y\}$$

Therefore, $(B | A)_y = (A \circ B)_{f^{-1}(y)}$ so $(B | A) = f(A \circ B)$. We conclude that $(B | A)$ and $A \circ B$ coexist. Also, A and $A \circ B$ coexist because $a_x = \sum_y a_x \circ b_y$. Thus, $(B | A)$ and A coexist.

If $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J} \in \text{In}(H)$, we have the instrument $\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J}$ given by $(\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J})_{(x,y)}(\rho) = \mathcal{J}_y(\mathcal{I}_x(\rho))$ with channel $\overline{\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J}} = \overline{\mathcal{I}} \circ \overline{\mathcal{J}}$ and instrument $(\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I})$ given by

$(\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I})_y(\rho) = \mathcal{J}_y(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(\rho))$ with channel $\overline{(\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I})} = \overline{\mathcal{I}} \circ \overline{\mathcal{J}}$. We say that \mathcal{J} is *part* of \mathcal{I} if there exists a surjection $f: \Omega_{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathcal{J}}$ such that

$$\mathcal{J}_y = \mathcal{I}_{f^{-1}(y)} = \sum \{\mathcal{I}_x: f(x) = y\}$$

We then write $\mathcal{J} = f(\mathcal{I})$. As with observables, we say that $\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{K} \in \text{In}(H)$ *coexist* if there exists an instrument \mathcal{I} such that $\mathcal{J} = f(\mathcal{I})$, $\mathcal{K} = g(\mathcal{I})$. Moreover, we have that $(\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I})$ and $\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J}$ coexist. However, $\mathcal{I}_x \neq \sum_y \mathcal{I}_x \circ \mathcal{J}_y$ in general, so $(\mathcal{J} | \mathcal{I})$ and \mathcal{I} may not coexist.

Lemma 4.3. (i) $f(\mathcal{I})^\wedge = f(\widehat{\mathcal{I}})$. (ii) If \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{K} coexist, the $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}, \widehat{\mathcal{K}}$ coexist.

Proof. (i) For all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr} [\rho f(\mathcal{I}_y^\wedge)] &= \text{tr} [f(\mathcal{I})_y(\rho)] = \text{tr} [\mathcal{I}_{f^{-1}(y)}(\rho)] = \text{tr} \left[\sum_{f(x)=y} \mathcal{I}_x(\rho) \right] \\ &= \sum_{f(x)=y} \text{tr} [\mathcal{I}_x(\rho)] = \sum_{f(x)=y} \text{tr} (\rho \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_x) = \text{tr} \left(\rho \sum_{f(x)=y} \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_x \right) = \text{tr} [\rho f(\widehat{\mathcal{I}})_y] \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $f(\mathcal{I})^\wedge = f(\widehat{\mathcal{I}})$. (ii) If \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{K} coexist, the $\mathcal{J} = f(\mathcal{I})$, $\mathcal{K} = g(\mathcal{I})$ for some $\mathcal{I} \in \text{In}(H)$. By (i) we obtain $\widehat{\mathcal{J}} = f(\widehat{\mathcal{I}})$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{K}} = g(\widehat{\mathcal{I}})$ so $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}$ coexist. \square

Lemma 4.4. (i) If $\mathcal{I}_x(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho a_x)\alpha$ is trivial and $\mathcal{J} = f(\mathcal{I})$, then \mathcal{J} is trivial with state α and observable $f(A)$. (ii) If \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{K} are trivial with the same state α and $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}, \widehat{\mathcal{K}}$ coexist, then \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{K} coexist.

Proof. (i) For all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ we obtain

$$\mathcal{J}_y(\rho) = \sum_{f(x)=y} \mathcal{I}_x(\rho) = \sum_{f(x)=y} \text{tr}(\rho a_x)\alpha = \text{tr} \left(\rho \sum_{f(x)=y} a_x \right) \alpha = \text{tr} [\rho f(A)_y] \alpha$$

Hence, \mathcal{J} is trivial with state α and observable $f(A)$. (ii) Let $\mathcal{J}_y(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho b_y)\alpha$, $\mathcal{K}_z(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho c_z)\alpha$ be trivial with the same state α . Since \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{K} coexist there exists an observable $A = \{a_x: x \in \Omega_A\}$ such that $\widehat{\mathcal{J}} = f(A)$, $\widehat{\mathcal{K}} = g(A)$. Letting $\mathcal{I} \in \text{In}(H)$ be defined by $\mathcal{I}_x(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho a_x)\alpha$ we obtain from (i) that

$$\mathcal{J}_y = \text{tr}(\rho \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_y)\alpha = \text{tr} [\rho f(A)_y] \alpha = f(\mathcal{I})_y(\rho)$$

and

$$\mathcal{K}_z(\rho) = \text{tr}(\rho \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_z) \alpha = \text{tr}[\rho g(A)_z] \alpha = g(\mathcal{I})_z(\rho)$$

Hence, $\mathcal{J} = f(\mathcal{I})$, $\mathcal{K} = g(\mathcal{I})$ so \mathcal{J} , \mathcal{K} coexist □

References

- [1] P. Busch, M. Grabowski and P. Lahti, *Operational Quantum Physics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995.
- [2] S. Filipov, T. Heinosaari and L. Leppäjärvi, Simulability of observables in general probabilistic theories, *Phys. Rev.* **A97**, 062102 (2018).
- [3] S. Gudder and R. Greechie, Sequential Products on effect algebras, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **49**, 87–111 (2002).
- [4] S. Gudder and G. Nagy, Sequential quantum measurements, *J. Math. Phys.* **42**, 5212–5222 (2001).
- [5] S. Gudder, Quantum instruments and conditioned observables, arXiv:quant-ph 2005.08117 (2020).
- [6] ———, Parts and composites of quantum systems, arXiv:quant-ph 2009.07371 (2020).
- [7] ———, Combinations of quantum observables and instruments, arXiv:quant-ph 2010.08025 (2020).
- [8] T. Heinosaari and M. Ziman, *The Mathematical Language of Quantum Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.
- [9] T. Heinosaari, D. Reitzner, R. Stano and M. Ziman, Coexistence of quantum operations, *J. Phys.* **A42**, 365302 (2009).
- [10] K. Kraus, *States, Effects and Operations*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.
- [11] P. Lahti, Coexistence and joint measurability in quantum mechanics, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **42**, 893–906 (2003).

- [12] G. Lüders, Über die Zustandsänderung durch den Messprozess, *Ann. Physik* **6**, 322–328 (1951).
- [13] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.