

# On Kirkwood–Dirac quasiprobabilities and unravelings of quantum channel assigned to a tight frame

Alexey E. Rastegin

*Irkutsk State University, K. Marx St. 1, Irkutsk 664003, Russia*

An issue which has attracted increasing attention in contemporary researches are Kirkwood–Dirac quasiprobabilities. List of their use includes many questions of quantum physics. Applications of complex tight frames in quantum information science were recently demonstrated. It is shown in this paper that quasiprobabilities naturally appear in the context of unravelings of a quantum channel. Using vectors of the given tight frame to build principal Kraus operators generates quasiprobabilities with interesting properties. For an equiangular tight frame, we characterize the Hilbert–Schmidt and spectral norms of the matrix consisted of quasiprobabilities. Hence, novel uncertainty relations in terms of Rényi and Tsallis entropies are obtained. New inequalities for characterizing the location of eigenvalues are derived. They give an alternative to estimating on the base of Geršgorin’s theorem. A utility of the presented inequalities is exemplified with symmetric informationally complete measurement in dimension two.

Keywords: Kirkwood–Dirac quasiprobabilities, Rényi entropy, Tsallis entropy, equiangular tight frames, matrix norms, eigenvalue location

## I. INTRODUCTION

Equiangular tight frames are discrete sets of finite-dimensional vectors with several notable properties [1, 2]. Such frames are interesting in their own right as well as for applications in many disciplines such as signal and image processing, data compression, sampling theory, and so on [3]. Complex equiangular tight frames with the maximal number of elements lead to symmetric informationally complete measurements. These measurements together with mutually unbiased bases provide an indispensable tool in quantum information science. Each complex tight frame provides the set of rank-one operators forming a non-orthogonal resolution of the identity in the Hilbert space. Measurements generated in this way seem to be very useful in quantum information theory and deserve more attention than they have obtained at the moment.

Dealing with an over-complete set of vectors results in many distinctions from the most familiar case of quantum measurements in orthonormal bases. New features can be characterized in terms of quasiprobabilities assigned to one and the same measurement. In general, quasiprobabilities represent quantum states similarly to probability densities representing states in classical statistical mechanics. Although the quasiprobabilities in a distribution sum to one they can have negative and even non-real values. Wigner functions [4] are the well-known example of quasiprobabilities used in various topics [5–10]. The Kirkwood–Dirac distribution is currently the subject of active researches [11, 12]. It is closely related to the so-called Terletsky–Margenau–Hill distribution [13, 14]. Recently, such distributions have found applications in quantum state tomography [15–18], information scrambling [19–22], postselected metrology [23–25], quantum thermodynamics [26–28], and studying conceptual questions [29–32].

This paper explores some properties of tight frames expressed in terms of the corresponding Kirkwood–Dirac quasiprobabilities [11, 12]. These quasiprobabilities constitute a Hermitian matrix assigned to a tight frame. Also, they can be interpreted as related to Kraus operators of certain quantum channel. The paper is organized as follows. Section II reviews the preliminary facts and gives the notation. Extremal unravelings of quantum channels in general are examined in Section III. Kirkwood–Dirac quasiprobabilities assigned to a tight frame are considered in Section IV. In Section V, new entropic uncertainty relations are formulated for arbitrary unraveling of the considered quantum channel. These results follow from inequalities with the Hilbert–Schmidt and spectral norms of the matrix consisted of the quasiprobabilities. The presented relations are exemplified in Section VI. Section VII concludes the paper with a summary of the results. Appendix A is devoted to results concerning the location of eigenvalues. An elementary inequality is proved in Appendix B.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

Let  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$  be the space of linear operators on finite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . By  $\mathcal{L}_+(\mathcal{H})$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{sa}(\mathcal{H})$ , we respectively mean the set of positive semi-definite operators and the real space of Hermitian ones. A state of the quantum system of interest is represented by the density matrix  $\rho \in \mathcal{L}_+(\mathcal{H})$  normalized as  $\text{tr}(\rho) = 1$ . The set of pure states contains density matrices of the form  $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ , where the ket  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$  is normalized as  $\langle\psi|\psi\rangle = 1$ . For two

operators  $X, Y \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ , their Hilbert–Schmidt inner product is defined by the formula

$$\langle X, Y \rangle_{\text{hs}} = \text{tr}(X^\dagger Y). \quad (1)$$

Using some orthonormal basis as computational, vectors and operators are represented by rectangular matrices. Let  $\mathbb{M}_{m \times n}(\mathbb{C})$  be the space of all  $m \times n$  complex matrices. By  $\mathbb{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ , we mean the space of  $n \times n$  complex matrices. The space of Hermitian  $n \times n$  matrices is denoted by  $\mathbb{M}_n^{(sa)}(\mathbb{C})$ , and the set of positive semi-definite  $n \times n$  matrices is denoted by  $\mathbb{M}_n^+(\mathbb{C})$ . For each  $G \in \mathbb{M}_{m \times n}(\mathbb{C})$ , the square matrices  $G^\dagger G$  and  $GG^\dagger$  have the same non-zero eigenvalues. The positive square roots of these eigenvalues are the singular values  $\sigma_j(G)$  of  $G$  [33]. For real  $q \geq 1$ , the Schatten  $q$ -norm is defined as

$$\|G\|_q = \left( \sum_j \sigma_j(G)^q \right)^{1/q}, \quad (2)$$

where the sum is actually taken over non-zero singular values of  $G$ . In particular, this family includes the trace norm for  $q = 1$ , the Hilbert–Schmidt norm, or the Frobenius norm,

$$\|G\|_2 = \sqrt{\text{tr}(G^\dagger G)} \quad (3)$$

for  $q = 2$ , and the spectral norm  $\|G\|_\infty = \max \sigma_j(G)$ . For  $M \in \mathbb{M}_n^+(\mathbb{C})$ , it holds that

$$\max x^\dagger M x = \|M\|_\infty, \quad (4)$$

where the maximum is taken over all normalized vectors  $x \in \mathbb{M}_{n \times 1}(\mathbb{C})$ . The mentioned three norms will often be used in the present paper.

Let us recall required material concerning tight frames in finite dimensions [3]. All the frames in  $d$ -dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_d$  are assumed to be complex. A set  $\mathcal{F} = \{|\phi_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^n$  of  $n \geq d$  unit kets of  $\mathcal{H}_d$  is called a frame if there exist strictly positive numbers  $S_0 < S_1 < \infty$  such that

$$S_0 \leq \sum_{j=1}^n |\langle \phi_j | \psi \rangle|^2 \leq S_1 \quad (5)$$

for all unit  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_d$ . The numbers  $S_0$  and  $S_1$  are the minimal and maximal eigenvalues of the frame operator

$$S = \sum_{j=1}^n |\phi_j\rangle\langle \phi_j|. \quad (6)$$

We will further deal with the special case of tight frames, when  $S_0 = S_1 = S = nd^{-1}$  and  $S = nd^{-1} \mathbb{1}_d$ . The states of a tight frame induce the resolution  $\mathcal{E} = \{E_j\}_{j=1}^n$  of the identity so that

$$\frac{d}{n} S = \sum_{j=1}^n E_j = \mathbb{1}_d. \quad (7)$$

That is, the positive semi-definite operators

$$E_j = \frac{d}{n} |\phi_j\rangle\langle \phi_j| \quad (8)$$

form the so-called positive operator-valued measure (POVM). When the pre-measurement state is described by density matrix  $\rho$  with  $\text{tr}(\rho) = 1$ , the probability of  $j$ -th outcome is equal to

$$\text{tr}(E_j \rho) = \frac{d}{n} \langle \phi_j | \rho | \phi_j \rangle. \quad (9)$$

Parseval tight frames obtained with  $S = 1$  are equivalent to orthonormal bases commonly used in quantum theory.

