

Bidirectional classical communication cost of a bipartite quantum channel assisted by non-signalling correlations

Chengkai Zhu¹, Xuanqiang Zhao², and Xin Wang^{*1}

¹Thrust of Artificial Intelligence, Information Hub,

The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou), Guangzhou 511453, China

²QICI Quantum Information and Computation Initiative, Department of Computer Science, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong

August 6, 2024

Abstract

Understanding the classical communication cost of simulating a quantum channel is a fundamental problem in quantum information theory, which becomes even more intriguing when considering the role of non-locality in quantum information processing. This paper investigates the bidirectional classical communication cost of simulating a bipartite quantum channel assisted by non-signalling correlations. Such non-signalling correlations are permitted not only across spatial dimension between the two parties but also along the temporal dimension of the channel simulation protocol. By introducing non-signalling superchannels, we derive semidefinite programming (SDP) formulations for the one-shot exact bidirectional classical communication cost via non-signalling bipartite superchannels. We further introduce a channel's bipartite conditional min-entropy as an efficiently computable lower bound on the asymptotic cost of bidirectional classical communication. Our results in both one-shot and asymptotic settings provide lower bounds on the entanglement-assisted simulation cost in scenarios where entanglement is available to the two parties and can be utilized across the timeline of the protocol. Numerical experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of our bounds in estimating communication costs for various quantum channels, showing that our bounds can be tight in different scenarios. Our results elucidate the role of non-locality in quantum communication and pave the way for exploring quantum reverse Shannon theory in bipartite scenarios.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminaries	3
3	Non-signalling bipartite channel and superchannel	4
3.1	Non-signalling bipartite channel	4
3.2	Non-signalling bipartite superchannel	6
4	Resource measures of classical communication	8
5	Bidirectional classical communication cost	10
5.1	One-shot bidirectional classical communication cost	11
5.2	Asymptotic bidirectional classical communication cost	15
6	Examples	17
7	Discussion	19
A	Dual SDP of the max-relative entropy of bidirectional classical communication	23

*felixxinwang@hkust-gz.edu.cn

1 Introduction

The study of quantum non-locality has been a central theme in quantum information theory since Bell’s seminal work [Bel66], which demonstrated that any local hidden variable theory cannot explain the correlations exhibited by entangled quantum systems. This non-local nature of quantum correlations has found numerous applications in quantum information processing, including quantum teleportation [BBC⁺93], superdense coding [BW92], and quantum cryptography [BB84, Eke91]. Moreover, the peaceful coexistence between quantum non-locality and the impossibility of superluminal communication has intrigued physicists for decades.

Despite the impossibility of utilizing quantum non-locality for superluminal communication, non-local resources like entanglement can be used to enhance the communication of classical information [BSST99], private classical information [Dev05], and quantum information. The most studied scenario is one-way communication between two parties, Alice and Bob, where they share a channel allowing Alice to send information to Bob. The communication is said to be entanglement-assisted if Alice and Bob can share an unlimited amount of entanglement before their communication. While a one-way quantum channel is a natural model of communication between two parties, a *bipartite quantum channel*, which jointly evolves an input from both Alice and Bob, provides the most general setting for two-party communication [CLL06] (see Figure 1). Bipartite quantum channels play a crucial role in describing and understanding a wide range of quantum interactions (e.g., [GHR⁺16, BDW18, BDWW19, GS20a, GS21, DKQ⁺23]) and are also reminiscent of two-way classical channels, first studied by Shannon [Sha61] and followed by extensive research on interference channels [HK81, MK09] and multiple-access channels (MACs) [TV05]. A point-to-point channel can be viewed as a special case of a bipartite channel, where Bob’s input and Alice’s output are trivial one-dimensional subsystems. Another common special case is a bipartite unitary, which describes the interaction between two isolated quantum systems.

One central problem in quantum information theory is to study how many standard communication resources, e.g., noiseless channels, are needed to produce other specialized resources, e.g., available noisy channels under different settings. This problem is also known as the channel simulation problem [FWTB20], which is central in quantum Shannon theory. When Alice and Bob can share an unlimited amount of entanglement, the quantum reverse Shannon theorem [BDH⁺14, BCR11] completely solves the problem in the asymptotic setting, stating that the optimal rate to simulate a quantum channel is determined by its entanglement-assisted classical capacity. In particular, for bipartite quantum channels, the standard resources are bidirectional communication [BHLS03]. Harrow and Leung [HL11] established a protocol for simulating a given bipartite unitary with the assistance of unlimited EPR pairs to study the classical communication cost. How to simulate general bipartite quantum channels with minimum resources, e.g., classical communication, remains unclear (see Figure 2).

Different from a point-to-point communication setting, the role of quantum resources in a multipartite communication or network communication setting becomes more sophisticated. For example, it was shown that entanglement offers no advantage in a point-to-point purely classical communication scenario [BSST99] while can substantially boost the capacity of a classical MAC [LALS20]. In addition to allowing Alice and Bob to share finite or unlimited entanglement to assist with information manipulation, a more general framework for investigating the role of non-locality in communication is to consider a setting where they have access to any non-signalling bipartite channels [PHHH06]. Non-signalling bipartite channels are also referred to as *non-signalling boxes* or *causal maps* and, while cannot be used to communicate, can exhibit a stronger violation of Bell’s inequalities than local measurements performed on bipartite quantum states [BGNP01, ESW02, OCB12]. A well-known classical example is the Popescu-Rohrlich machine for violating Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt inequalities [CHSH69, PR97, BP05]. Furthermore, the non-signalling correlations are valuable in studying the coding theory of point-to-point channels, known as the *non-signalling codes* when giving the input system and output system access to any quantum resources that cannot be used for communicating between them directly (see, e.g., [LM15, DW16, WXD18] for quantum channels and, e.g., [CLMW11, Mat12, BF18, FF24a, FF24b] for classical channels).




Figure 1: The left side shows a point-to-point quantum channel \mathcal{N} through which Alice can send quantum states to Bob. The right side illustrates a bipartite quantum channel, where each party provides an input to the channel, which evolves their inputs jointly to produce an output $\rho'_{A_1 B_1}$ shared between them.




Figure 2: Bipartite quantum channel simulation. Alice (in yellow) and Bob (in blue) aim to simulate a bipartite quantum channel $\mathcal{M}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$ with given $\mathcal{N}_{\bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_1}$ and available channels $\mathcal{E}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A' \bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_0 B'}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{A' \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_1 B' \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$. In general, \mathcal{N} can be a standard communication resource between Alice and Bob, e.g., noiseless bidirectional channels, and we aim to quantify the minimum resource required for simulating the target channel \mathcal{M} .

By allowing Alice and Bob to consume these non-signalling correlations, we can explore the ultimate limits of non-locality in facilitating communication. In this context, classical communication between the parties becomes the golden resource. Our goal in this work is to determine the minimum number of classical bits that need to be exchanged between the two parties to simulate a target bipartite channel, given access to unlimited non-signalling correlations between two communicating parties and each party's simulation protocol. To this end, we introduce bipartite non-signalling superchannels and exploit their properties for channel simulation tasks. We derive the one-shot exact bidirectional classical communication cost of bipartite quantum channels using semidefinite programming (SDP). Furthermore, we introduce the channel conditional min-entropy and demonstrate that it serves as an efficiently computable lower bound on the asymptotic exact bidirectional classical communication cost of a bipartite channel.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the notations and preliminaries used throughout the paper. In Section 3, we introduce the notions of bipartite non-signalling channels and superchannels and characterize their properties. Section 4 defines resource measures of classical communication based on the max-relative entropy and relative entropy. In Section 5, we study the problem of simulating a bipartite quantum channel using non-signalling channels and classical communication. We derive an SDP formulation of the one-shot exact bidirectional classical communication cost of an arbitrary bipartite channel and establish a lower bound on the asymptotic exact bidirectional classical communication cost based on the channel's bipartite conditional min-entropy. Section 6 presents numerical experiments that demonstrate the performance of our bounds. Finally, we conclude with a discussion of our results and future directions in Section 7.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout the paper, the physical systems and their associated Hilbert spaces are denoted by A, B, C and $\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{H}_B, \mathcal{H}_C$, respectively. We consider finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces and denote the dimension of a quantum system by d_A . We use the tilde symbol to denote an identical copy of the system under it, i.e., $\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{A}}$ is isomorphic to \mathcal{H}_A . We denote by $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ the set of linear operators and $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ the set of density operators or quantum states in the system A . A quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}$ is a linear map from $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ to $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ that is completely positive (CP) and trace-preserving (TP). We denote by id the identity channel and by $\text{CPTP}(A, B)$ the set of all quantum channels from system A to system B . The Choi-Jamiołkowski operator of a quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}$ is given by

$$J_{AB}^{\mathcal{N}} := (\text{id}_A \otimes \mathcal{N}_{\tilde{A} \rightarrow B})(|\Gamma\rangle\langle\Gamma|_{A\tilde{A}}) = \sum_{i,j=0}^{d_A-1} |i\rangle\langle j|_A \otimes \mathcal{N}_{\tilde{A} \rightarrow B}(|i\rangle\langle j|_{\tilde{A}}), \quad (1)$$

where $\{|i\rangle_A\}$ and $\{|i\rangle_{\tilde{A}}\}$ are orthonormal bases of isomorphic Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H}_A and $\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{A}}$, respectively, and $|\Gamma\rangle_{A\tilde{A}} := \sum_{i=0}^{d_A-1} |i\rangle_A |i\rangle_{\tilde{A}}$ is the unnormalized maximally entangled state between systems A and \tilde{A} . For simplicity, we often omit the identity channel explicitly in equations, e.g., $J_{AB}^{\mathcal{N}} = \mathcal{N}_{\tilde{A} \rightarrow B}(|\Gamma\rangle\langle\Gamma|_{A\tilde{A}})$.

More generally, a multipartite quantum channel refers to a channel in which the input and output systems consist of composite quantum systems shared among multiple parties. For a bipartite quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$, we consider the input and output shared between Alice and Bob, where we use the subscript '0' to denote the input system and the subscript '1' to denote the output system for each party. The set of all bipartite quantum channels from system $A_0 B_0$ to system $A_1 B_1$ is denoted by

CPTP(A_0B_0, A_1B_1). The Choi-Jamiołkowski operator of a bipartite channel $\mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ is given by

$$J_{A_0B_0A_1B_1}^{\mathcal{N}} := \mathcal{N}_{\tilde{A}_0\tilde{B}_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}(|\Gamma\rangle\langle\Gamma|_{A_0\tilde{A}_0} \otimes |\Gamma\rangle\langle\Gamma|_{B_0\tilde{B}_0}). \quad (2)$$

For simplicity, we also use $J_{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}}$ to denote the Choi-Jamiołkowski operator of a bipartite quantum channel, where the bold symbol \mathbf{A} in the subscript denotes all Alice's systems and \mathbf{B} denotes all Bob's systems.

Transitioning to a higher-order perspective, quantum channels are subject to manipulation by quantum superchannels, which transform quantum channels into quantum channels. A supermap $\Theta_{(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (C \rightarrow D)}$ is called a superchannel if the output map

$$(\mathbb{I}_R \otimes \Theta_{(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (C \rightarrow D)})(\mathcal{N}_{R_0A \rightarrow R_1B}) \quad (3)$$

is a quantum channel for all input bipartite channels $\mathcal{N}_{R_0A \rightarrow R_1B}$, where the reference system R_0, R_1 are arbitrary and \mathbb{I}_R denotes the identity superchannel for channels from R_0 to R_1 . For a simpler notation, we will often omit the identity supermap when there is no ambiguity, e.g., Eq. (3) will be denoted as $\Theta(\mathcal{N}_{R_0A \rightarrow R_1B})$. It is shown that any superchannel $\Theta_{(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (C \rightarrow D)}$ can be realized by a pre-processing channel $\mathcal{E}_{C \rightarrow AA'}$ and a post-processing channel $\mathcal{D}_{BA' \rightarrow D}$ such that [CDP08a]

$$\Theta_{(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (C \rightarrow D)}(\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}) = \mathcal{D}_{BA' \rightarrow D} \circ \mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B} \circ \mathcal{E}_{C \rightarrow AA'}. \quad (4)$$

Hence, every superchannel $\Theta_{(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (C \rightarrow D)}$ corresponds to a bipartite quantum channel

$$\mathcal{Q}_{CB \rightarrow AD}^{\Theta} := \mathcal{D}_{BA' \rightarrow D} \circ \mathcal{E}_{C \rightarrow AA'}, \quad (5)$$

both of which share the same Choi-Jamiołkowski operator, i.e.,

$$J_{CBAD}^{\Theta} := \mathcal{Q}_{C\tilde{B} \rightarrow AD}^{\Theta}(|\Gamma\rangle\langle\Gamma|_{C\tilde{C}} \otimes |\Gamma\rangle\langle\Gamma|_{B\tilde{B}}), \quad (6)$$

which satisfies

$$J_{CBAD}^{\Theta} \geq 0, \quad J_{CB}^{\Theta} = \mathbb{1}_{CB}, \quad J_{CBA}^{\Theta} = J_{CA}^{\Theta} \otimes \pi_B, \quad (7)$$

where the last equation corresponds to the B to A non-signalling constraint. There is a one-to-one correspondence between a B to A non-signalling bipartite channel and a superchannel, which is a special case of the quantum comb formalism [CDP08b].