Equiangular tight frames (ETFs) are especially interesting for many reasons. The tight frame  $\mathcal{F}$  is called equiangular, when there exists  $c > 0$  such that

$$|\langle \phi_i | \phi_j \rangle|^2 = c \quad (10)$$

for each pair  $i \neq j$ . Calculations then show that

$$c = \frac{S-1}{n-1} = \frac{n-d}{(n-1)d}. \quad (11)$$

If there exists an ETF with  $n$  elements in dimension  $d$ , then  $n \leq d^2$  and also exists an ETF with  $n$  elements in dimension  $n-d$ . The least case  $n = d^2$  with

$$|\langle \phi_i | \phi_j \rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{d+1} \quad (i \neq j)$$

gives a symmetric informationally complete measurement (SIC-POVM) [34]. Its existence for arbitrary  $d$  is still an open question, though exact constructions have been found [35–37].

### III. ON EXTREMAL UNRAVELINGS OF QUANTUM CHANNELS

The dynamics of systems in quantum information theory is typically described in terms of Kraus operators [38]. Let us consider a linear map

$$\rho \mapsto \Psi(\rho) = \sum_j A_j \rho A_j^\dagger, \quad (12)$$

where each of Kraus operators  $A_j$  maps kets of  $\mathcal{H}$  to kets of  $\mathcal{H}'$ . In general, the input space  $\mathcal{H}$  and the output space  $\mathcal{H}'$  can differ. The map is called positive when it maps elements of  $\mathcal{L}_+(\mathcal{H})$  to elements of  $\mathcal{L}_+(\mathcal{H}')$ . This property is clearly valid for (12). In addition, maps of the form (12) are completely positive in the following sense. Let us imagine an environmental system with its Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}''$ . The complete positivity implies that the map  $\Psi \otimes \text{id}''$  with identity map  $\text{id}''$  is positive for arbitrary dimensionality of  $\mathcal{H}''$ . The considered map preserves the trace, when its Kraus operators satisfy

$$\sum_j A_j^\dagger A_j = \mathbb{1}, \quad (13)$$

where  $\mathbb{1}$  is the identity operator on  $\mathcal{H}$ . Trace-preserving completely positive maps will be referred to as quantum channels. They often called super-operators, where “super” conveys that the map takes operators to operators [39]. The concrete set  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_j\}$  in the right-hand side of (12) will be named an unraveling of the quantum channel. This terminology is due to Carmichael [40] who introduced this word for a representation of the master equation.

Probability distributions of interest will be characterized in terms of the entropies of Rényi [41] and Tsallis [42]. For  $0 < \alpha \neq 1$ , the Rényi  $\alpha$ -entropy and the Tsallis  $\alpha$ -entropy are respectively defined as

$$R_\alpha(\mathcal{A}; \rho) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \ln \left( \sum_j p_j(\mathcal{A}; \rho)^\alpha \right), \quad (14)$$

$$H_\alpha(\mathcal{A}; \rho) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \left( \sum_j p_j(\mathcal{A}; \rho)^\alpha - 1 \right) = - \sum_j p_j(\mathcal{A}; \rho)^\alpha \ln_\alpha(p_j(\mathcal{A}; \rho)), \quad (15)$$

where the probabilities are expressed as  $p_j(\mathcal{A}; \rho) = \text{tr}(A_j^\dagger A_j \rho)$ . The so-called  $\alpha$ -logarithm of strictly positive  $\xi$  is defined as

$$\ln_\alpha(\xi) = \begin{cases} \frac{\xi^{1-\alpha} - 1}{1-\alpha}, & \text{for } 0 < \alpha \neq 1, \\ \ln \xi, & \text{for } \alpha = 1. \end{cases}$$

In the limit  $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ , both the above entropies leads to the Shannon entropy

$$H_1(\mathcal{A}; \rho) = - \sum_j p_j(\mathcal{A}; \rho) \ln p_j(\mathcal{A}; \rho). \quad (16)$$

It is easy to see that the Tsallis  $\alpha$ -entropy (15) is concave for all  $\alpha > 0$ . Other properties of Tsallis information functions and some physical applications are discussed, e.g., in [43–49]. The right-hand side of (14) is certainly concave for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  [50]. Convexity properties of the Rényi entropies with orders  $\alpha > 1$  depend on dimensionality of probabilistic vectors [51, 52]. For example, the binary Rényi entropy is concave for  $0 < \alpha \leq 2$  [52]. However, this fact is not used in the following.

The complete sum of squared probabilities is usually referred to as the index of coincidence

$$I(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) = \sum_j p_j(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho})^2. \quad (17)$$

It follows from (14) and (17) that

$$R_2(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) = -\ln I(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho}), \quad (18)$$

$$H_2(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) = 1 - I(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho}). \quad (19)$$

The entropy (18) is often referred to as the collision entropy [53]. Another especially important case is the min-entropy

$$R_\infty(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) = -\ln(\max p_j(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho})), \quad (20)$$

which is obtained from (14) for  $\alpha = \infty$ .

It is well known that the choice of Kraus operators is not unique due to unitary freedom in operator-sum representations. Two Kraus representations of the same super-operator are related as

$$B_i = \sum_j A_j u_{ji}. \quad (21)$$

where the matrix  $\mathbf{U} = [[u_{ji}]]$  is unitary [38, 39]. To make the two unravelings the same size, the smaller set should be added by zero operators. Following [54], one introduces the matrix  $\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho})$  with entries

$$\langle A_i \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\rho}}, A_j \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \rangle_{\text{hs}} = \text{tr}(A_i^\dagger A_j \boldsymbol{\rho}). \quad (22)$$

Hence, we immediately obtain the matrix relation

$$\mathbf{U}^\dagger \Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) \mathbf{U} = \Lambda(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho}). \quad (23)$$

The extremal unraveling  $\mathcal{A}^{(ex)} = \{A_i^{(ex)}\}$  is obtained, when we take the unitary matrix  $\mathbf{V}$  that diagonalizes  $\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho})$ , so that

$$\mathbf{V}^\dagger \Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) \mathbf{V} = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n), \quad (24)$$

$$A_i^{(ex)} = \sum_j A_j v_{ji}. \quad (25)$$

The eigenvalues listed in the right-hand side of (24) are actually the probabilities  $p_i(\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}; \boldsymbol{\rho})$ . Hence, the considered matrices are all positive semi-definite. Of course, the unitary matrix  $\mathbf{V}$  depends on the actual density matrix of the principal system. The obtained unraveling provides the extremality property with respect to the Tsallis  $\alpha$ -entropies for  $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$  and the Rényi  $\alpha$ -entropies for  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ . Namely, for arbitrary unraveling  $\mathcal{B}$  we have

$$H_\alpha(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) \geq H_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) \quad \forall \alpha \in (0, \infty), \quad (26)$$

$$R_\alpha(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) \geq R_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) \quad \forall \alpha \in (0, 1]. \quad (27)$$