3 Non-signalling bipartite channel and superchannel

In quantum information theory, the concept of non-signalling correlation is crucial for understanding the limitations of information transfer between spatially separated parties. This section introduces two important structures that incorporate non-signalling constraints: non-signalling bipartite quantum channels and non-signalling bipartite superchannels. Non-signalling bipartite channels are quantum operations that act on two separate parties, Alice and Bob, in such a way that neither party's output will be affected by the other party's input, meaning they cannot signal each other by using such a quantum channel. Building upon this, we then explore non-signalling bipartite superchannels, which are higher-order quantum transformations for channels while preserving two parties' non-signalling properties. These superchannels play a critical role in understanding the manipulation and transformation of non-signalling correlations in quantum information processing tasks.

3.1 Non-signalling bipartite channel

A bipartite channel $\mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ is said to be *non-signalling from Alice to Bob* if Alice cannot send classical information to Bob by using it. It is formally defined as follows [PHHH06, KW24].

Definition 1 (A to B non-signalling channel) *A bipartite channel $\mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ is called a non-signalling channel from Alice to Bob if*

$$\mathcal{R}_{A_1}^{\pi} \circ \mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1} = \mathcal{R}_{A_1}^{\pi} \circ \mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1} \circ \mathcal{R}_{A_0}^{\pi}, \quad (8)$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{A_0}^{\pi}$ is a replacement channel defined as $\mathcal{R}_{A_0}^{\pi}(\cdot) := \text{Tr}_{A_0}[\cdot]\pi_{A_0}$ with $\pi_{A_0} := \mathbb{1}_{A_0}/d_{A_0}$ being the maximally mixed state on system A_0 .

The condition in Eq. (8) states that the reduced state on Bob's output system B_1 has no dependence on Alice's input system A_0 . Therefore, Alice cannot use $\mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ to signal Bob. Equivalently, $\mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ is non-signalling from Alice to Bob if and only if its Choi-Jamiołkowski operator satisfies

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{A_1} [J_{A_0A_1B_0B_1}^{\mathcal{N}}] = \pi_{A_0} \otimes \mathrm{Tr}_{A_0A_1} [J_{A_0A_1B_0B_1}^{\mathcal{N}}]. \quad (9)$$

For simplicity, we will denote $\mathrm{Tr}_{A_0A_1} [J_{A_0A_1B_0B_1}^{\mathcal{N}}]$ by $J_{B_0B_1}^{\mathcal{N}}$. We further denote by $\mathrm{NS}^{\rightarrow}(A_0B_0, A_1B_1)$ the set of all A to B non-signalling channels, i.e.,

$$\mathrm{NS}^{\rightarrow}(A_0B_0, A_1B_1) := \left\{ \mathcal{N} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A_0B_0, A_1B_1) \mid J_{A_0B_0B_1}^{\mathcal{N}} = \pi_{A_0} \otimes J_{B_0B_1}^{\mathcal{N}} \right\}. \quad (10)$$

A one-way LOCC channel (1-LOCC) from Bob to Alice is an interesting example of a bipartite channel that is non-signalling from Alice to Bob. Similarly, a non-signalling channel from Bob to Alice is defined as follows.

Definition 2 (B to A non-signalling channel) *A bipartite channel $\mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ is called a non-signalling channel from Bob to Alice if*

$$\mathcal{R}_{B_1}^{\pi} \circ \mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1} = \mathcal{R}_{B_1}^{\pi} \circ \mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1} \circ \mathcal{R}_{B_0}^{\pi}, \quad (11)$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{B_0}^{\pi}$ is a replacement channel defined as $\mathcal{R}_{B_0}^{\pi}(\cdot) := \mathrm{Tr}_{B_0}[\cdot] \pi_{B_0}$ with $\pi_{B_0} := \mathbb{1}_{B_0}/d_{B_0}$ being the maximally mixed state on system B_0 .

Equivalently, $\mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ is non-signalling from Bob to Alice if and only if its Choi-Jamiołkowski operator satisfies $J_{A_0A_1B_0}^{\mathcal{N}} = \pi_{B_0} \otimes J_{A_0A_1}^{\mathcal{N}}$.

A bipartite quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ is called a non-signalling channel if it is non-signalling both from Alice to Bob and from Bob to Alice. We denote by $\mathrm{NS}(A_0B_0, A_1B_1)$ the set of all bipartite bidirectional non-signalling channels, i.e.,

$$\mathrm{NS}(A_0B_0, A_1B_1) := \left\{ \mathcal{N} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A_0B_0, A_1B_1) \mid J_{A_0B_0B_1}^{\mathcal{N}} = \pi_{A_0} \otimes J_{B_0B_1}^{\mathcal{N}}, J_{A_0A_1B_0}^{\mathcal{N}} = \pi_{B_0} \otimes J_{A_0A_1}^{\mathcal{N}} \right\}.$$

It is easy to check that $\mathrm{NS}(A_0B_0, A_1B_1)$ is a convex set, and we will abbreviate it as NS when there is no ambiguity about the systems we are considering. A property of non-signalling channels is that the composition of non-signalling channels is still non-signalling.

Lemma 1 (Composition of non-signalling channels) *For two non-signalling channels $\mathcal{M}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ and $\mathcal{N}_{A_1B_1 \rightarrow A_2B_2}$, their composition*

$$\mathcal{P}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_2B_2} := \mathcal{N}_{A_1B_1 \rightarrow A_2B_2} \circ \mathcal{M}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1} \quad (12)$$

is also a non-signalling channel.

Proof Since $\mathcal{N}_{A_1B_1 \rightarrow A_2B_2}$ is a non-signalling channel, we have

$$\mathcal{R}_{A_2}^{\pi} \circ \mathcal{N}_{A_1B_1 \rightarrow A_2B_2} = \mathcal{R}_{A_2}^{\pi} \circ \mathcal{N}_{A_1B_1 \rightarrow A_2B_2} \circ \mathcal{R}_{A_1}^{\pi}, \quad (13)$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{A_2}^{\pi} \circ \mathcal{N}_{A_1B_1 \rightarrow A_2B_2} \circ \mathcal{M}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1} &= \mathcal{R}_{A_2}^{\pi} \circ \mathcal{N}_{A_1B_1 \rightarrow A_2B_2} \circ \mathcal{R}_{A_1}^{\pi} \circ \mathcal{M}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1} \\ &= \mathcal{R}_{A_2}^{\pi} \circ \mathcal{N}_{A_1B_1 \rightarrow A_2B_2} \circ \mathcal{R}_{A_1}^{\pi} \circ \mathcal{M}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1} \circ \mathcal{R}_{A_0}^{\pi}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where we used the fact that $\mathcal{M}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ is non-signalling in the second equality. Then using Eq. (13) again, we have

$$\mathcal{R}_{A_2}^{\pi} \circ \mathcal{P}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_2B_2} = \mathcal{R}_{A_2}^{\pi} \circ \mathcal{P}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_2B_2} \circ \mathcal{R}_{A_0}^{\pi}, \quad (15)$$

which yields $\mathcal{P}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_2B_2}$ is a non-signalling channel from Alice to Bob. Similarly, one can show that $\mathcal{P}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_2B_2}$ is also non-signalling from Bob to Alice, thus a non-signalling channel. ■

It is quite expected that sequential uses of non-signalling channels still cannot enable signalling between Alice and Bob. Conversely, if $\mathcal{P}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_2B_2}$ is non-signalling, we cannot assert that both $\mathcal{M}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ and $\mathcal{N}_{A_1B_1 \rightarrow A_2B_2}$ are non-signalling channels. A simple example is that $\mathcal{N}_{A_1B_1 \rightarrow A_2B_2}$ is a replacement channel, which yields $\mathcal{P}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_2B_2}$ a replacement channel, thus non-signalling even if $\mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ is signalling.




Figure 3: The left side shows the manipulation of a bipartite quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{\bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_1}$ via a bipartite superchannel $\Theta_{(\bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_1) \rightarrow (A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1)}$, which can be implemented by a pre-processing channel $\mathcal{E}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A'_0 \bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_0 B'}$ and a post-processing channel $\mathcal{D}_{A'_0 \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_1 B' \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$. The right side illustrates a non-signalling bipartite superchannel where the input on subsystem A_0 can only signal to the outputs on subsystems \bar{A}_0, A_1 , and the input on subsystem \bar{A}_1 can only signal to the output on subsystem A_1 . Similarly, the input on subsystem B_0 can only signal to the outputs on subsystems \bar{B}_0, B_1 , and the input on subsystem \bar{B}_1 can only signal to the output on subsystem B_1 .

3.2 Non-signalling bipartite superchannel

A bipartite superchannel $\Theta_{(\bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_1) \rightarrow (A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1)}$ between Alice and Bob, as a higher-order quantum operation, describes the manipulation of bipartite quantum channels. It is natural to consider scenarios where spatially separated parties perform higher-order transformations on quantum channels while respecting local causality constraints.

To explore the full potential of non-signalling correlations, suppose Alice and Bob have access to any quantum resources that cannot be used for direct communication between them. By combining this constraint with a definite causal structure, Alice's input can only affect her own future subsystems (A_0 influences \bar{A}_0 and A_1 , while \bar{A}_1 affects only A_1) and similarly for Bob's subsystems (see Figure 3). In this context, we introduce the notion of *non-signalling bipartite superchannels*, which provide a rigorous framework for studying distributed quantum information processing tasks, quantum communication protocols, and fundamental limits of causally restricted higher-order quantum operations. Before the formal definition, we remark on how we treat a replacement channel as a superchannel. Given a quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}$, we denote

$$\mathcal{R}_A^\pi(\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}) := \mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B} \circ \mathcal{R}_A^\pi, \quad \mathcal{R}_B^\pi(\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}) := \mathcal{R}_B^\pi \circ \mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B} \quad (16)$$

when we treat replacement channels as superchannels.

Definition 3 (Non-signalling bipartite superchannel) Let $\Theta_{(\bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_1) \rightarrow (A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1)}$ be a superchannel that maps bipartite channels in CPTP($\bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_0, \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_1$) to bipartite channels in CPTP($A_0 B_0, A_1 B_1$). Then it is called a *non-signalling bipartite superchannel* if

$$\mathcal{R}_{A_0 A_1}^\pi \circ \Theta \circ \mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_0}^\pi = \mathcal{R}_{A_1}^\pi \circ \Theta \circ \mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_0}^\pi, \quad \mathcal{R}_{A_1}^\pi \circ \Theta \circ \mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1}^\pi = \mathcal{R}_{A_1}^\pi \circ \Theta, \quad (17)$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}_{B_0 B_1}^\pi \circ \Theta \circ \mathcal{R}_{\bar{B}_0}^\pi = \mathcal{R}_{B_1}^\pi \circ \Theta \circ \mathcal{R}_{\bar{B}_0}^\pi, \quad \mathcal{R}_{B_1}^\pi \circ \Theta \circ \mathcal{R}_{\bar{B}_1}^\pi = \mathcal{R}_{B_1}^\pi \circ \Theta. \quad (18)$$

It is easy to check that a superchannel $\Theta_{(\bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_1) \rightarrow (A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1)}$ is a non-signalling bipartite superchannel if and only if its Choi-Jamiołkowski operator satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} J_{A_0 \bar{A}_1 \mathbf{B}}^\Theta &= \pi_{A_0} \otimes J_{\bar{A}_1 \mathbf{B}}^\Theta, & J_{A_0 \bar{A}_0 \bar{A}_1 \mathbf{B}}^\Theta &= \pi_{\bar{A}_1} \otimes J_{A_0 \bar{A}_0 \mathbf{B}}^\Theta, \\ J_{\mathbf{A} B_0 \bar{B}_1}^\Theta &= \pi_{B_0} \otimes J_{\bar{B}_1 \mathbf{A}}^\Theta, & J_{\mathbf{A} B_0 \bar{B}_0 \bar{B}_1}^\Theta &= \pi_{\bar{B}_1} \otimes J_{\mathbf{A} B_0 \bar{B}_0}^\Theta. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

We note that a typical non-signalling bipartite superchannel is a superchannel realized by a pre-processing non-signalling bipartite channel and a post-processing non-signalling bipartite channel.

Remark 1 The causality condition of a superchannel already ensures $J_{A_0 \bar{A}_0 \bar{A}_1 B_0 \bar{B}_0 \bar{B}_1}^\Theta = \pi_{\bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_1} \otimes J_{A_0 \bar{A}_0 B_0 \bar{B}_0}^\Theta$, which equivalently states that \bar{A}_1 cannot signal \bar{A}_0 and \bar{B}_0 . Noticing that the condition $J_{A_0 \bar{A}_1 \mathbf{B}}^\Theta = \pi_{A_0} \otimes J_{\bar{A}_1 \mathbf{B}}^\Theta$ in the above definition ensures \bar{A}_1 cannot signal B_1 , careful readers might question the necessity of the condition $J_{A_0 \bar{A}_0 \bar{A}_1 \mathbf{B}}^\Theta = \pi_{\bar{A}_1} \otimes J_{A_0 \bar{A}_0 \mathbf{B}}^\Theta$. However, we note that this condition is indeed crucial considering the non-signalling structures, as there exist scenarios where \bar{A}_1 cannot signal \bar{A}_0 and B_1 individually, yet can signal the composite subsystem $\bar{A}_0 B_1$ as a whole.




Figure 4: The sketch of different steps in the proof of Theorem 2.

Having established the concept of non-signalling bipartite superchannels, which describes the physical limits of bipartite higher-order transformations, we now turn our attention to a more abstract yet meaningful notion. For the manipulation of bipartite channels, if the output channel of a bipartite superchannel is a non-signalling channel for every input non-signalling channel, we call this superchannel a *non-signalling-preserving (NS-preserving) superchannel*.

Definition 4 (Completely NS-preserving superchannel) Let $\Theta_{(\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1\bar{B}_1) \rightarrow (A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1)}$ be a superchannel that maps bipartite channels in $\text{CPTP}(\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_0, \bar{A}_1\bar{B}_1)$ to bipartite channels in $\text{CPTP}(A_0B_0, A_1B_1)$.

1. Θ is called an NS-preserving superchannel if, for any $\mathcal{N}_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1\bar{B}_1} \in \text{NS}(\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_0, \bar{A}_1\bar{B}_1)$, $\Theta(\mathcal{N})$ is a non-signalling channel, i.e., $\Theta(\mathcal{N}) \in \text{NS}(A_0B_0, A_1B_1)$.
2. Θ is called a completely NS-preserving superchannel (CNSP), if $\mathbb{I}_{A'B'} \otimes \Theta$ is an NS-preserving superchannel for any bipartite system $A'A : B'B$, where $\mathbb{I}_{A'B'}$ denotes the identity superchannel on $A'B'$.

This definition is straightforward from the perspective of quantum dynamics resource theories [SCG20, GS20b]. When non-signalling bipartite channels are considered free resources, it adopts the perspective that higher-order transformations can only send free channels to free channels, without generating resources. The CNSP constraint ensures the preservation of non-signalling structures between Alice and Bob and with respect to any additional environments of each party, meaning the superchannel can be freely applied to subsystems of larger non-signalling structures. In the following, we shall see that every non-signalling bipartite superchannel is CNSP.

Theorem 2 Every non-signalling bipartite superchannel $\Theta_{(\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1\bar{B}_1) \rightarrow (A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1)}$ is CNSP.

Proof Denote

$$\mathcal{M}_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_0A'_0B'_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1\bar{B}_1A'_1B'_1} := (\mathbb{I}_{A'_0B'_0 \rightarrow A'_1B'_1} \otimes \Theta)(\mathcal{N}_{A'_0B'_0A_0B_0 \rightarrow A'_1B'_1A_1B_1}). \quad (20)$$

If $\mathcal{N}_{A'_0B'_0A_0B_0 \rightarrow A'_1B'_1A_1B_1}$ is a non-signalling channel, consider that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1\bar{A}'_1}^\pi \circ \mathcal{M}_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_0A'_0B'_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1\bar{B}_1A'_1B'_1} \circ \mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_0A'_0}^\pi \\ & \stackrel{(i)}{=} \mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1}^\pi \circ (\mathbb{I}_{A'B'} \otimes \Theta)(\mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1A'_1}^\pi \circ \mathcal{N}_{A'_0B'_0A_0B_0 \rightarrow A'_1B'_1A_1B_1}) \circ \mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_0A'_0}^\pi \\ & \stackrel{(ii)}{=} \mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1}^\pi \circ (\mathbb{I}_{A'B'} \otimes \Theta)(\mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1A'_1}^\pi \circ \mathcal{N}_{A'_0B'_0A_0B_0 \rightarrow A'_1B'_1A_1B_1} \circ \mathcal{R}_{A_0}^\pi) \circ \mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_0A'_0}^\pi \\ & \stackrel{(iii)}{=} \mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1}^\pi \circ (\mathbb{I}_{A'B'} \otimes \Theta)(\mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1A'_1}^\pi \circ \mathcal{N}_{A'_0B'_0A_0B_0 \rightarrow A'_1B'_1A_1B_1} \circ \mathcal{R}_{A_0}^\pi) \circ \mathcal{R}_{A'_0}^\pi \\ & \stackrel{(iv)}{=} \mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1}^\pi \circ (\mathbb{I}_{A'B'} \otimes \Theta)(\mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1A'_1}^\pi \circ \mathcal{N}_{A'_0B'_0A_0B_0 \rightarrow A'_1B'_1A_1B_1}) \\ & \stackrel{(v)}{=} \mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1}^\pi \circ (\mathbb{I}_{A'B'} \otimes \Theta)(\mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1}^\pi \circ \mathcal{N}_{A'_0B'_0A_0B_0 \rightarrow A'_1B'_1A_1B_1}) \\ & = \mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1A'_1}^\pi \circ \mathcal{M}_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_0A'_0B'_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1\bar{B}_1A'_1B'_1}, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

wherein (i) and (v) we used the fact that $\mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1}^\pi \circ \Theta \circ \mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1}^\pi = \mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1}^\pi \circ \Theta$; in (ii) and (iv) we used the fact that $\mathcal{N}_{A'_0B'_0A_0B_0 \rightarrow A'_1B'_1A_1B_1}$ is a non-signalling channel; in (iii) we used the fact that $\mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1}^\pi \circ \Theta \circ \mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1}^\pi = \mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1}^\pi \circ \Theta$

and $\mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1 A_0}^\pi \circ \Theta \circ \mathcal{R}_{A_1 \bar{A}_0} = \mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1 A_0}^\pi \circ \Theta$ will give

$$\mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1 A_0}^\pi \circ \Theta \circ \mathcal{R}_{A_1 \bar{A}_0} = \mathcal{R}_{\bar{A}_1 A_0}^\pi \circ \Theta \circ \mathcal{R}_{A_1}^\pi. \quad (22)$$

The sketch of different steps in Eq. (21) is shown in Figure 4. Hence, we know that $\mathcal{M}_{\bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_0 A'_0 B'_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_1 A'_1 B'_1}$ is non-signalling from **A** to **B** whenever $\mathcal{N}_{A'_0 B'_0 A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A'_1 B'_1 A_1 B_1}$ is a non-signalling channel. Furthermore, since $\mathcal{R}_{\bar{B}_1 B_0}^\pi \circ \Theta \circ \mathcal{R}_{B_0 B_1}^\pi = \mathcal{R}_{\bar{B}_1 B_0}^\pi \circ \Theta$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\bar{B}_1}^\pi \circ \Theta \circ \mathcal{R}_{B_1}^\pi = \mathcal{R}_{\bar{B}_1}^\pi \circ \Theta$, we can have a similar analysis to see that $\mathcal{M}_{\bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_0 A'_0 B'_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_1 A'_1 B'_1}$ is non-signalling from **B** to **A**. Thus, Θ is a CNSP superchannel. ■

Theorem 2 reveals that non-signalling bipartite superchannels, while motivated by physical constraints, also emerge as fundamental free operations in the framework of dynamical resource theories. These superchannels cannot transform a free channel (a non-signalling channel) into a resourceful one (a channel enabling signalling between parties), aligning with the core principle of resource theories wherein free operations should not generate resources. Consequently, non-signalling bipartite superchannels offer a powerful approach to analyzing the classical communication cost in scenarios where non-signalling channels are available. These higher-order transformations provide a natural foundation for investigating the interplay between bipartite quantum channels and classical communication, a theme that we will explore extensively in subsequent sections.

4 Resource measures of classical communication

In this section, we define a general measure for the classical communication resource of bipartite quantum channels. In the language of quantum resource theories and dynamical resource theories [GW19], we consider classical communication between two parties as a resource. Consequently, all non-signalling bipartite channels are treated as free objects, encompassing all quantum resources except communication. We note that, as a related work, Ref. [MBC22] considers the resource theory of causal connection where their free objects are non-signalling process matrices, which are different from non-signalling bipartite channels.

To define a resource measure, recall that a generalized divergence $\mathbf{D}(\rho||\sigma)$ is a function of a quantum state ρ and a positive semidefinite operator σ that obeys data-processing inequality [PV10, SW13]. Based on this, the corresponding generalized channel divergence [LKDW18] provides a way of quantifying the distinguishability of two quantum channels $\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{A \rightarrow B}$. The generalized channel divergence is defined as

$$\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{M}) := \sup_{\psi_{AR}} \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}(\psi_{AR})||\mathcal{M}_{A \rightarrow B}(\psi_{AR})), \quad (23)$$

where the maximization ranges over all pure states ψ_{AR} such that the reference system R is isomorphic to the channel input system A .

Definition 5 (Generalized channel divergence of classical communication) *Let $\mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$ be a bipartite quantum channel. The generalized divergence of one-way classical communication of $\mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$ is defined as*

$$\mathfrak{D}^\rightarrow(\mathcal{N}) := \inf_{\mathcal{E} \in \text{NS}^\rightarrow} \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{E}), \quad (24)$$

where the optimization is with respect to all non-signalling channels in $\text{NS}^\rightarrow(A_0 B_0, A_1 B_1)$. The generalized divergence of bidirectional classical communication is defined as

$$\mathfrak{D}^\leftrightarrow(\mathcal{N}) := \inf_{\mathcal{E} \in \text{NS}} \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{E}). \quad (25)$$

The generalized divergence of bidirectional communication satisfies monotonicity, i.e., it is nonincreasing under non-signalling-preserving superchannels, which include CNSP superchannels and non-signalling bipartite superchannels.

Lemma 3 (Monotonicity) *For every bipartite quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{\bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_1}$ and every non-signalling-preserving $\Theta_{(\bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_1) \rightarrow (A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1)}$, it satisfies*

$$\mathfrak{D}^\leftrightarrow(\mathcal{N}) \geq \mathfrak{D}^\leftrightarrow(\Theta(\mathcal{N})). \quad (26)$$

Proof Consider that

$$\mathfrak{D}^\leftrightarrow(\mathcal{N}) = \inf_{\mathcal{E} \in \text{NS}} \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{E}) \stackrel{(i)}{\geq} \inf_{\mathcal{E} \in \text{NS}} \mathbf{D}(\Theta(\mathcal{N})||\Theta(\mathcal{E})) \stackrel{(ii)}{\geq} \inf_{\hat{\mathcal{E}} \in \text{NS}} \mathbf{D}(\Theta(\mathcal{N})||\hat{\mathcal{E}}) = \mathfrak{D}^\leftrightarrow(\Theta(\mathcal{N})) \quad (27)$$

where in (i) we used the monotonicity of the generalized channel divergence [Gou19, Section V-A], and (ii) is because Θ is non-signalling-preserving. ■

As a particular case of generalized channel divergences, we consider the channel max-relative entropy [CMW16], given by

$$D_{\max}(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{E}) := \max_{\psi_{RA}} D_{\max}(\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}(\psi_{RA}) || \mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow B}(\psi_{RA})), \quad (28)$$

where the max-relative entropy of states is defined as $D_{\max}(\rho||\sigma) := \log \min\{t \mid \rho \leq t\sigma\}$. It is shown that [WBHK20]

$$D_{\max}(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{E}) = D_{\max}(\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}(\Phi_{RA}) || \mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow B}(\Phi_{RA})) = \log \min\{t \mid J_{AB}^{\mathcal{N}} \leq tJ_{AB}^{\mathcal{E}}\}, \quad (29)$$

where Φ_{RA} is the maximally entangled state and $J_{AB}^{\mathcal{N}}$ is the Choi-Jamiołkowski operator of the channel $\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}$ and similarly for $J_{AB}^{\mathcal{E}}$. The logarithms in this work are taken in the base 2. Eq. (29) implies the channel max-relative entropy is additive under tensor products, i.e., $D_{\max}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}||\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}) = nD_{\max}(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{E})$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Definition 6 (Max-relative entropy of classical communication) *Let $\mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ be a bipartite quantum channel. The max-relative entropy of one-way classical communication of $\mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ is defined as*

$$\mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{N}) := \min_{\mathcal{E} \in \text{NS}^{\rightarrow}} D_{\max}(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{E}), \quad (30)$$

where the minimization ranges over all one-way non-signalling channels in $\text{NS}^{\rightarrow}(A_0B_0, A_1B_1)$. The max-relative entropy of bidirectional classical communication of $\mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ is defined as

$$\mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N}) := \min_{\mathcal{E} \in \text{NS}} D_{\max}(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{E}). \quad (31)$$

We also define the ϵ -smooth max-relative entropy of classical communication as

$$\mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{*,\epsilon}(\mathcal{N}) := \min_{\mathcal{M}: \frac{1}{2}\|\mathcal{M}-\mathcal{N}\|_{\diamond} \leq \epsilon} \mathfrak{D}_{\max}^*(\mathcal{M}), \quad (32)$$

where $*$ $\in \{\rightarrow, \leftrightarrow\}$ and \mathcal{M} ranges over all bipartite channels in $\text{CPTP}(A_0B_0, A_1B_1)$.

In the rest of the paper, we will mainly focus on bidirectional classical communication. The results can be easily generalized to one-way classical communication. Given a bipartite quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$, its max-relative entropy of bidirectional classical communication is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N}) &= \log \min \lambda \\ \text{s.t. } & J_{A_0A_1B_0B_1}^{\mathcal{N}} \leq Y_{A_0A_1B_0B_1}, \quad Y_{A_0B_0} = \lambda \mathbb{1}_{A_0B_0}, \\ & Y_{A_0B_0B_1} = \pi_{A_0} \otimes Y_{B_0B_1}, \quad Y_{A_0A_1B_0} = \pi_{B_0} \otimes Y_{A_0A_1}, \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

whose dual SDP is

$$\begin{aligned} \log \max \quad & \text{Tr} \left[M_{A_0A_1B_0B_1} J_{A_0A_1B_0B_1}^{\mathcal{N}} \right] \\ \text{s.t. } \quad & \text{Tr} N_{A_0B_0} = 1, \quad P_{B_0B_1} = 0, \quad Q_{A_0A_1} = 0 \\ & 0 \leq M_{A_0A_1B_0B_1} \leq N_{A_0B_0} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_1B_1} + P_{A_0B_0B_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_1} + Q_{A_0A_1B_0} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

The max-relative entropy of bidirectional classical communication satisfies subadditivity with respect to the tensor product of bipartite quantum channels.