Due to  $\Lambda(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) = \mathbf{W} \Lambda(\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) \mathbf{W}^\dagger$  with unitary  $\mathbf{W}$ , one gets

$$p_i(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) = \sum_j w_{ij} w_{ij}^* p_j(\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}; \boldsymbol{\rho}). \quad (28)$$

The results (26) and (27) follow from concavity of the entropies and the fact that the square matrix with elements  $w_{ij} w_{ij}^*$  is unistochastic [54]. With respect to the Rényi  $\alpha$ -entropy, the unraveling with operators of the form (25) is generally extremal for  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ . Nevertheless, the above unraveling allows us to estimate  $R_\alpha(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho})$  from below for arbitrary unraveling  $\mathcal{B}$  and all  $\alpha \geq 2$ . The corresponding new result is posed as follows.

**Proposition 1** *Let  $\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}$  be consisted of Kraus operators defined for the given quantum channel and density matrix  $\boldsymbol{\rho}$  by (25). For arbitrary unraveling  $\mathcal{B}$  of this channel, it holds that*

$$R_\alpha(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) \geq \frac{\alpha - 2}{\alpha - 1} R_\infty(\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) + \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} R_2(\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}; \boldsymbol{\rho}), \quad (29)$$

where  $\alpha \in [2, \infty]$ .

**Proof.** Let us begin with the inequalities for  $\alpha = 2$  and  $\alpha = \infty$ , namely

$$R_\infty(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) \geq R_\infty(\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}; \boldsymbol{\rho}), \quad (30)$$

$$R_2(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) \geq R_2(\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}; \boldsymbol{\rho}). \quad (31)$$

These relations are proved as follows. Due to (4), each of the diagonal elements of positive semi-definite matrix  $\mathbf{M}$  is not greater than  $\|\mathbf{M}\|_\infty$ . Applying this to  $\Lambda(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho})$  leads to the inequality

$$p_i(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) \leq \|\Lambda(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho})\|_\infty = \|\Lambda(\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}; \boldsymbol{\rho})\|_\infty. \quad (32)$$

Combining (20) with (32) completes the proof of (30).

The square of the Hilbert–Schmidt norm is equal to the sum of squared moduli of all elements of the given square matrix. Hence, we obtain

$$I(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) \leq \|\Lambda(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho})\|_2^2 = \|\Lambda(\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}; \boldsymbol{\rho})\|_2^2 = I(\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}; \boldsymbol{\rho}). \quad (33)$$

Combining the latter with  $R_2(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) = -\ln I(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho})$  immediately gives (31).

Using (30) and (31), we estimate  $R_\alpha(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho})$  from below for intermediate values of  $\alpha$ . It was proved in [55] that the Rényi  $\alpha$ -entropy of order  $\alpha \in [2, \infty]$  satisfies

$$R_\alpha(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) \geq \frac{\alpha - 2}{\alpha - 1} R_\infty(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) + \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} R_2(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho}). \quad (34)$$

The inequality (29) directly follows from (30), (31) and (34). ■

Thus, the statement of Proposition 1 allows one to estimate  $R_\alpha(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho})$  from below in terms of entropies of the unraveling with Kraus operators of the form (25). The novel relation (29) has completed in part the consideration of extremal unravelings given in [54]. The analysis for  $\alpha$  between 1 and 2 is an open question. It seems that new methods should be developed to resolve this question.

#### IV. KIRKWOOD–DIRAC QUASIPROBABILITIES ASSIGNED TO A TIGHT FRAME

Let us begin with the concept of Kirkwood–Dirac quasiprobabilities originally introduced for orthonormal bases. An extension to the case of POVMs is posed as follows [56]. To the given POVM  $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathbf{E}_j\}_{j=1}^n$  and density matrix  $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ , one assigns  $n^2$  quantities of the form  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{E}_i \mathbf{E}_j \boldsymbol{\rho})$ . These quantities will be referred to as generalized Kirkwood–Dirac quasiprobabilities [56]. By  $\Pi(\mathcal{E}; \boldsymbol{\rho})$ , we denote the  $n \times n$  matrix constituted by these quasiprobabilities. In the case of POVM with elements (8), quasiprobabilities are expressed as

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{E}_i \mathbf{E}_j \boldsymbol{\rho}) = \frac{d^2}{n^2} \langle \phi_i | \phi_j \rangle \langle \phi_j | \boldsymbol{\rho} | \phi_i \rangle. \quad (35)$$

To each POVM, one can naturally assign trace-preserving completely positive map

$$\boldsymbol{\rho} \mapsto \Psi(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{A}_j \boldsymbol{\rho} \mathbf{A}_j^\dagger, \quad (36)$$

where

$$\mathbf{A}_j = \sqrt{\mathbf{E}_j}. \quad (37)$$

The set  $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathbf{A}_j\}$  gives an unraveling of  $\Psi$  in terms of Kraus operators. The operators defined by (37) can be treated as measurement operators in the sense of sections 2.2.3 and 2.2.6 of [38]. An ordinary link between measurement operators and POVM elements is used here. Following [57], the operators  $\mathbf{A}_j$  will be referred to as the principal Kraus operators. Further, the above equations are rewritten as

$$\boldsymbol{\rho} \mapsto \Psi(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \sum_{j=1}^n p_j(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) |\phi_j\rangle \langle \phi_j|, \quad (38)$$

$$\mathbf{A}_j = \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}} |\phi_j\rangle \langle \phi_j|, \quad (39)$$

$$p_j(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) = \frac{d}{n} \langle \phi_j | \boldsymbol{\rho} | \phi_j \rangle. \quad (40)$$

Quantum channels of the form (38) are particular examples of entanglement breaking channels [58]. Quantum channel is an entanglement breaking one if and only if it has an unraveling with rank-one Kraus operators [58].

In the following, we deal with the  $n \times n$  matrix  $\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho)$  with elements

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}_i^\dagger \mathbf{A}_j \rho) = \frac{d}{n} \langle \phi_i | \phi_j \rangle \langle \phi_j | \rho | \phi_i \rangle. \quad (41)$$

The latter differs from (35) only by a factor. Therefore, the matrix equation

$$\Pi(\mathcal{E}; \rho) = \frac{d}{n} \Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho) \quad (42)$$

is valid due to the chosen form of POVM elements. It is obvious that  $\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho) \in \mathbb{M}_n^{(sa)}(\mathbb{C})$ , whereas positive semi-definiteness was mentioned right after (25). If  $n$  unit kets  $|\phi_j\rangle$  generate a tight frame, then the form (8) of POVM elements implies (42). It is of interest to ask, whether the implication holds in opposite direction. The following statement takes place.