Lemma 4 (Subadditivity of $\mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}$) *The max-relative entropy of bidirectional communication is sub-additive with respect to the tensor product of quantum channels, i.e., for every $\mathcal{N} \in \text{CPTP}(A_0B_0 : A_1B_1)$ and $\mathcal{M} \in \text{CPTP}(A'_0B'_0 : A'_1B'_1)$,*

$$\mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N} \otimes \mathcal{M}) \leq \mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N}) + \mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{M}). \quad (35)$$

Proof Suppose the optimal solutions for $\mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N})$ and $\mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{M})$ considering Eq. (31) are \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 , respectively. That is, $\mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N}) = D_{\max}(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{E}_1)$ and $\mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{M}) = D_{\max}(\mathcal{M}||\mathcal{E}_2)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N} \otimes \mathcal{M}) &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} D_{\max}(\mathcal{N} \otimes \mathcal{M}||\mathcal{E}_1 \otimes \mathcal{E}_2) \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{=} D_{\max}(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{E}_1) + D_{\max}(\mathcal{M}||\mathcal{E}_2) \\ &= \mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N}) + \mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{M}), \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where (i) is due to the fact that $\mathcal{E}_1 \otimes \mathcal{E}_2$ is non-signalling between \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , thus giving a feasible solution. In (ii), we have used the additivity of the channel max-relative entropy. \blacksquare

Recalling that the max-relative entropy is interlinked with the robustness of resources, we introduce the robustness of classical communication as follows.

Definition 7 (Robustness of classical communication) Let $\mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ be a bipartite quantum channel. The robustness of bidirectional classical communication of $\mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ is defined as

$$R_{\text{NS}}(\mathcal{N}) := \min \left\{ r \geq 0 \mid \frac{\mathcal{N} + r\mathcal{M}}{1+r} \in \text{NS}(A_0B_0, A_1B_1), \mathcal{M} \in \text{CPTP}(A_0B_0, A_1B_1) \right\}. \quad (37)$$

The robustness of bidirectional classical communication has a relationship with the max-relative entropy of bidirectional classical communication as

$$\mathfrak{D}_{\text{max}}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N}) = \log(1 + R_{\text{NS}}(\mathcal{N})). \quad (38)$$

It is worth noting that there is no need to define the *standard* robustness of classical communication in a similar manner:

$$\min \left\{ r \geq 0 \mid \frac{\mathcal{N} + r\mathcal{M}}{1+r} \in \text{NS}(A_0B_0, A_1B_1), \mathcal{M} \in \text{NS}(A_0B_0, A_1B_1) \right\}. \quad (39)$$

This is because, due to the linearity of non-signalling constraints, there is no feasible $\mathcal{M} \in \text{NS}$ that can make $\mathcal{N} + r\mathcal{M}$ non-signalling unless \mathcal{N} is already non-signalling itself.

Another entropic quantifier of quantum channels is the relative entropy of quantum channels [CMW16, LKDW18], given by

$$D(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{E}) := \max_{\psi_{RA}} D(\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}(\psi_{RA}) \parallel \mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow B}(\psi_{RA})), \quad (40)$$

where $D(\rho \parallel \sigma) := \text{Tr}(\rho \log \rho - \rho \log \sigma)$ is the relative entropy of quantum states. Subsequently, we introduce the relative entropy of classical communication as follows.

Definition 8 (Relative entropy of classical communication) Let $\mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ be a bipartite quantum channel. The relative entropy of one-way classical communication of $\mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ is defined as

$$\mathfrak{D}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{N}) := \min_{\mathcal{E} \in \text{NS}^{\rightarrow}} D(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{E}), \quad (41)$$

where the minimization ranges over all one-way non-signalling channel in $\text{NS}^{\rightarrow}(A_0B_0, A_1B_1)$. The relative entropy of bidirectional classical communication of $\mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$ is defined as

$$\mathfrak{D}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N}) := \min_{\mathcal{E} \in \text{NS}} D(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{E}). \quad (42)$$

Similar quantities can also be defined by choosing $\mathbf{D}(\rho \parallel \sigma)$ as the Petz-Rényi entropy [Pet86], the sandwiched Rényi entropy [MLDS⁺13, WWY14], and the the Hilbert α -divergences [BG17].

5 Bidirectional classical communication cost

In this section, we address the problem of quantifying the classical communication resources required to simulate a bipartite quantum channel using non-signalling correlations. Our objective is to determine the minimum number of classical bits that need to be exchanged between Alice and Bob to replicate the action of a target bipartite quantum channel accurately. This analysis assumes access to unlimited non-signalling correlations, which represent the most general form of quantum resources one can exploit without invoking communication, surpassing even unlimited entanglement [CLMW11, Mat12, LM15]. Specifically, we approach this problem by studying the channel simulation task via non-signalling bipartite superchannels.

Definition 9 (Channel simulation via non-signalling superchannels) Given two bipartite quantum channels $\mathcal{N}_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1\bar{B}_1}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}$, the minimum error of simulation from \mathcal{N} to \mathcal{M} via non-signalling bipartite superchannels is defined as

$$e_{\text{NS}}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) := \frac{1}{2} \inf_{\Theta} \left\| \Theta(\mathcal{N}_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1\bar{B}_1}) - \mathcal{M}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1} \right\|_{\diamond}, \quad (43)$$

where $\|\mathcal{F}\|_{\diamond} := \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{\|X\|_1 \leq 1} \|(\mathcal{F} \otimes \text{id}_k)(X)\|_1$ denotes the diamond norm of a linear operator \mathcal{F} and the minimization ranges over all non-signalling bipartite superchannels $\Theta_{(\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1\bar{B}_1) \rightarrow (A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1)}$.

We characterize the simulation cost from both one-shot and asymptotic perspectives. In the one-shot scenario, we show that the ϵ -smooth max-relative entropy of bidirectional classical communication is a lower bound on the ϵ -error simulation cost, and give semidefinite programming (SDP) formulations for the exact bidirectional classical communication cost. For the asymptotic case, we establish a single-letter lower bound on the exact communication cost and relate the vanishing error cost with the relative entropy of bidirectional classical communication.

5.1 One-shot bidirectional classical communication cost

The classical communication between Alice and Bob can be characterized via a noiseless classical channel. A noiseless classical channel that allows Alice to send m message to Bob is defined as

$$\Upsilon_{A \rightarrow B}(\cdot) = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \langle k | (\cdot) | k \rangle | k \rangle \langle k|. \quad (44)$$

Consider the bidirectional classical communication between Alice and Bob. If there are m messages they can share with each other at the same time, then the classical communication can be characterized by a bidirectional classical noiseless channel $\Upsilon_m : A_0 B_0 \mapsto A_1 B_1$ whose Choi-Jamiołkowski operator is given by

$$C_{A_0 B_0 A_1 B_1} = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} |kk\rangle \langle kk|_{A_0 B_1} \otimes |ll\rangle \langle ll|_{B_0 A_1}. \quad (45)$$

This channel maps each input state $|k\rangle \langle k|_{A_0} \otimes |l\rangle \langle l|_{B_0}$ to an output state $|l\rangle \langle l|_{A_1} \otimes |k\rangle \langle k|_{B_1}$. In the context of bidirectional classical communication, such a bipartite channel Υ_m is considered a fundamental resource. We aim to study how to simulate an arbitrary bipartite quantum channel using non-signalling superchannels and Υ_m . Consequently, we introduce the bidirectional classical communication cost of a bipartite quantum channel as follows.

Definition 10 (Bidirectional classical communication cost) *Let $\mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$ be a bipartite quantum channel. The one-shot ϵ -error bidirectional classical communication cost of $\mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$ via non-signalling bipartite superchannels is defined as*

$$S_{\leftrightarrow, \epsilon}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}) := \log \inf \left\{ m \mid e_{\text{NS}}(\Upsilon_m, \mathcal{N}) \leq \epsilon, m \in \mathbb{N} \right\}. \quad (46)$$

Our first result is that the one-shot ϵ -error bidirectional classical communication cost is lower bounded by the ϵ -smooth max-relative entropy of bidirectional classical communication.

Theorem 5 (One-shot ϵ -error bidirectional classical communication cost) *For a given bipartite quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$, its one-shot ϵ -error bidirectional classical communication cost via non-signalling bipartite superchannels satisfies*

$$S_{\leftrightarrow, \epsilon}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}) \geq \mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow, \epsilon}(\mathcal{N}). \quad (47)$$

Proof Let m be the positive integer satisfying $S_{\leftrightarrow, \epsilon}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}) = \log m$. By the definition of $S_{\leftrightarrow, \epsilon}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N})$, there exists a non-signalling bipartite superchannel Θ such that $\frac{1}{2} \|\Theta(\Upsilon_m) - \mathcal{N}\|_{\diamond} \leq \epsilon$, implying

$$\mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow, \epsilon}(\mathcal{N}) = \min_{\mathcal{M}: \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{M} - \mathcal{N}\|_{\diamond} \leq \epsilon} \mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{M}) \leq \mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\Theta(\Upsilon_m)). \quad (48)$$

Let $\mathcal{E}' \in \text{CPTP}(\bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_0, \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_1)$ be a bipartite quantum channel with the Choi-Jamiołkowski operator

$$J_{\bar{A}_0 \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_0 \bar{B}_1}^{\mathcal{E}'} := \frac{1}{m} C_{\bar{A}_0 \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_0 \bar{B}_1} + \frac{1}{m(m-1)} (\mathbb{1} - C)_{\bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_1} \otimes (\mathbb{1} - C)_{\bar{B}_0 \bar{A}_1}. \quad (49)$$

One can see that \mathcal{E}' is non-signalling by checking $J_{A_0 B_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{E}'} = \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{1}_{A_0 B_1 B_0}$ and $J_{A_0 A_1 B_0}^{\mathcal{E}'} = \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{1}_{A_0 A_1 B_0}$. For that Θ is a non-signalling bipartite superchannel, which is CNSP, we know that $\Theta(\mathcal{E}')$ is also non-signalling, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\Theta(\Upsilon_m)) &= \min_{\mathcal{E} \in \text{NS}} D_{\max}(\Theta(\Upsilon_m) \| \mathcal{E}) \\ &\leq D_{\max}(\Theta(\Upsilon_m) \| \Theta(\mathcal{E}')) \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} D_{\max}(\Upsilon_m \| \mathcal{E}') \\ &= D_{\max}(C_{\bar{A}_0 \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_0 \bar{B}_1} \| J^{\mathcal{E}'}) \\ &\leq \log m, \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where in (i) we used the data processing inequality of the channel max-relative entropy. Combining Eqs. (48) and (50), we conclude

$$\mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow, \epsilon}(\mathcal{N}) \leq \log m = S_{\leftrightarrow, \epsilon}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}). \quad (51)$$

Hence, we complete the proof. ■

Theorem 5 also provides a lower bound on entanglement-assisted one-shot exact bidirectional simulation cost when the communicating parties, Alice and Bob, are assisted by unlimited entanglement, which they can share not only between each other but also across the timeline of their own simulation protocol. When extended to multipartite channels, such a setting could serve as a general framework for network communication assisted by quantum entanglement. Let $\epsilon = 0$, we have that $S_{\leftrightarrow,0}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}) \geq \mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N})$. The channel max-relative entropy is also called the log-robustness for point-to-point channels in literature [LW19, GW19]. It characterizes the one-shot simulation cost of channels in many cases, including the resource theory of coherence with MIO as free channels [DFW⁺18] and the resource theory of thermal nonequilibrium with Gibbs-preserving maps as free channels [FR18, FBB19]. To further characterize the one-shot bidirectional classical communication, we derive the SDP formulation of the one-shot minimum simulation error via non-signalling bipartite superchannels.