**Proposition 2** *Let elements of POVM  $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathbf{E}_j\}_{j=1}^n$  on  $\mathcal{H}_d$  be all of rank one, and let quantum channel  $\Psi : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_d) \mapsto \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_d)$  be assigned to  $\mathcal{E}$  in accordance with (36) and (37). The following two statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *The POVM elements are represented as (8), where  $n$  unit kets  $|\phi_j\rangle$  form a tight frame in  $\mathcal{H}_d$ .*
- (2) *The matrix relation (42) holds for all unit vectors  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_d$ .*

**Proof.** The implication (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) was actually shown right before (42). One should prove that (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1). Since the POVM  $\mathcal{E}$  consists of rank-one elements  $\mathbf{E}_j \in \mathcal{L}_+(\mathcal{H}_d)$  only, we can write

$$\mathbf{E}_j = \gamma_j^2 |\phi_j\rangle \langle \phi_j|, \quad (43)$$

where non-zero  $\gamma_j \in \mathbb{R}$  and each of  $n$  kets  $|\phi_j\rangle$  is unit. Due to (37), the Kraus operators read as  $\mathbf{A}_j = \gamma_j |\phi_j\rangle \langle \phi_j|$ . With no loss of generality, we can take  $\gamma_j > 0$ . Using (43) and  $\rho = |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|$ , the diagonal elements of interest are represented as

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{E}_j^2 \rho) = \gamma_j^4 |\langle \phi_j | \psi \rangle|^2, \quad \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}_j^2 \rho) = \gamma_j^2 |\langle \phi_j | \psi \rangle|^2. \quad (44)$$

Let the matrix relation (42) hold for all unit  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_d$ . Combining this with (44) implies that  $\gamma_j^2 = n^{-1}d$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . Further, the completeness relation for  $\mathcal{E}$  then reads as

$$\frac{d}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |\phi_j\rangle \langle \phi_j| = \mathbf{1}_d. \quad (45)$$

Hence,  $n$  unit kets  $|\phi_j\rangle$  form a tight frame in  $\mathcal{H}_d$ . ■

As was already mentioned, the choice of Kraus operators is not unique due to unitary freedom in the operator-sum representation. Using (21) with the principal Kraus operators (39) leads to another unraveling of the quantum channel. Kraus operators of new unraveling are generally not of rank one. Being consisted of the states of an ETF, the unraveling with the Kraus operators (39) plays a special role. It allows us to evaluate exactly the Hilbert–Schmidt norms of the matrices  $\Pi(\mathcal{E}; \rho)$  and  $\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho)$ . The following statement takes place.

**Proposition 3** *Let the matrix  $\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho)$  with elements (22) be assigned to the given density matrix  $\rho$  and ETF  $\mathcal{F} = \{|\phi_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^n$ ; then  $\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho) \in \mathbb{M}_n^+(\mathbb{C})$ ,  $\|\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho)\|_1 = 1$  and*

$$\|\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho)\|_2^2 = (1 - c) I(\mathcal{A}; \rho) + c \text{tr}(\rho^2). \quad (46)$$

**Proof.** It was already mentioned that  $\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho)$  is positive semi-definite. Combining this fact with  $\text{tr}(\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho)) = 1$  implies  $\|\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho)\|_1 = 1$ . To prove (46), we shall evaluate  $\text{tr}(\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho)^2)$  due to the basic properties of equiangular tight frames. The  $(i, i)$ -entry of the square of  $\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho)$  reads as

$$\frac{d^2}{n^2} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle \phi_i | \phi_j \rangle \langle \phi_j | \rho | \phi_i \rangle \langle \phi_j | \phi_i \rangle \langle \phi_i | \rho | \phi_j \rangle = \frac{d^2}{n^2} \langle \phi_i | \rho | \phi_i \rangle^2 + \frac{cd^2}{n^2} \sum_{j \neq i} \langle \phi_i | \rho | \phi_j \rangle \langle \phi_j | \rho | \phi_i \rangle \quad (47)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{(1-c)d^2}{n^2} \langle \phi_i | \rho | \phi_i \rangle^2 + \frac{cd^2}{n^2} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle \phi_i | \rho | \phi_j \rangle \langle \phi_j | \rho | \phi_i \rangle \\ &= (1-c) p_i(\mathcal{A}; \rho)^2 + \frac{cd}{n} \langle \phi_i | \rho^2 | \phi_i \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Here, the step (47) follows from (10) and the step (48) follows from (7). Summing (48) over all  $i = 1, \dots, n$  finally gives

$$\|\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho)\|_2^2 = \text{tr}(\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho)^2) = (1-c)I(\mathcal{A}; \rho) + c \text{tr}(\rho^2), \quad (49)$$

where we again used (7) and (17). ■

The Hilbert–Schmidt norm of  $\Pi(\mathcal{E}; \rho)$  is obviously expressed as

$$\|\Pi(\mathcal{E}; \rho)\|_2 = \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}} \left( (1-c) \sum_{j=1}^n \text{tr}(\mathbf{E}_j \rho)^2 + c \text{tr}(\rho^2) \right)^{1/2}. \quad (50)$$

It should be pointed out that the result (46) is proved only for the concrete unraveling with the Kraus operators (39). Using a unitary freedom in the operator-sum representation, we can extend a treatment to arbitrary unraveling of the map (38). This will be done in the next section devoted to uncertainty relations.

## V. ENTROPIC UNCERTAINTY RELATIONS FOR UNRAVELINGS ASSIGNED TO AN ETF

The above results lead to uncertainty relations for the quantum channel defined by (38). Information entropies provide a flexible tool to express uncertainties in quantum measurements. In particular, this approach allows one to treat naturally uncertainty relations in the presence of quantum memory [59–62]. For a general discussion of entropic uncertainty relations, see the review [63] and references therein. For some special type of measurements, entropic uncertainty relations often follow from estimation of the corresponding indices of coincidence. For measurements in mutually unbiased bases, this approach was given in [64, 65]. It is also useful for SIC-POVMs [66] and their generalizations [67]. Mutually unbiased bases have found use in numerous questions [68]. In effect, they were used in testing uncertainty relations for multiple measurements [69]. It was mentioned in [70] that equiangular tight frames deserve wider application in quantum information science. The results of the present section aim to support this claim.

Due to Proposition 3, we can evaluate the Hilbert–Schmidt norm of all matrices of the form  $\Lambda(\mathcal{B}; \rho)$ . These positive semi-definite matrices have the same non-zero eigenvalues, whence

$$\|\Lambda(\mathcal{B}; \rho)\|_q = \|\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho)\|_q. \quad (51)$$

It was proved in [70] that the index of coincidence satisfies

$$I(\mathcal{A}; \rho) \leq \frac{Sc + (1-c) \text{tr}(\rho^2)}{S^2}. \quad (52)$$

It can be shown that this inequality is saturated for density matrices of the form

$$\rho = \sum_{j=1}^n \nu_j |\phi_j\rangle\langle\phi_j|, \quad (53)$$

where non-negative weights  $\nu_j$  sum to 1. In particular, the equality takes place for the maximally mixed state  $\rho_* = d^{-1} \mathbf{1}_d$  and for one of the pure states that form an ETF  $\mathcal{F}$ . For a SIC-POVM, the inequality (52) is replaced with equality for all density matrices. The corresponding result was presented in [66].

Combining (46) with (52) immediately leads to the inequality

$$\text{tr}(\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho)^2) \leq \frac{(1-c)c}{S} + \left( \frac{(1-c)^2}{S^2} + c \right) \text{tr}(\rho^2). \quad (54)$$

It then follows from (54) and (A1) that

$$\left| \lambda_j - \frac{1}{n} \right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{n-1}}{n} \sqrt{n \text{tr}(\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho)^2) - 1} \quad (55)$$

$$\leq \frac{\sqrt{n-1}}{n} \sqrt{\left( \frac{(1-c)^2}{S^2} + c \right) n \text{tr}(\rho^2) + (1-c)cd - 1}. \quad (56)$$

This interval is described in terms of purity  $\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\rho}^2)$  and the parameters of an ETF. In particular, we obtain

$$\|\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho})\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{n} + \frac{\sqrt{n-1}}{n} \sqrt{\left(\frac{(1-c)^2}{S^2} + c\right) n \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\rho}^2) + (1-c)cd - 1}. \quad (57)$$

Since matrices of the form  $\Lambda(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho})$  have the same non-zero eigenvalues, the inequality (57) holds for each of these matrices. Hence, we have arrived at a conclusion.

**Proposition 4** *Let principal Kraus operators (39) be built of the states of ETF  $\mathcal{F} = \{|\phi_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^n$ , and let  $\alpha \in [2, \infty]$ . For arbitrary unraveling  $\mathcal{B}$  of the channel (38) and each density matrix  $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ , it holds that*

$$R_\alpha(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) \geq \frac{\alpha \ln n - 2 \ln d - \ln[(1-c)cS + ((1-c)^2 + cS^2)\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\rho}^2)]}{\alpha - 1} - \frac{\alpha - 2}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left\{ 1 + \sqrt{n-1} \sqrt{\left(\frac{(1-c)^2}{S^2} + c\right) n \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\rho}^2) + (1-c)cd - 1} \right\}. \quad (58)$$

**Proof.** It follows from (4) that

$$\max_j p_j(\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) = \|\Lambda(\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}; \boldsymbol{\rho})\|_\infty. \quad (59)$$

Combining this with the definition of the min-entropy, (51) and (57) immediately leads to the inequality

$$R_\infty(\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) \geq \ln n - \ln \left\{ 1 + \sqrt{n-1} \left[ \left(\frac{(1-c)^2}{S^2} + c\right) n \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\rho}^2) + (1-c)cd - 1 \right]^{1/2} \right\}. \quad (60)$$

By construction, the matrix  $\Lambda(\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}; \boldsymbol{\rho})$  is diagonal. Due to (51) and (54), we then have

$$I(\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) = \|\Lambda(\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}; \boldsymbol{\rho})\|_2^2 = \|\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho})\|_2^2 \leq \frac{(1-c)c}{S} + \left(\frac{(1-c)^2}{S^2} + c\right) \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\rho}^2), \quad (61)$$

whence

$$R_2(\mathcal{A}^{(ex)}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) \geq 2 \ln S - \ln[(1-c)cS + ((1-c)^2 + cS^2)\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\rho}^2)]. \quad (62)$$

Substituting (60) and (62) into (29) completes the proof. ■

The statement of Proposition 4 gives a family of uncertainty relations for an unraveling of quantum channel in terms of Rényi entropies. The inequality (61) also leads to Tsallis-entropy uncertainty relations. For  $\alpha \in (0, 2]$  and arbitrary unraveling  $\mathcal{B}$ , the Tsallis  $\alpha$ -entropy and the index of coincidence satisfy

$$H_\alpha(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) \geq \ln_\alpha(I(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho})^{-1}). \quad (63)$$

This inequality follows from Jensen's inequality and concavity of the function  $\xi \mapsto \ln_\alpha(\xi^{-1})$  for  $0 < \alpha \leq 2$  [66]. Combining (26) with (61) and (63) leads to a conclusion.

**Proposition 5** *Let principal Kraus operators (39) be built of the states of ETF  $\mathcal{F} = \{|\phi_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^n$ , and let  $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ . For arbitrary unraveling  $\mathcal{B}$  of the channel (38) and each density matrix  $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ , it holds that*

$$H_\alpha(\mathcal{B}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) \geq \ln_\alpha \left( \frac{S^2}{(1-c)cS + ((1-c)^2 + cS^2)\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\rho}^2)} \right). \quad (64)$$

The statement of Proposition 5 provides a family of Tsallis-entropy uncertainty relations for an unraveling of the quantum channel (38). Sometimes, Tsallis entropies are a good alternative to Rényi entropies. In particular, the case of detection inefficiencies can be addressed in this way [66]. We refrain from presenting the details here.

Entropic uncertainty relations for a pair of unravelings were studied in [54]. In contrast, the uncertainty relations (58) and (64) are posed for a single unraveling. Nevertheless, it is instructive to compare both the approaches within a suitable example. To avoid a bulky presentation, we restrict a consideration to state-independent uncertainty relations for the case  $n = d^2$ . Another feature of uncertainty relations derived in [54] is caused by the use of Riesz's theorem.



Namely, we have to deal with two different entropic parameters constrained by a certain condition. To keep here a single entropy, we will consider the Shannon one. It then follows from the results of [54] that

$$H_1(\mathcal{B}; \rho) \geq -\ln(\max \|B_i B_j\|_\infty). \quad (65)$$

In general, the right-hand side of (65) is difficult to evaluate. But this question is simplified for unraveling with the principal Kraus operators (39). In the case  $n = d^2$  we obtain

$$H_1(\mathcal{A}; \rho) \geq \ln d. \quad (66)$$

The state-independent version of (64) reads as

$$H_\alpha(\mathcal{B}; \rho) \geq \ln_\alpha \left( \frac{S^2}{(1-c)cS + (1-c)^2 + cS^2} \right). \quad (67)$$

It holds for each unraveling  $\mathcal{B}$  of the channel (38) and arbitrary quantum state. Calculating the right-hand side of (64) for  $n = d^2$  leads to the inequality

$$H_1(\mathcal{B}; \rho) \geq 2 \ln(d+1) - \ln(d+3). \quad (68)$$

The right-hand side of (66) is slightly larger than the right-hand side of (68). But the former takes place for one concrete unraveling, whereas the latter holds for all unravelings of the channel (38). These uncertainty relations are independent, but the latter is more important due to its scope. At the same time, the difference between the right-hand sides of (66) and (68) is enough small even for a space of fewer dimensions, since

$$\ln(d^2 + 3d) - 2 \ln(d+1) = \ln \left( 1 + \frac{d-1}{(d+1)^2} \right) < \frac{d-1}{(d+1)^2}.$$

With growth of  $d$ , the mentioned two bounds tend to coincide. This example allows us to illustrate the advantage for utilizing the current method.