Proposition 6 (Minimum simulation error) *For a given bipartite quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$, the one-shot minimum error of simulation from the bidirectional classical noiseless channel $\Upsilon_m : \bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_0 \mapsto \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_1$ to $\mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$ via non-signalling bipartite superchannels is given by the following SDP:*

$$\begin{aligned}
e_{\text{NS}}(\Upsilon_m, \mathcal{N}) = \min \quad & \mu \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \text{Tr}_{A_1 B_1} Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \leq \mu \mathbb{1}_{A_0 B_0}, Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq 0, \\
& Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} - J^{\mathcal{N}}, Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq 0, \\
& Q_{A_0 B_0} = \mathbb{1}_{A_0 B_0}, V_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}, \\
& W_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}, X_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}, \\
& X_{A_0 B_0 B_1} = \pi_{A_0} \otimes X_{B_0 B_1}, X_{A_0 A_1 B_0} = \pi_{B_0} \otimes X_{A_0 A_1}, \\
& m Q_{A_0 B_0 B_1} = W_{A_0 B_0 B_1}, X_{A_0 B_0 B_1} = V_{A_0 B_0 B_1}, \\
& m Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0} = V_{A_0 A_1 B_0}, X_{A_0 A_1 B_0} = W_{A_0 A_1 B_0}.
\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Proof For any two quantum channels $\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2$ from system A to system B , their difference in terms of the diamond norm can be expressed as an SDP as follows [Wat09]:

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{N}_1 - \mathcal{N}_2\|_{\diamond} = \min \{ \mu \mid \text{Tr}_B Y \leq \mu \mathbb{1}_A, Y \geq 0, Y \geq J_{\mathcal{N}_1} - J_{\mathcal{N}_2} \}, \tag{53}$$

where $J_{\mathcal{N}_1}$ and $J_{\mathcal{N}_2}$ are the Choi-Jamiołkowski operators of \mathcal{N}_1 and \mathcal{N}_2 , respectively. It follows that the minimum error $e_{\text{NS}}(\Upsilon_m, \mathcal{N})$ can be expressed as the following SDP:

$$e_{\text{NS}}(\Upsilon_m, \mathcal{N}) = \min \quad \mu \tag{54a}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \text{Tr}_{A_1 B_1} Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \leq \mu \mathbb{1}_{A_0 B_0}, \tag{54b}$$

$$Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq 0, Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq J^{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}} - J^{\mathcal{N}}, \tag{54c}$$

$$J^{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}} = \text{Tr}_{\bar{A}_0 \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_0 \bar{B}_1} J_{\mathbf{AB}}^{\Theta} (C_{\bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_0 \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}) \tag{54d}$$

$$J_{\mathbf{AB}}^{\Theta} \text{ satisfies Eq. (58)}, \tag{54e}$$

where $J_{\mathbf{AB}}^{\Theta}$ is the Choi-Jamiołkowski operator of Θ . For any $m \times m$ permutations τ and τ' in the symmetric group S_m , if $J_{\mathbf{AB}}^{\Theta}$ is feasible, then

$$J'_{\mathbf{AB}} = \left(\tau_{\bar{A}_0} \otimes \tau_{\bar{B}_1} \otimes \tau'_{\bar{B}_0} \otimes \tau'_{\bar{A}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \right) J_{\mathbf{AB}}^{\Theta} \left(\tau_{\bar{A}_0} \otimes \tau_{\bar{B}_1} \otimes \tau'_{\bar{B}_0} \otimes \tau'_{\bar{A}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \right)^{\dagger} \tag{55}$$

is also feasible. Furthermore, if $J'_{\mathbf{AB}}$ and $J''_{\mathbf{AB}}$ are feasible, so is any convex combination $\lambda J'_{\mathbf{AB}} + (1-\lambda) J''_{\mathbf{AB}}$ for $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$. With these facts, we can always construct a new feasible $\tilde{J}_{\mathbf{AB}}^{\Theta}$ by performing the following twirling operation on a feasible solution $J_{\mathbf{AB}}^{\Theta}$

$$\tilde{J}_{\mathbf{AB}}^{\Theta} := \frac{1}{(m!)^2} \sum_{\tau, \tau' \in S_m} \left(\tau_{\bar{A}_0} \otimes \tau_{\bar{B}_1} \otimes \tau'_{\bar{B}_0} \otimes \tau'_{\bar{A}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_0 B_0 A_1 B_1} \right) J_{\mathbf{AB}}^{\Theta} \left(\tau_{\bar{A}_0} \otimes \tau_{\bar{B}_1} \otimes \tau'_{\bar{B}_0} \otimes \tau'_{\bar{A}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_0 B_0 A_1 B_1} \right)^{\dagger}.$$

Note that the symmetry group $G := \left\{ \tau_{\bar{A}_0} \otimes \tau_{\bar{B}_1} \otimes \tau'_{\bar{B}_0} \otimes \tau'_{\bar{A}_1} : \tau, \tau' \in S_m \right\}$ acts independently on two pairs of systems (\bar{A}_0, \bar{B}_1) and (\bar{A}_1, \bar{B}_0) . For each pair, the action of the symmetric group S_m decomposes the space into two irreducible subspaces, i.e., the symmetric subspace with a projector $C_{\bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_1}$ and the antisymmetric subspace with a projector $(\mathbb{1} - C)_{\bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_1}$. Here $C_{\bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_1} = \sum_{k=1}^m |kk\rangle\langle kk|_{\bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_1}$ is the Choi-Jamiołkowski matrix of the noiseless classical channel from system A_0 to system \bar{B}_1 , so is $C_{\bar{B}_0 \bar{A}_1}$. Since the group G acts independently in two pairs of systems, we can consider combinations of symmetric and

antisymmetric subspaces for each pair. By applying Schur's Lemma to the symmetry group G , we have that $\tilde{J}_{\mathbf{AB}}^\Theta$ can be chosen as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{J}_{\mathbf{AB}}^\Theta &= C_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_1} \otimes C_{\bar{B}_0\bar{A}_1} \otimes E_{A_0A_1B_0B_1}^{(1)} + (\mathbb{1} - C)_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_1} \otimes C_{\bar{B}_0\bar{A}_1} \otimes E_{A_0A_1B_0B_1}^{(2)} \\ &\quad + C_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_1} \otimes (\mathbb{1} - C)_{\bar{B}_0\bar{A}_1} \otimes E_{A_0A_1B_0B_1}^{(3)} + (\mathbb{1} - C)_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_1} \otimes (\mathbb{1} - C)_{\bar{B}_0\bar{A}_1} \otimes E_{A_0A_1B_0B_1}^{(4)}. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Taking this into condition Eq. (54d), we can obtain

$$J^{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}} = m^2 E_{A_0A_1B_0B_1}^{(1)}. \quad (57)$$

By definition, the Choi-Jamiołkowski operator of Θ should satisfy

$$J_{\mathbf{AB}}^\Theta \geq 0, \quad (\text{CP}) \quad (58a)$$

$$J_{A_0\bar{A}_1B_0\bar{B}_1}^\Theta = \mathbb{1}_{A_0\bar{A}_1B_0\bar{B}_1}, \quad (\text{TP}) \quad (58b)$$

$$J_{A_0\bar{A}_1\mathbf{B}}^\Theta = \pi_{A_0} \otimes J_{\bar{A}_1\mathbf{B}}^\Theta, \quad J_{A_0\bar{A}_0\bar{A}_1\mathbf{B}}^\Theta = \pi_{\bar{A}_1} \otimes J_{A_0\bar{A}_0\mathbf{B}}^\Theta, \quad (\mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}) \quad (58c)$$

$$J_{\mathbf{AB}_0\bar{B}_1}^\Theta = \pi_{B_0} \otimes J_{\bar{B}_1\mathbf{A}}^\Theta, \quad J_{\mathbf{AB}_0\bar{B}_0\bar{B}_1}^\Theta = \pi_{\bar{B}_1} \otimes J_{\mathbf{AB}_0\bar{B}_0}^\Theta. \quad (\mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}) \quad (58d)$$

We now simplify the constraints in Eq. (58). In this process, we will frequently use the facts that the marginal operator of $C_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_1}$ (or $C_{\bar{B}_0\bar{A}_1}$) on one system is the identity operator $\mathbb{1}$ on that system and the marginal operator of $(\mathbb{1} - C)_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_1}$ (or $(\mathbb{1} - C)_{\bar{B}_0\bar{A}_1}$) on one system is $(m - 1)\mathbb{1}$ on that system.

For the CP constraint, we have $E_{A_0A_1B_0B_1}^{(1)} \geq 0$, $E_{A_0A_1B_0B_1}^{(2)} \geq 0$, $E_{A_0A_1B_0B_1}^{(3)} \geq 0$, $E_{A_0A_1B_0B_1}^{(4)} \geq 0$. For the TP constraint, we have $E_{A_0B_0}^{(1)} + (m - 1)(E_{A_0B_0}^{(2)} + E_{A_0B_0}^{(3)}) + (m - 1)^2 E_{A_0B_0}^{(4)} = \mathbb{1}_{A_0B_0}$.

For the non-signalling condition $\mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{J}_{A_0\bar{A}_1\mathbf{B}}^\Theta &= \mathbb{1}_{\bar{B}_1} \otimes C_{\bar{B}_0\bar{A}_1} \otimes \left(E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(1)} + (m - 1)E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(2)} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{\bar{B}_1} \otimes (\mathbb{1} - C)_{\bar{B}_0\bar{A}_1} \otimes \left(E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(3)} + (m - 1)E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(4)} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{J}_{\bar{A}_1\mathbf{B}}^\Theta &= \mathbb{1}_{\bar{B}_1} \otimes C_{\bar{B}_0\bar{A}_1} \otimes \left(E_{B_0B_1}^{(1)} + (m - 1)E_{B_0B_1}^{(2)} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{\bar{B}_1} \otimes (\mathbb{1} - C)_{\bar{B}_0\bar{A}_1} \otimes \left(E_{B_0B_1}^{(3)} + (m - 1)E_{B_0B_1}^{(4)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Therefore, to satisfy the constraint $J_{A_0\bar{A}_1\mathbf{B}}^\Theta = \pi_{A_0} \otimes J_{\bar{A}_1\mathbf{B}}^\Theta$, it must hold that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(1)} + (m - 1)E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(2)} &= \pi_{A_0} \otimes \left(E_{B_0B_1}^{(1)} + (m - 1)E_{B_0B_1}^{(2)} \right), \\ E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(3)} + (m - 1)E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(4)} &= \pi_{A_0} \otimes \left(E_{B_0B_1}^{(3)} + (m - 1)E_{B_0B_1}^{(4)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Moreover, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{J}_{A_0\bar{A}_0\bar{A}_1\mathbf{B}}^\Theta &= C_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_1} \otimes C_{\bar{B}_0\bar{A}_1} \otimes E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(1)} + (\mathbb{1} - C)_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_1} \otimes C_{\bar{B}_0\bar{A}_1} \otimes E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(2)} \\ &\quad + C_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_1} \otimes (\mathbb{1} - C)_{\bar{B}_0\bar{A}_1} \otimes E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(3)} + (\mathbb{1} - C)_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_1} \otimes (\mathbb{1} - C)_{\bar{B}_0\bar{A}_1} \otimes E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(4)} \\ &= C_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_1} \otimes \left(\mathbb{1}_{\bar{B}_0\bar{A}_1} \otimes E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(3)} + C_{\bar{B}_0\bar{A}_1} \otimes (E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(1)} - E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(3)}) \right) \\ &\quad + (\mathbb{1} - C)_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_1} \otimes \left(\mathbb{1}_{\bar{B}_0\bar{A}_1} \otimes E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(4)} + C_{\bar{B}_0\bar{A}_1} \otimes (E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(2)} - E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(4)}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{J}_{A_0\bar{A}_0\mathbf{B}}^\Theta &= C_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\bar{B}_0} \otimes \left(E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(1)} + (m - 1)E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(3)} \right) \\ &\quad + (\mathbb{1} - C)_{\bar{A}_0\bar{B}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\bar{B}_0} \otimes \left(E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(2)} + (m - 1)E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(4)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

To satisfy the constraint $J_{A_0\bar{A}_0\bar{A}_1\mathbf{B}}^\Theta = \pi_{\bar{A}_1} \otimes J_{A_0\bar{A}_0\mathbf{B}}^\Theta$, it must hold that

$$E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(1)} = E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(3)} \quad \text{and} \quad E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(2)} = E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(4)}. \quad (64)$$

Combining Eqs. (61) and (64), the $\mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$ constraint is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(1)} &= E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(3)}, \quad E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(2)} = E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(4)}, \\ E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(1)} + (m - 1)E_{A_0B_0B_1}^{(4)} &= \pi_{A_0} \otimes \left(E_{B_0B_1}^{(1)} + (m - 1)E_{B_0B_1}^{(4)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

For the non-signalling condition $\mathbf{B} \nrightarrow \mathbf{A}$, following the same steps as those for $\mathbf{A} \nrightarrow \mathbf{B}$, we have that the $\mathbf{B} \nrightarrow \mathbf{A}$ constraint is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} E_{A_0 A_1 B_0}^{(1)} &= E_{A_0 A_1 B_0}^{(2)}, & E_{A_0 A_1 B_0}^{(3)} &= E_{A_0 A_1 B_0}^{(4)}, \\ E_{A_0 A_1 B_0}^{(1)} + (m-1)E_{A_0 A_1 B_0}^{(4)} &= \pi_{B_0} \otimes (E_{A_0 A_1}^{(1)} + (m-1)E_{A_0 A_1}^{(4)}). \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

Note that with the simplified non-signalling constraints, the TP constraint can be further simplified to $m^2 E_{A_0 B_0}^{(1)} = \mathbb{1}_{A_0 B_0}$. So far, the SDP has been simplified to

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \mu \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \text{Tr}_{A_1 B_1} Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \leq \mu \mathbb{1}_{A_0 B_0}, Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq 0, \\ & Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq m^2 E_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{(1)} - J^{\mathcal{N}}, \\ & E_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{(1)} \geq 0, m^2 E_{A_0 B_0}^{(1)} = \mathbb{1}_{A_0 B_0}, \\ & E_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{(2)} \geq 0, E_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{(3)} \geq 0, E_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{(4)} \geq 0, \\ & E_{A_0 B_0 B_1}^{(1)} + (m-1)E_{A_0 B_0 B_1}^{(4)} = \pi_{A_0} \otimes (E_{B_0 B_1}^{(1)} + (m-1)E_{B_0 B_1}^{(4)}), \\ & E_{A_0 A_1 B_0}^{(1)} + (m-1)E_{A_0 A_1 B_0}^{(4)} = \pi_{B_0} \otimes (E_{A_0 A_1}^{(1)} + (m-1)E_{A_0 A_1}^{(4)}), \\ & E_{A_0 B_0 B_1}^{(1)} = E_{A_0 B_0 B_1}^{(3)}, E_{A_0 B_0 B_1}^{(2)} = E_{A_0 B_0 B_1}^{(4)}, \\ & E_{A_0 A_1 B_0}^{(1)} = E_{A_0 A_1 B_0}^{(2)}, E_{A_0 A_1 B_0}^{(3)} = E_{A_0 A_1 B_0}^{(4)}. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

Let $Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} := m^2 E_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{(1)}$, $V_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} := m^2 E_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{(1)} + m^2(m-1)E_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{(2)}$, $W_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} := m^2 E_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{(1)} + m^2(m-1)E_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{(3)}$ and $X_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} := m^2 E_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{(1)} + m^2(m-1)E_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{(4)}$. It follows that the SDP can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \mu \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \text{Tr}_{A_1 B_1} Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \leq \mu \mathbb{1}_{A_0 B_0}, Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq 0, \\ & Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} - J^{\mathcal{N}}, Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq 0, \\ & Q_{A_0 B_0} = \mathbb{1}_{A_0 B_0}, V_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}, \\ & W_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}, X_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}, \\ & X_{A_0 B_0 B_1} = \pi_{A_0} \otimes X_{B_0 B_1}, X_{A_0 A_1 B_0} = \pi_{B_0} \otimes X_{A_0 A_1}, \\ & mQ_{A_0 B_0 B_1} = W_{A_0 B_0 B_1}, X_{A_0 B_0 B_1} = V_{A_0 B_0 B_1}, \\ & mQ_{A_0 A_1 B_0} = V_{A_0 A_1 B_0}, X_{A_0 A_1 B_0} = W_{A_0 A_1 B_0}. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

Hence, we complete the proof. \blacksquare

Based on the minimum simulation error, we present an SDP characterization of the one-shot exact bidirectional classical communication cost.