## VI. EXAMPLES OF KIRKWOOD-DIRAC QUASIPROBABILITIES

In this section, we briefly discuss explicit examples of the matrices  $\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho)$  and  $\Pi(\mathcal{E}; \rho)$  related via (42). For an ETF-based measurement, the matrix  $\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho)$  consists of Kirkwood-Dirac quasiprobabilities multiplied by  $nd^{-1}$ . For the maximally mixed state  $\rho_* = d^{-1}\mathbb{1}_d$ , we have

$$\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho_*) = \frac{1}{n} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & c & \cdots & c \\ c & 1 & \cdots & c \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ c & c & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (69)$$

Using  $r_i = n^{-1}(n-1)c$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , we see from the Geršgorin theorem that

$$\left| \lambda_j - \frac{1}{n} \right| \leq \frac{(n-1)c}{n} = \frac{n-d}{nd}. \quad (70)$$

The inequality (52) is saturated here with  $I(\mathcal{A}; \rho_*) = n^{-1}$ . Combining this with  $\text{tr}(\rho_*^2) = d^{-1}$  and (46) leads to

$$\text{tr}(\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho_*)^2) = \frac{1-c}{n} + \frac{c}{d} = \frac{d-1}{(n-1)d} + \frac{n-d}{(n-1)d^2} = \frac{d^2 - 2d + n}{(n-1)d^2}, \quad (71)$$

where we also used (11). Meantime, direct calculations on the base of (69) give

$$\text{tr}(\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \rho_*)^2) = \frac{1 + (n-1)c^2}{n} = \frac{1}{n} \left( 1 + \frac{(n-d)^2}{(n-1)d^2} \right) = \frac{nd^2 - 2nd + n^2}{n(n-1)d^2}. \quad (72)$$

In this way, we can check our calculations because the quantities (71) and (72) are equal. Substituting  $\text{tr}(\rho_*^2) = d^{-1}$  in the right-hand side of (56), we get (70) again. Therefore, for the maximally mixed state our results lead to the same interval as Geršgorin's theorem.

Taking one of pure states  $|\phi_j\rangle$  leads to another case that allows us to make calculations explicitly. For definiteness, we further substitute  $\boldsymbol{\rho} = |\phi_1\rangle\langle\phi_1|$ . The matrix of interest then reads as

$$\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) = \frac{d}{n} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & c & c & \cdots & c \\ c & c & \ell_{23} & \cdots & \ell_{2n} \\ c & \ell_{23}^* & c & \cdots & \ell_{3n} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ c & \ell_{2n}^* & \ell_{3n}^* & \cdots & c \end{pmatrix}. \quad (73)$$

Except for the first row and first column, off-diagonal complex entries have moduli  $|\ell_{ij}| = c^{3/2}$ , whereas their phases depend on the explicit structure of an ETF. The Geršgorin theorem establishes the two intervals, namely

$$\left| \lambda_j - \frac{d}{n} \right| \leq \frac{(n-1)cd}{n}, \quad (74)$$

$$\left| \lambda_j - \frac{cd}{n} \right| \leq \frac{cd}{n} (1 + (n-2)\sqrt{c}). \quad (75)$$

Since the eigenvalues are all positive, these formulas can be rewritten as

$$\max\{2n^{-1}d - 1, 0\} \leq \lambda_j \leq 1, \quad (76)$$

$$0 \leq \lambda_j \leq \frac{cd}{n} (2 + (n-2)\sqrt{c}). \quad (77)$$

Using (76) and (77) to estimate the maximum of positive eigenvalues, we have arrived at the inequality

$$\max \lambda_j = \|\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho})\|_\infty \leq 1, \quad (78)$$

with the constant right-hand side. The latter alone witnesses that estimates could be improved. In contrast to (78), the inequality (56) allows us to estimate  $\max \lambda_j$  in terms of the parameters of an ETF. In the considered case, the index of coincidence is equal to

$$I(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho}) = \frac{d^2}{n^2} + (n-1) \frac{c^2 d^2}{n^2} = \frac{d^2 - 2d + n}{n^2 - n}, \quad (79)$$

so that the inequality (52) is saturated [70]. Then the formulas (46) and (55) lead to

$$\left| \lambda_j - \frac{1}{n} \right| \leq \frac{1}{n} \sqrt{(1-c)(d^2 - 2d + n) + \frac{n^2}{d} - 2n + 1}. \quad (80)$$

As is shown in Appendix B, for  $n > d$  the square root in the right-hand side of (80) is less than  $n - 1$ . Thus, one has

$$0 \leq \lambda_j < 1. \quad (81)$$

Hence, we deal with the inequality

$$\|\Lambda(\mathcal{A}; \boldsymbol{\rho})\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \sqrt{(1-c)(d^2 - 2d + n) + \frac{n^2}{d} - 2n + 1}, \quad (82)$$

which is always better than the estimate on the base of (76).

To exemplify the obtained results, we consider symmetric informationally complete quantum measurement in dimension two. Using  $\omega = \exp(i2\pi/3)$ , one introduces the four kets  $|\phi_j\rangle$  such that

$$|\phi_0\rangle = |0\rangle, \quad \sqrt{3}|\phi_1\rangle = |0\rangle + \sqrt{2}|1\rangle, \quad \sqrt{3}|\phi_2\rangle = |0\rangle + \sqrt{2}\omega|1\rangle, \quad \sqrt{3}|\phi_3\rangle = |0\rangle + \sqrt{2}\omega^*|1\rangle.$$

Here, the vectors are numerated by indices from 0, since this better reflects the structure. The corresponding pure states are represented on the Bloch sphere by vertices of tetrahedron. For  $\boldsymbol{\rho} = |\phi_0\rangle\langle\phi_0|$ , the matrix (73) reads as

$$\frac{1}{6} \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}} & -\frac{i}{\sqrt{3}} \\ 1 & -\frac{i}{\sqrt{3}} & 1 & \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}} \\ 1 & \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}} & -\frac{i}{\sqrt{3}} & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (83)$$

Its non-zero eigenvalues are  $2/3$  and  $1/3$ . Since  $c = 1/3$  according to (11), we see from (80) that

$$\left| \lambda_j - \frac{1}{4} \right| \leq \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\frac{11}{3}},$$

whence

$$0 \leq \lambda_j < \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\frac{11}{3}} < 0.729. \quad (84)$$

The Geršgorin theorem gives here the two interval, whose union leads to

$$0 \leq \lambda_j \leq 1. \quad (85)$$

Both the ways are useless to bound non-negative eigenvalues from below. But the result (84) estimates the spectral norm of (83) from above much more precisely. The relative error is about 9.3 % instead of 50 % due to (85). For positive semi-definite matrices of the considered form, the inequality (A9) deserves an attention together with the Geršgorin theorem.

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

One considered Kirkwood–Dirac quasiprobabilities due to their importance for quantum physics issues. Finite tight frames are interesting in various fields including quantum information theory. So, symmetric informationally complete measurements are a special class of equiangular tight frames. This paper examined a quantum channel with Kraus operators built of the vectors of an ETF. Then Kirkwood–Dirac quasiprobabilities appear in the context of unravelings of the quantum channel. Unitary freedom in the operator-sum representation leads to a family of similar square matrices. Each of them consists of the corresponding quasiprobabilities. The revealed matrix properties allow one to estimate from above some norms of the matrices of interest.

It is typical in statistical disciplines to examine links between various quantitative characteristics. Say, entropic functions are hardly exposed to measure immediately. The estimates derived in this paper give a ground to examine desired connections. It was exemplified by new uncertainty relations in terms of Rényi and Tsallis entropies for the considered quantum channel. We have also obtained inequalities, which describe the location of eigenvalues of positive semi-definite matrices. This provides an alternative to estimation with the use of Geršgorin’s theorem. A symmetric informationally complete measurement in dimension two illustrated a significance of the obtained results. More detailed comparison of the above alternatives would be a subject of separate investigation.

### Appendix A: On the location of eigenvalues of a Hermitian matrix

This appendix is devoted to the question how to characterize the location of eigenvalues. The following statement takes place.

**Lemma 1** *Let  $M$  be a Hermitian  $n \times n$  matrix, and let  $\mu_j$  be one of its eigenvalues. It holds that*

$$\left| \mu_j - \frac{\text{tr}(M)}{n} \right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{n-1}}{n} \sqrt{n\|M\|_2^2 - \text{tr}(M)^2}, \quad (A1)$$

*with equality if and only if other eigenvalues of  $M$  are all equal.*

**Proof.** Recall that any Hermitian matrix is unitarily diagonalizable and has real eigenvalues. For definiteness, we denote the eigenvalues by  $\mu_j$  and the eigenvalue of interest by  $\mu_1$ . Let us put auxiliary values

$$x_j = \frac{\mu_j}{\text{tr}(M)} \quad (A2)$$

for all  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , so that these values sum to 1. As the function  $\xi \mapsto \xi^2$  is strictly convex, it follows from Jensen’s inequality that

$$\sum_{j=1}^n x_j^2 \geq x_1^2 + \frac{(1-x_1)^2}{n-1} = \frac{nx_1^2 - 2x_1 + 1}{n-1}, \quad (A3)$$

with equality if and only if  $x_j = (n-1)^{-1}(1-x_1)$  for all  $j = 2, \dots, n$ . The formula (A3) can be rewritten as

$$(n-1) \left( n \sum_{j=1}^n x_j^2 - 1 \right) \geq n^2 x_1^2 - 2n x_1 + n - (n-1) = (n x_1 - 1)^2. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Combining the latter with

$$\sum_{j=1}^n x_j^2 = \frac{\text{tr}(\mathbf{M}^2)}{\text{tr}(\mathbf{M})^2} \quad (\text{A5})$$

and  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{M}^2) = \|\mathbf{M}\|_2^2$  leads to the claim (A1) for  $\mu_1$ . Here, the condition for equality reads as  $\mu_j = (n-1)^{-1}(\text{tr}(\mathbf{M}) - \mu_1)$  for all  $j = 2, \dots, n$ . ■

The condition of Hermiticity is essential for the above proof. For arbitrary  $n \times n$  matrix  $\mathbf{M}$  with complex entries, we have a similar inequality in terms of singular values. Each singular value  $\sigma_j$  satisfies

$$\left| \sigma_j - \frac{\|\mathbf{M}\|_1}{n} \right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{n-1}}{n} \sqrt{n \|\mathbf{M}\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{M}\|_1^2}, \quad (\text{A6})$$

with equality if and only if other singular values of  $\mathbf{M}$  are all equal. This statement can be shown in line with the proof of (A1). We refrain from presenting the details here.

The statement of Lemma 1 allows us to characterize position of eigenvalues of a Hermitian matrix on the real axis. It is an alternative to more traditional way based on Geršgorin's theorem [71]. To a complex  $n \times n$  matrix  $\mathbf{M} = [[m_{ij}]]$ , we assign  $n$  positive numbers

$$r_i(\mathbf{M}) = \sum_{j \neq i} |m_{ij}|. \quad (\text{A7})$$

This term is the  $i$ -th deleted absolute row sum. For every eigenvalue  $\mu$  of  $\mathbf{M} = [[m_{ij}]]$  there is a positive integer  $k$  such that [71]

$$|\mu - m_{kk}| \leq r_k(\mathbf{M}). \quad (\text{A8})$$

Characterizing eigenvalues of positive semi-definite matrices is often required in questions of quantum information theory. As a rule, positive eigenvalues are then assumed to be arranged in non-increasing order, viz.

$$\mu_1^\downarrow \geq \mu_2^\downarrow \geq \dots \geq \mu_n^\downarrow \geq 0.$$

According to (A1), the maximal eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{M}_n^+(\mathbb{C})$  is bounded from above as

$$\mu_1^\downarrow \leq \frac{1}{n} \left( \|\mathbf{M}\|_1 + \sqrt{n-1} \sqrt{n \|\mathbf{M}\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{M}\|_1^2} \right). \quad (\text{A9})$$

This inequality is saturated if and only if other eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{M}$  are all equal. The argumentation is the same as in the proof of Lemma 1.

## Appendix B: An inequality

This appendix aims to show that, for  $n > d$ , the square root in the right-hand side of (80) is less than  $n-1$ . It will be sufficient to prove

$$(1-c)(d^2 - 2d + n) + \frac{n^2}{d} - 2n + 1 \leq d^2 - 2d + \frac{n^2}{d} - n + 1 < (n-1)^2, \quad (\text{B1})$$

for all  $n > d$ . Indeed, one has  $c \geq 0$  with equality if and only if  $n = d$ . The desired inequality can be rewritten as

$$f(n) = \frac{d-1}{d} n^2 - n - d^2 + 2d > 0. \quad (\text{B2})$$

Treating for a time  $n$  as a continuous variable at fixed  $d$ , we see a parabola  $n \mapsto f(n)$  with  $f(d) = 0$ . It intersects here the abscissa axis with a positive slope due to

$$f'(d) = 2d - 3 > 0, \quad (\text{B3})$$

where integer  $d \geq 2$ . Hence, the inequalities  $f(n) > 0$  and (B1) hold for all  $n > d$ .