Theorem 7 (One-shot exact bidirectional classical communication cost) *For a given bipartite quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$, its one-shot exact bidirectional classical communication cost via non-signalling bipartite superchannels is given by the following SDP:*

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\leftrightarrow,0}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}) &= \log \min [m] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & V_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq J_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}}, W_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq J_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}}, \\ & X_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq J_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}}, \\ & X_{A_0 B_0 B_1} = \pi_{A_0} \otimes X_{B_0 B_1}, X_{A_0 A_1 B_0} = \pi_{B_0} \otimes X_{A_0 A_1}, \\ & mJ_{A_0 B_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}} = W_{A_0 B_0 B_1}, X_{A_0 B_0 B_1} = V_{A_0 B_0 B_1}, \\ & mJ_{A_0 A_1 B_0}^{\mathcal{N}} = V_{A_0 A_1 B_0}, X_{A_0 A_1 B_0} = W_{A_0 A_1 B_0}. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Proof By the definition of the one-shot exact bidirectional classical communication cost and Proposition 6, we have

$$S_{\leftrightarrow,0}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}) = \log \min [m] \quad (70a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} = J_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}}, Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq 0, \quad (70b)$$

$$Q_{A_0 B_0} = \mathbb{1}_{A_0 B_0}, V_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}, \quad (70c)$$

$$W_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}, X_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}, \quad (70d)$$

$$X_{A_0 B_0 B_1} = \pi_{A_0} \otimes X_{B_0 B_1}, X_{A_0 A_1 B_0} = \pi_{B_0} \otimes X_{A_0 A_1}, \quad (70e)$$

$$mQ_{A_0 B_0 B_1} = W_{A_0 B_0 B_1}, X_{A_0 B_0 B_1} = V_{A_0 B_0 B_1}, \quad (70f)$$

$$mQ_{A_0 A_1 B_0} = V_{A_0 A_1 B_0}, X_{A_0 A_1 B_0} = W_{A_0 A_1 B_0}. \quad (70g)$$

Since $Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} = J_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}}$, we can replace the variable $Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}$ with the input channel $J_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}}$, and the constraints $Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq 0$ and $Q_{A_0 B_0} = \mathbb{1}_{A_0 B_0}$ are guaranteed. This replacement of $Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}$ with $J_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}}$ results in the SDP specified in the statement of this theorem. \blacksquare

Different from previous studies on point-to-point channel simulation cost assisted by non-signalling correlations [DW16, FWTB20], the simulation cost we have derived takes into account not only the non-signalling correlations between the simulation codes across the timeline of the protocol, but also the non-signaling correlations between two parties communicating through the target bipartite quantum channel. This network communication scenario is more practical when we consider both the space separation and the time separation of a bipartite quantum process. Notably, if A_1 and B_0 are taken as trivial one-dimensional subsystems (see Figure 1), the SDP (69) will reduce to

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \min [m] \\ & \text{s.t. } J_{A_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}} \leq V_{A_0 B_1}, J_{A_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}} \leq W_{A_0 B_1}, J_{A_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}} \leq X_{A_0 B_1}, \\ & X_{A_0 B_1} = \pi_{A_0} \otimes X_{B_1}, \\ & mJ_{A_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}} = W_{A_0 B_1}, X_{A_0 B_1} = V_{A_0 B_1}, \\ & mJ_{A_0}^{\mathcal{N}} = V_{A_0}, X_{A_0} = W_{A_0}. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Notice that $V_{A_0 B_1}$ and $W_{A_0 B_1}$ are redundant variables and $J_{A_0}^{\mathcal{N}} = \mathbb{1}_{A_0}$, so the SDP can be further simplified to

$$\log \min \{ [m] \mid J_{A_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}} \leq \pi_{A_0} \otimes X_{B_1}, \text{Tr}[X_{B_1}] \pi_{A_0} = m \mathbb{1}_{A_0} \}. \quad (72)$$

Redefining $X_{B_1} := X_{B_1}/d_{A_0}$ results in

$$\log \min \{ [\text{Tr}[X_{B_1}]] \mid J_{A_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}} \leq \mathbb{1}_{A_0} \otimes X_{B_1} \}. \quad (73)$$

This is identical to $\log [2^{-H_{\min}(A|B)_{J^{\mathcal{N}}}}]$, which has been shown by Duan and Winter [DW16] to characterize the one-shot exact classical simulation cost of $\mathcal{N}_{A_0 \rightarrow B_1}$ under non-signalling assistance with $H_{\min}(A|B)_{J^{\mathcal{N}}}$ being the conditional min-entropy [Ren05, Dat09]. Thus, Theorem 7 can be reduced to the case for a point-to-point channel from A_0 to B_1 . From Theorem 7, we can also obtain that the max-relative entropy of bidirectional classical communication is a lower bound on the one-shot exact bidirectional classical communication cost.

5.2 Asymptotic bidirectional classical communication cost

While the one-shot exact bidirectional classical communication cost provides insights into the resources required for a single instance of channel simulation, it is also essential to investigate the asymptotic behavior of the cost when simulating a large number of identical and independently distributed (i.i.d.) target channels. The asymptotic bidirectional classical communication cost of $\mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$ via non-signalling bipartite superchannel is given by the regularization

$$S_{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N}) := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} S_{\leftrightarrow, \epsilon}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}), \quad (74)$$

and the asymptotic exact bidirectional classical communication cost of $\mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$ is given by

$$S_{\leftrightarrow, 0}(\mathcal{N}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} S_{\leftrightarrow, 0}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}). \quad (75)$$

For a bipartite quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$, we introduce the *channel's bipartite conditional min-entropy* and demonstrate its role as an additive lower bound on the one-shot exact bidirectional classical communication cost of $\mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$. Then it will favorably give a lower bound on the asymptotic exact cost.

Definition 11 (Bipartite conditional min-entropy) Let $\mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$ be a bipartite quantum channel. The bipartite conditional min-entropies of $\mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}} &:= - \min_{\mathcal{X}} D_{\max}(\mathcal{R}_{A_1}^{\pi} \circ \mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1} \parallel \mathcal{R}_{A_0 \rightarrow A_1}^{\pi} \otimes \mathcal{X}_{B_0 \rightarrow B_1}), \\ H_{\min}(\mathbf{B}|\mathbf{A})_{\mathcal{N}} &:= - \min_{\mathcal{Y}} D_{\max}(\mathcal{R}_{B_1}^{\pi} \circ \mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1} \parallel \mathcal{Y}_{A_0 \rightarrow A_1} \otimes \mathcal{R}_{B_0 \rightarrow B_1}^{\pi}), \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

where \mathcal{X} ranges over all quantum channels in $\text{CPTP}(B_0, B_1)$ for $H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}}$, and \mathcal{Y} ranges over all quantum channels in $\text{CPTP}(A_0, A_1)$ for $H_{\min}(\mathbf{B}|\mathbf{A})_{\mathcal{N}}$.

By the property of the max-relative entropy of quantum channels, the bipartite conditional min-entropies of $\mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$ can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}} &= -\min_{\mathcal{X}} D_{\max}(\mathbb{1}_{A_1} \otimes J_{A_0 B_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}} \parallel \mathbb{1}_{A_0 A_1} \otimes J_{B_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{X}}) \\ &= -\log \min \{m \mid X_{B_0} = m \cdot \mathbb{1}_{B_0}, J_{A_0 B_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}} \leq \mathbb{1}_{A_0} \otimes X_{B_0 B_1}\}, \\ H_{\min}(\mathbf{B}|\mathbf{A})_{\mathcal{N}} &= -\min_{\mathcal{Y}} D_{\max}(\mathbb{1}_{B_1} \otimes J_{A_0 A_1 B_0}^{\mathcal{N}} \parallel \mathbb{1}_{B_0 B_1} \otimes J_{A_0 A_1}^{\mathcal{Y}}) \\ &= -\log \min \{m \mid Y_{A_0} = m \cdot \mathbb{1}_{A_0}, J_{A_0 A_1 B_0}^{\mathcal{N}} \leq \mathbb{1}_{B_0} \otimes Y_{A_0 A_1}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

Notably, if A_1 and B_0 are taken as one-dimensional trivial subsystems, the bipartite conditional min-entropy $H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}}$ will reduce to the common channel conditional min-entropy of a point-to-point channel [DW16]:

$$H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}} = -\min_{\mathcal{X}} D_{\max}(\mathcal{N}_{A_0 \rightarrow B_1} \parallel \mathcal{R}_{A_0 \rightarrow B_1}^{\sigma}) = -\min_{\sigma_{B_1}} D_{\max}(J_{A_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}} \parallel \mathbb{1}_{A_0} \otimes \sigma_{B_1}), \quad (78)$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{A_0 \rightarrow B_1}^{\sigma}$ is a replacement channel that always outputs σ_{B_1} . It is also related to the channel's max-information [FWTB20] as $H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}} = -I_{\max}(A : B)_{\mathcal{N}}$. In the following, we show a valuable property of the bipartite channel conditional min-entropy, additivity with respect to the tensor product of quantum channels.

Lemma 8 (Additivity of bipartite conditional min-entropy) *The channel's bipartite conditional min-entropy is additive with respect to the tensor product of quantum channels, i.e., for any $\mathcal{N}_1 \in \text{CPTP}(A_0 B_0 : A_1 B_1)$ and $\mathcal{N}_2 \in \text{CPTP}(A'_0 B'_0 : A'_1 B'_1)$,*

$$H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2} = H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}_1} + H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}_2}. \quad (79)$$

Proof Suppose $\{m_1, X_{B_0 B_1}^{(1)}\}$ and $\{m_2, X_{B'_0 B'_1}^{(2)}\}$ form two feasible solutions of the SDP (77) for $H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}_1}$ and $H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}_2}$, respectively. It is easy to verify that $\{m_1 m_2, X_{B_0 B_1}^{(1)} \otimes X_{B'_0 B'_1}^{(2)}\}$ forms a feasible solution of the SDP for $H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2}$. Hence, we have

$$H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2} \geq -\log m_1 m_2 = -\log m_1 - \log m_2 = H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}_1} + H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}_2}. \quad (80)$$

Using Lagrangian method, the dual SDP of $H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}}$ is given by

$$-\log \max \left\{ \text{Tr} [M_{A_0 B_0 B_1} J_{A_0 B_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}}] \mid \text{Tr} N_{B_0} = 1, M_{A_0 B_0 B_1} \geq 0, N_{B_0} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B_1} \geq M_{B_0 B_1} \right\}. \quad (81)$$

It is easy to see the strong duality holds by Slater's condition. For any feasible solution $\{M_{A_0 B_0 B_1}^{(1)}, N_{B_0}^{(1)}\}$ and $\{M_{A'_0 B'_0 B'_1}^{(2)}, N_{B'_0}^{(2)}\}$ for the dual SDPs of $H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}_1}$ and $H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}_2}$, respectively, we can verify that $\{M_{A_0 B_0 B_1}^{(1)} \otimes M_{A'_0 B'_0 B'_1}^{(2)}, N_{B_0}^{(1)} \otimes N_{B'_0}^{(2)}\}$ forms a feasible solution of the dual SDP for $H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2}$. Hence, we have $H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2} \leq H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}_1} + H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}_2}$. Together with Eq. (80), we have $H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2} = H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}_1} + H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}_2}$. Similar results can be obtained for $H_{\min}(\mathbf{B}|\mathbf{A})_{\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2}$. Hence, we complete the proof. ■

Based on the additivity of the channel's bipartite conditional min-entropy, we present a single-letter lower bound on the asymptotic exact bidirectional classical communication cost of an arbitrary bipartite quantum channel.