- 
- [1] J.H. van Lint, J.J. Seidel, *Indag. Math.* **28** (1966) 335–348.
  - [2] P.W.H. Lemmens, J.J. Seidel, *J. Algebra* **24** (1973) 494–512.
  - [3] P.G. Casazza, G. Kutyniok (Eds.), *Finite Frames: Theory and Applications*, Boston, Birkhäuser, 2013.
  - [4] E.P. Wigner, *Phys. Rev.* **40** (1932) 749–759.
  - [5] A. Casado, S. Guerra, J. Plácido, *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **41** (2008) 045501.
  - [6] A.N. Vall, I.A. Perevalova, M.V. Polyakov, O.N. Soldatenko, *Russ. Phys. J.* **54** (2011) 47–53.
  - [7] D. Sels, F. Brosens, W. Magnus, *Physica A* **392** (2013) 326–335.
  - [8] R.A. Earnshaw, C. Lei, J. Li, S. Mugassabi, A. Vourdas, *Physica A* **391** (2012) 2401–2407.
  - [9] F. Siyouri, M. El Baz, Y. Hassouni, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **15** (2016) 4237–4252.
  - [10] G.S. Thekkadath, F. Hufnagel, J.S. Lundeen, *New J. Phys.* **20** (2018) 113034.
  - [11] J.G. Kirkwood, *Phys. Rev.* **44** (1933) 31–37.
  - [12] P.A.M. Dirac, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **17** (1945) 195–199.
  - [13] Y.P. Terletsy, *JETP* **7** (1937) 1290–1298 (in Russian).
  - [14] H. Margenau, R.N. Hill, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **26** (1961) 722–738.
  - [15] L.M. Johansen, *Phys. Rev. A* **76** (2007) 012119.
  - [16] J.S. Lundeen, B. Sutherland, A. Patel, C. Stewart, C. Bamber, *Nature* **474** (2011) 188–191.
  - [17] J.S. Lundeen, C. Bamber, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108** (2012) 070402.
  - [18] C. Bamber, J.S. Lundeen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112** (2014) 070405.
  - [19] N.Y. Halpern, *Phys. Rev. A* **95** (2017) 012120.
  - [20] N.Y. Halpern, B. Swingle, J. Dressel, *Phys. Rev. A* **97** (2018) 042105.
  - [21] J.R.G. Alonso, N.Y. Halpern, J. Dressel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122** (2019) 040404.
  - [22] N.Y. Halpern, A. Bartolotta, J. Pollack, *Commun. Phys.* **2** (2019) 92.
  - [23] J. Dressel, *Phys. Rev. A* **91** (2015) 032116.
  - [24] R. Kunjwal, M. Lostaglio, M.F. Pusey, *Phys. Rev. A* **100** (2019) 042116.
  - [25] D.R.M. Arvidsson-Shukur, N.Y. Halpern, H.V. Lepage, A.A. Lasek, C.H.W. Barnes, S. Lloyd, *Nat. Commun.* **11** (2020) 3775.
  - [26] A.E. Allahverdyan, *Phys. Rev. E* **90** (2014) 032137.
  - [27] H.J.D. Miller, J. Anders, *New J. Phys.* **19** (2017) 062001.
  - [28] A. Levy, M. Lostaglio, *PRX Quantum* **1** (2020) 010309.
  - [29] H.F. Hofmann, *Phys. Rev. A* **13** (2015) 103009.
  - [30] J.J. Halliwell, *Phys. Rev. A* **93** (2016) 022123.
  - [31] D.R.M. Arvidsson-Shukur, J.C. Drori, N.Y. Halpern, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **54** (2021) 284001.
  - [32] S. De Bièvre, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127** (2021) 190404.
  - [33] R.A. Horn, C.R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
  - [34] J.M. Renes, R. Blume-Kohout, A.J. Scott, C.M. Caves, *J. Math. Phys.* **45** (2004) 2171–2180.
  - [35] C.A. Fuchs, M.C. Hoang, B.C. Stacey, *Axioms* **6** (2017) 21.
  - [36] M. Appleby, I. Bengtsson, *J. Math. Phys.* **60** (2019) 062203.
  - [37] M. Appleby, S. Flammia, G. McConnell, J. Yard, *Acta Arith.* **192** (2020) 211–233.
  - [38] M.A. Nielsen, I.L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.
  - [39] J. Preskill. Lecture Notes for Ph219/CS219: Quantum Information, Chapter 3, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena. <http://www.theory.caltech.edu/~preskill/ph229/>
  - [40] H.J. Carmichael, *An Open Systems Approach to Quantum Optics*, Lecture Notes in Physics, vol. m18, Springer, Berlin, 1993.
  - [41] A. Rényi, *Proceedings of the 4th Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, vol. I, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, 1961, 547–561.
  - [42] C. Tsallis, *J. Stat. Phys.* **52** (1988) 479–487.
  - [43] L. Borland, A.R. Plastino, C. Tsallis, *J. Math. Phys.* **39** (1998) 6490–6501.
  - [44] S. Furuichi, K. Yanagi, K. Kuriyama, *J. Math. Phys.* **45** (2004) 4868–4877.
  - [45] S. Abe, *Physica A* **344** (2004) 359–365.
  - [46] A. Dukupati, M.N. Murty, S. Bhatnagar, *Physica A* **361** (2006) 124–138.
  - [47] A.P. Majtey, A.R. Plastino, A. Plastino, *Physica A* **391** (2012) 2491–2499.
  - [48] F. Chapeau-Blondeau, *Physica A* **414** (2014) 204–215.
  - [49] A.E. Rastegin, *Physica A* **505** (2018) 233–242.
  - [50] P. Jizba, T. Arimitsu, *Ann. Phys.* **312** (2004) 17–59.
  - [51] I. Bengtsson, K. Życzkowski, *Geometry of Quantum States: An Introduction to Quantum Entanglement*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2017.
  - [52] M. Ben-Bassat, J. Raviv, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **24** (1978) 324–331.

- [53] G.M. Bosyk, M. Portesi, F. Holik, A. Plastino, Phys. Scr. **87** (2013) 065002.
- [54] A.E. Rastegin, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **44** (2011) 095303.
- [55] A.E. Rastegin, Open Syst. Inf. Dyn. **22** (2015) 1550005.
- [56] N. Lupu-Gladstein, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128** (2022) 220504.
- [57] J.B. DeBroda, B.C. Stacey, Phys. Rev. A **100** (2019) 062327.
- [58] M. Horodecki, P.W. Shor, M.B. Ruskai, Rev. Math. Phys. **15** (2003) 629–641.
- [59] M. Berta, M. Christandl, R. Colbeck, J.M. Renes, R. Renner, Nature Phys. **6** (2010) 659–662.
- [60] J.M. Renes, J.-C. Boileau, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103** (2009) 020402.
- [61] F. Ming, D. Wang, X.-G. Fan, W.-N. Shi, L. Ye, J.-L. Chen, Phys. Rev. A **102** (2020) 012206.
- [62] L. Wu, L. Ye, D. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **106** (2022) 062219.
- [63] P.J. Coles, M. Berta, M. Tomamichel, S. Wehner, Rev. Mod. Phys. **89** (2017) 015002.
- [64] S. Wu, S. Yu, K. Mølmer, Phys. Rev. A **79** (2009) 022104.
- [65] B. Canturk, Z. Gedik, Physica A **582** (2021) 126275.
- [66] A.E. Rastegin, Eur. Phys. J. D **67** (2013) 269.
- [67] A.E. Rastegin, Phys. Scr. **89** (2014) 085101.
- [68] T. Durt, B.-G. Englert, I. Bengtsson, K. Życzkowski, Int. J. Quantum Inf. **8** (2010) 535–640.
- [69] B.-F. Xie, F. Ming, D. Wang, L. Ye, J.-L. Chen, Phys. Rev. A **104** (2021) 062204.
- [70] A.E. Rastegin, Proc. R. Soc. A **479** (2023) 20220546.
- [71] R.S. Varga, Geršgorin and His Circles, Springer, Berlin, 2004.