Theorem 9 (Asymptotic exact bidirectional classical communication cost) *For a given bipartite quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1}$, its asymptotic exact bidirectional classical communication cost via non-signalling bipartite superchannels satisfies*

$$S_{\leftrightarrow, 0}(\mathcal{N}) \geq -\min \{H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}}, H_{\min}(\mathbf{B}|\mathbf{A})_{\mathcal{N}}\}. \quad (82)$$

Proof Recall the definition of the max-relative entropy of bidirectional communication:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N}) &= \log \min \lambda \\ \text{s.t. } & J_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}} \leq Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}, Y_{A_0 B_0} = \lambda \mathbb{1}_{A_0 B_0}, \\ & Y_{A_0 B_0 B_1} = \pi_{\bar{A}_0} \otimes Y_{B_0 B_1}, Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0} = \pi_{B_0} \otimes Y_{A_0 A_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

Suppose $\{\lambda, Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}\}$ forms a feasible solution of SDP (83). Then let

$$\bar{X}_{B_0 B_1} := Y_{B_0 B_1} / d_{A_0}, \quad \bar{Y}_{A_0 A_1} := Y_{A_0 A_1} / d_{B_0}. \quad (84)$$

It follows that $\{\lambda, \bar{X}_{B_0 B_1}\}$ and $\{\lambda, \bar{Y}_{A_0 A_1}\}$ are feasible solutions of the optimization for $-H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}}$ and $-H_{\min}(\mathbf{B}|\mathbf{A})_{\mathcal{N}}$ as given in Eq. (77), respectively. Thus, we have $-H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}} \leq \mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N})$ and $-H_{\min}(\mathbf{B}|\mathbf{A})_{\mathcal{N}} \leq \mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N})$ which yields $\mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N}) \geq \max\{-H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}}, -H_{\min}(\mathbf{B}|\mathbf{A})_{\mathcal{N}}\}$. Combining with Theorem 5, we have

$$S_{\leftrightarrow,0}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}) \geq -\min\{H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}}, H_{\min}(\mathbf{B}|\mathbf{A})_{\mathcal{N}}\}. \quad (85)$$

Then, consider that

$$S_{\leftrightarrow,0}(\mathcal{N}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} S_{\leftrightarrow,0}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}) \stackrel{(i)}{\geq} -\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}} \stackrel{(ii)}{=} -\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{n} H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}} = -H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}},$$

where we used Eq. (85) in (i), and Lemma 8 in (ii). Applying the same inequality for $H_{\min}(\mathbf{B}|\mathbf{A})_{\mathcal{N}}$, we complete the proof. \blacksquare

Using the relationship between the ϵ -smooth max-relative entropy of resources and the relative entropy of resources in dynamical resource theory, we have the following result on the asymptotic vanishing error bidirectional classical communication cost.

Theorem 10 (Asymptotic bidirectional classical communication cost) *For a given bipartite quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{\bar{A}_0 \bar{B}_0 \rightarrow \bar{A}_1 \bar{B}_1}$, its asymptotic bidirectional classical communication cost via non-signalling bipartite superchannels satisfies*

$$S_{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N}) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathfrak{D}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}). \quad (86)$$

Proof It is proved in Ref. [GW19, Lemma 13] that for any convex quantum resource theory \mathfrak{F} ,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathfrak{D}_{\max, \mathfrak{F}}^{\epsilon}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathfrak{D}_{\mathfrak{F}}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}). \quad (87)$$

Hence, we directly have

$$S_{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N}) \geq \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow, \epsilon}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathfrak{D}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}). \quad (88)$$

\blacksquare

6 Examples

In this section, we investigate some representative examples of bipartite quantum channels and estimate their bidirectional classical communication cost assisted by non-signalling correlations.

Noisy SWAP $^{\alpha}$ gate. The SWAP gate is defined as $S|\phi\rangle|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle|\phi\rangle$. In a two-qubit case, the Heisenberg exchange between two electron spin qubits results in a SWAP $^{\alpha}$ gate [FRS05] whose matrix form is given by

$$S^{\alpha} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1+e^{i\pi\alpha}}{2} & \frac{1-e^{i\pi\alpha}}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1-e^{i\pi\alpha}}{2} & \frac{1+e^{i\pi\alpha}}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (89)$$

Consider a SWAP $^{\alpha}$ gate affected by a global depolarizing noise, resulting in a noisy bipartite channel $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha,p}(\cdot)$ as

$$\mathcal{N}_{\alpha,p}(\rho) = (1-p) \cdot \text{SWAP}^{\alpha} \rho (\text{SWAP}^{\alpha})^{\dagger} + p \cdot \frac{\mathbb{1}}{4}. \quad (90)$$

We numerically computed the one-shot exact bidirectional communication cost, as derived in Theorem 7, and the lower bound on the asymptotic exact bidirectional classical communication cost, as established in Theorem 9, for the channel $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha,p}(\cdot)$ with varying values of p and α . The results are illustrated in Figure 5. The red solid line represents the lower bound $-\min\{H_{\min}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B})_{\mathcal{N}}, H_{\min}(\mathbf{B}|\mathbf{A})_{\mathcal{N}}\}$, while the gray dotted line shows $S_{\leftrightarrow,0}^{(1)}(\cdot)$.

It can be seen that the classical communication cost increases with increasing α or decreasing noise level p . Notably, when $\alpha = 1$ and $p = 0$, the channel $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha,p}(\cdot)$ corresponds to a SWAP gate, which requires




Figure 5: Asymptotic exact bidirectional classical communication cost estimates as a function of the SWAP^α gate parameter α under varying depolarizing noise p . The graphs illustrate how increasing p affects the communication cost, with dashed lines representing the one-shot exact cost and the red solid lines representing our lower bounds.




Figure 6: Asymptotic exact bidirectional classical communication cost estimates as a function of the partial swap operation parameter a under varying depolarizing noise p . The graphs illustrate how increasing p affects the communication cost, with dashed lines representing the one-shot exact cost and the red solid lines representing our lower bounds.

2 bits of classical information to implement with the assistance of non-signalling correlations, as shown in the figure. This scenario can be realized through a standard bidirectional teleportation protocol, where Alice and Bob each send 2 messages to the other to exchange their quantum states perfectly. This result further indicates that non-signalling correlations offer no advantage over local operations assisted by shared entanglement for such a SWAP operation. We also observe that our lower bound on the asymptotic bidirectional classical communication cost becomes increasingly tight as the depolarizing noise increases. Specifically, when $p = 0.2$, the one-shot cost closely approaches the lower bound, and at $p = 0.4$, they almost coincide in our plot. As the one-shot exact cost is an upper bound on the asymptotic cost, this convergence suggests that the channel's bipartite conditional min-entropy provides a reliable estimate of the asymptotic classical communication cost, particularly in higher noise regimes. Furthermore, when $p = 0.4$, the target noisy channel can be simulated with less than $\log 3$ bits of classical information, which is better than trivially applying a bidirectional teleportation.

Noisy partial swap operation. Another bipartite operation we consider is the qubit partial swap operation [ADO16], defined as $U_a = \sqrt{a}\mathbb{1} + i\sqrt{1-a}S$. It is known to resemble a beamsplitter [KS13]. We investigate the bidirectional classical communication cost for this operation under various noise levels. Similar to the SWAP^α gate, the noisy partial swap channel is modeled as:

$$\mathcal{N}_{a,p}(\rho) = (1-p) \cdot U_a \rho U_a^\dagger + p \cdot \frac{\mathbb{1}}{4}, \quad (91)$$

where p represents the depolarizing noise parameter. We computed the one-shot exact bidirectional classical communication cost and the lower bound for the asymptotic case.

Figure 6 illustrates these results for different values of a and noise levels p . As a approaches 1, corresponding to the identity operation, the communication cost decreases. Increasing noise levels generally reduces the required communication cost. The lower bound on the asymptotic exact cost approaches the one-shot exact cost as the noise level increases, similar to our observations for the SWAP^α gate. These results further support our earlier conclusions about the relationship between noise levels and the tightness of our lower bound.

7 Discussion

In this work, we have investigated how much bidirectional classical communication resources are required to simulate a desired bipartite quantum channel when non-signalling correlations are available. This channel simulation problem is central in quantum Shannon theory, and non-signalling correlations encompass all possible resources with no communication capabilities. To this end, we have introduced non-signalling bipartite channels and superchannels, which serve as the foundation for defining resource measures for classical communication. We have shown that the one-shot exact ϵ -error bidirectional classical communication cost is lower bounded by the ϵ -error max-relative entropy of classical communication and have derived an SDP formulation for the one-shot exact cost. Furthermore, we have introduced a channel's bipartite conditional min-entropy as an efficiently computable lower bound on the asymptotic exact bidirectional classical communication cost, which recovers and generalizes the results for point-to-point channels.

Numerical experiments showcase the effectiveness of our bound on various bipartite quantum channels, particularly for a class of noisy bipartite unitary operations. Our results shed light on the fundamental interplay between non-locality and classical communication in a quantum setting. The resource-theoretic approach allows for a systematic characterization of the communication capabilities of bipartite quantum channels under non-signalling correlations. Several intriguing questions remain unsolved:

1. The non-signalling bipartite superchannel given in Definition 3 is physically motivated by non-signalling correlations. Another natural consideration is a superchannel realized by non-signalling pre- and post-processing channels, which we may call a non-signalling realizable bipartite superchannel. Furthermore, a CNSP superchannel is motivated by dynamical resource theory. It is clear that a non-signalling realizable bipartite superchannel is a non-signalling bipartite superchannel, and thus a CNSP superchannel. However, it remains an open question whether the converse statement also holds.
2. Investigating the additivity of different resource measures of classical communication is an interesting problem. For instance, the additivity of the max-relative entropy bidirectional classical communication remains unclear. If it holds, the max-relative entropy would provide a lower bound on the asymptotic exact bidirectional classical communication cost. Furthermore, the additivity of the relative entropy of classical communication is still unknown. If it is additive, we can obtain a single-letter lower bound on the vanishing error bidirectional classical communication cost according to Theorem 10.
3. In addition to the problem of simulating target channels using classical swap channels, it is also of interest to investigate the ability of a bipartite channel to exchange information. Similar methods may be applied to examine the maximum amount of classical information that can be reliably transmitted in both directions through a bipartite quantum channel, with the help of non-signalling correlations. Remarkably, Shannon's noisy channel coding theorem [Sha48] and its dual, the reverse Shannon theorem [BSST02], characterize the capacity of classical channels and the resources required to simulate them using noiseless channels, respectively. In the quantum realm, the quantum reverse Shannon theorem [BDH⁺14, BCR11] solves the case where communicating parties share unlimited entanglement, establishing that the optimal asymptotic simulation cost equals its entanglement-assisted classical capacity. This result directly implies a reverse Shannon theorem for the case of channels assisted by non-signaling correlations. When considering a more general and practical bipartite scenario, it becomes crucial and fascinating to investigate whether a quantum reverse Shannon theorem holds for bipartite channels assisted by non-local resources, such as entanglement and non-signaling correlations.

Acknowledgement

This work was partially supported by the National Key R&D Program of China (Grant No. 2024YFE0102500), the Guangdong Provincial Quantum Science Strategic Initiative (Grant No. GDZX2303007), the Guangdong Provincial Key Lab of Integrated Communication, Sensing and Computation for Ubiquitous Internet of Things (Grant No. 2023B1212010007), the Start-up Fund (Grant No. G0101000151) from HKUST (Guangzhou), and the Education Bureau of Guangzhou Municipality.

References

- [ADO16] Koenraad Audenaert, Nilanjana Datta, and Maris Ozols. Entropy power inequalities for qudits. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 57(5), May 2016.
- [BB84] Charles H Bennett and Gilles Brassard. Quantum cryptography: Public key distribution and coin tossing. In *International Conference on Computers, Systems & Signal Processing, Bangalore, India, Dec 9-12, 1984*, pages 175–179, 1984.
- [BBC⁺93] Charles H Bennett, Gilles Brassard, Claude Crépeau, Richard Jozsa, Asher Peres, and William K Wootters. Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels. *Physical Review Letters*, 70(13):1895–1899, Mar 1993.
- [BCR11] Mario Berta, Matthias Christandl, and Renato Renner. The quantum reverse shannon theorem based on one-shot information theory. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 306(3):579–615, Aug 2011.
- [BDH⁺14] Charles H. Bennett, Igor Devetak, Aram W. Harrow, Peter W. Shor, and Andreas Winter. The quantum reverse shannon theorem and resource tradeoffs for simulating quantum channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(5):2926–2959, 2014.
- [BDW18] Stefan Bäuml, Siddhartha Das, and Mark M. Wilde. Fundamental limits on the capacities of bipartite quantum interactions. *Physical Review Letters*, 121:250504, Dec 2018.
- [BDWW19] Stefan Bäuml, Siddhartha Das, Xin Wang, and Mark M. Wilde. Resource theory of entanglement for bipartite quantum channels, 2019.
- [Bel66] John S Bell. On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics. *Reviews of Modern physics*, 38(3):447, 1966.
- [BF18] Siddharth Barman and Omar Fawzi. Algorithmic aspects of optimal channel coding. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(2):1038–1045, Feb 2018.
- [BG17] Francesco Buscemi and Gilad Gour. Quantum relative lorenz curves. *Physical Review A*, 95(1), Jan 2017.
- [BGNP01] David Beckman, Daniel Gottesman, M. A. Nielsen, and John Preskill. Causal and localizable quantum operations. *Physical Review A*, 64:052309, Oct 2001.
- [BHLS03] C.H. Bennett, A.W. Harrow, D.W. Leung, and J.A. Smolin. On the capacities of bipartite hamiltonians and unitary gates. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 49(8):1895–1911, 2003.
- [BP05] Jonathan Barrett and Stefano Pironio. Popescu-rohrlich correlations as a unit of nonlocality. *Physical Review Letters*, 95:140401, Sep 2005.
- [BSST99] Charles H. Bennett, Peter W. Shor, John A. Smolin, and Ashish V. Thapliyal. Entanglement-assisted classical capacity of noisy quantum channels. *Physical Review Letters*, 83:3081–3084, Oct 1999.
- [BSST02] C.H. Bennett, P.W. Shor, J.A. Smolin, and A.V. Thapliyal. Entanglement-assisted capacity of a quantum channel and the reverse shannon theorem. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 48(10):2637–2655, 2002.
- [BW92] Charles H Bennett and Stephen J Wiesner. Communication via one-and two-particle operators on Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen states. *Physical Review Letters*, 69(20):2881–2884, nov 1992.

- [CDP08a] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti. Transforming quantum operations: Quantum supermaps. *Europhysics Letters*, 83(3), 2008.
- [CDP08b] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti. Quantum circuit architecture. *Physical Review Letters*, 101(6), Aug 2008.
- [CHSH69] John F. Clauser, Michael A. Horne, Abner Shimony, and Richard A. Holt. Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories. *Physical Review Letters*, 23:880–884, Oct 1969.
- [CLL06] Andrew M. Childs, Debbie W. Leung, and Hoi-Kwong Lo. Two-way quantum communication channels. *International Journal of Quantum Information*, 04(01):63–83, Feb 2006.
- [CLMW11] Toby S. Cubitt, Debbie Leung, William Matthews, and Andreas Winter. Zero-error channel capacity and simulation assisted by non-local correlations. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(8):5509–5523, Aug 2011.
- [CMW16] Tom Cooney, Milán Mosonyi, and Mark M. Wilde. Strong converse exponents for a quantum channel discrimination problem and quantum-feedback-assisted communication. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 344(3):797–829, May 2016.
- [Dat09] Nilanjana Datta. Min-and max-relative entropies and a new entanglement monotone. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55(6):2816–2826, 2009.
- [Dev05] I. Devetak. The private classical capacity and quantum capacity of a quantum channel. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 51(1):44–55, 2005.
- [DFW⁺18] María García Díaz, Kun Fang, Xin Wang, Matteo Rosati, Michalis Skotiniotis, John Calsamiglia, and Andreas Winter. Using and reusing coherence to realize quantum processes. *Quantum*, 2:100, Oct 2018.
- [DKQ⁺23] Dawei Ding, Sumeet Khatri, Yihui Quek, Peter W. Shor, Xin Wang, and Mark M. Wilde. Bounding the forward classical capacity of bipartite quantum channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 69(5):3034–3061, 2023.
- [DW16] Runyao Duan and Andreas Winter. No-signalling-assisted zero-error capacity of quantum channels and an information theoretic interpretation of the lovász number. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(2):891–914, 2016.
- [Eke91] Artur K. Ekert. Quantum cryptography based on Bell’s theorem. *Physical Review Letters*, 67(6):661–663, aug 1991.
- [ESW02] T Eggeling, D Schlingemann, and R. F Werner. Semicausal operations are semilocalizable. *Europhysics Letters*, 57(6):782–788, Mar 2002.
- [FBB19] Philippe Faist, Mario Berta, and Fernando Brandão. Thermodynamic capacity of quantum processes. *Physical Review Letters*, 122(20), May 2019.
- [FF24a] Omar Fawzi and Paul Fermé. Broadcast channel coding: Algorithmic aspects and non-signaling assistance. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, pages 1–1, 2024.
- [FF24b] Omar Fawzi and Paul Fermé. Multiple-access channel coding with non-signaling correlations. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 70(3):1693–1719, Mar 2024.
- [FR18] Philippe Faist and Renato Renner. Fundamental work cost of quantum processes. *Physical Review X*, 8:021011, Apr 2018.
- [FRS05] Heng Fan, Vwani Roychowdhury, and Thomas Szkopek. Optimal two-qubit quantum circuits using exchange interactions. *Physical Review A*, 72(5), Nov 2005.
- [FWTB20] Kun Fang, Xin Wang, Marco Tomamichel, and Mario Berta. Quantum channel simulation and the channel’s smooth max-information. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(4):2129–2140, Apr 2020.
- [GHR⁺16] John Goold, Marcus Huber, Arnau Riera, Lidia del Rio, and Paul Skrzypczyk. The role of quantum information in thermodynamics—a topical review. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 49(14):143001, Feb 2016.

- [Gou19] Gilad Gour. Comparison of quantum channels by superchannels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 65(9):5880–5904, Sep 2019.
- [GS20a] Gilad Gour and Carlo Maria Scandolo. Dynamical entanglement. *Physical Review Letters*, 125:180505, Oct 2020.
- [GS20b] Gilad Gour and Carlo Maria Scandolo. Dynamical resources, 2020.
- [GS21] Gilad Gour and Carlo Maria Scandolo. Entanglement of a bipartite channel. *Phys. Rev. A*, 103:062422, Jun 2021.
- [GW19] Gilad Gour and Andreas Winter. How to quantify a dynamical quantum resource. *Physical Review Letters*, 123(15), Oct 2019.
- [HK81] Te Han and K. Kobayashi. A new achievable rate region for the interference channel. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 27(1):49–60, 1981.
- [HL11] Aram W. Harrow and Debbie W. Leung. A communication-efficient nonlocal measurement with application to communication complexity and bipartite gate capacities. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(8):5504–5508, 2011.
- [KS13] Robert König and Graeme Smith. Limits on classical communication from quantum entropy power inequalities. *Nature Photonics*, 7(2):142–146, Jan 2013.
- [KW24] Sumeet Khatri and Mark M. Wilde. Principles of quantum communication theory: A modern approach, 2024.
- [LALS20] Felix Leditzky, Mohammad A. Alhejji, Joshua Levin, and Graeme Smith. Playing games with multiple access channels. *Nature Communications*, 11(1), Mar 2020.
- [LKDW18] Felix Leditzky, Eneet Kaur, Nilanjana Datta, and Mark M. Wilde. Approaches for approximate additivity of the holevo information of quantum channels. *Physical Review A*, 97(1), Jan 2018.
- [LM15] Debbie Leung and William Matthews. On the power of PPT-preserving and non-signalling codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(8):4486–4499, 2015.
- [LW19] Zi-Wen Liu and Andreas Winter. Resource theories of quantum channels and the universal role of resource erasure, 2019.
- [Mat12] W. Matthews. A linear program for the finite block length converse of polyanskiy–pöor–verdú via nonsignaling codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 58(12):7036–7044, Dec 2012.
- [MBC22] Simon Milz, Jessica Bavaresco, and Giulio Chiribella. Resource theory of causal connection. *Quantum*, 6:788, Aug 2022.
- [MK09] Abolfazl Seyed Motahari and Amir Keyvan Khandani. Capacity bounds for the gaussian interference channel. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55(2):620–643, 2009.
- [MLDS⁺13] Martin Müller-Lennert, Frédéric Dupuis, Oleg Szehr, Serge Fehr, and Marco Tomamichel. On quantum rényi entropies: A new generalization and some properties. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 54(12), Dec 2013.
- [OCB12] Ognjan Oreshkov, Fabio Costa, and Āaslav Brukner. Quantum correlations with no causal order. *Nature Communications*, 3(1), Oct 2012.
- [Pet86] Dénes Petz. Quasi-entropies for finite quantum systems. *Reports on Mathematical Physics*, 23(1):57–65, 1986.
- [PHHH06] M. Piani, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki. Properties of quantum nonsignaling boxes. *Physical Review A*, 74(1), Jul 2006.
- [PR97] Sandu Popescu and Daniel Rohrlich. Causality and nonlocality as axioms for quantum mechanics, 1997.
- [PV10] Yury Polyanskiy and Sergio Verdú. Arimoto channel coding converse and rényi divergence. *2010 48th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, pages 1327–1333, 2010.

- [Ren05] Renato Renner. *Security of Quantum Key Distribution*. PhD thesis, ETH Zurich, 2005.
- [SCG20] Gaurav Saxena, Eric Chitambar, and Gilad Gour. Dynamical resource theory of quantum coherence. *Physical Review Research*, 2:023298, Jun 2020.
- [Sha48] C. E. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3):379–423, 1948.
- [Sha61] Claude E Shannon. Two-way communication channels. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 1: Contributions to the Theory of Statistics*, volume 4, pages 611–645. University of California Press, 1961.
- [SW13] Naresh Sharma and Naqeeb Ahmad Warsi. Fundamental bound on the reliability of quantum information transmission. *Physical Review Letters*, 110(8), Feb 2013.
- [TV05] David Tse and Pramod Viswanath. *MIMO IV: multiuser communication*, page 425–495. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [Wat09] John Watrous. Semidefinite programs for completely bounded norms. *Theory of Computing*, 5(11):217–238, 2009.
- [WBHK20] Mark M. Wilde, Mario Berta, Christoph Hirche, and Eneet Kaur. Amortized channel divergence for asymptotic quantum channel discrimination. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 110(8):2277–2336, June 2020.
- [WWY14] Mark M. Wilde, Andreas Winter, and Dong Yang. Strong converse for the classical capacity of entanglement-breaking and hadamard channels via a sandwiched rényi relative entropy. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 331(2):593–622, Jul 2014.
- [WXD18] Xin Wang, Wei Xie, and Runyao Duan. Semidefinite programming strong converse bounds for classical capacity. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(1):640–653, Jan 2018.

A Dual SDP of the max-relative entropy of bidirectional classical communication

Consider the primal SDP:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N}_{A_0 B_0 \rightarrow A_1 B_1}) &= \log \min \lambda \\
&\text{s.t. } J_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}} \leq Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}, \\
&Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \geq 0, Y_{A_0 B_0} = \lambda \mathbb{1}_{A_0 B_0}, \\
&Y_{A_0 B_0 B_1} = \pi_{A_0} \otimes Y_{B_0 B_1}, Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0} = \pi_{B_0} \otimes Y_{A_0 A_1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

The Lagrange function is

$$\begin{aligned}
&L(\lambda, Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}, M_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}, N_{A_0 B_0}, P_{A_0 B_0 B_1}, Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0}) \\
&= \lambda + \langle M, J_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}} - Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \rangle + \langle N, Y_{A_0 B_0} - \lambda \mathbb{1}_{A_0 B_0} \rangle \\
&\quad + \langle P, Y_{A_0 B_0 B_1} - \pi_{A_0} \otimes Y_{B_0 B_1} \rangle + \langle Q, Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0} - \pi_{B_0} \otimes Y_{A_0 A_1} \rangle \\
&= \lambda + \text{Tr} [M J_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}}] - \text{Tr} [M Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}] + \text{Tr} [(N_{A_0 B_0} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_1 B_1}) Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}] \\
&\quad - \lambda \text{Tr} N_{A_0 B_0} + \text{Tr} [(P_{A_0 B_0 B_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_1}) Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}] + \text{Tr} [(Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B_1}) Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}] \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{d_{A_0}} \text{Tr} [(P_{B_0 B_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_0 A_1}) Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}] - \frac{1}{d_{B_0}} \text{Tr} [(Q_{A_0 A_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B_0 B_1}) Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}] \\
&= \lambda(1 - \text{Tr} N_{A_0 B_0}) + \text{Tr} [M J_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}^{\mathcal{N}}] + \left\langle Y_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}, N_{A_0 B_0} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_1 B_1} - M_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + P_{A_0 B_0 B_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_1} + Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B_1} - \frac{1}{d_{A_0}} P_{B_0 B_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_0 A_1} - \frac{1}{d_{B_0}} Q_{A_0 A_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B_0 B_1} \right\rangle,
\end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

where we have introduced $M_{A_0 A_1 B_0 B_1}, N_{A_0 B_0}, P_{A_0 B_0 B_1}, Q_{A_0 A_1 B_0}$ as dual variables. The corresponding Lagrange dual function is

$$g(M, N, P, Q) = \inf_{Y \geq 0} L(Y, \lambda, M, N, P, Q). \tag{94}$$

For $Y_{A_0A_1B_0B_1} \geq 0$, it must hold that $\text{Tr } N_{A_0B_0} \leq 1$, $M_{A_0A_1B_0B_1} \geq 0$, and

$$N_{A_0B_0} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_1B_1} + P_{A_0B_0B_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_1} + Q_{A_0A_1B_0} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B_1} \geq M_{A_0A_1B_0B_1} + \frac{1}{d_{A_0}} P_{B_0B_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_0A_1} + \frac{1}{d_{B_0}} Q_{A_0A_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B_0B_1}.$$

Thus, we arrive at the dual SDP as

$$\log \max \text{Tr} [M_{A_0A_1B_0B_1} J_{A_0A_1B_0B_1}^{\mathcal{N}}] \quad (95a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } M_{A_0A_1B_0B_1} \geq 0, \text{Tr } N_{A_0B_0} \leq 1, \quad (95b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} M_{A_0A_1B_0B_1} &\leq N_{A_0B_0} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_1B_1} + (P_{A_0B_0B_1} - \pi_{A_0} \otimes P_{B_0B_1}) \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_1} \\ &\quad + (Q_{A_0A_1B_0} - \pi_{B_0} \otimes Q_{A_0A_1}) \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (95c)$$

It is easy to see that the strong duality holds by Slater's condition. We further note that the inequality $\text{Tr } N_{AB} \leq 1$ can be restricted to equality. This is because for any feasible solution $\{M, N, P, Q\}$, we can replace N with $\widehat{N} := N_{A_0B_0} + (1 - \text{Tr } N_{A_0B_0}) \mathbb{1}_{A_0B_0} / d_{A_0B_0}$ to get $\{M, \widehat{N}, P, Q\}$. This is also a feasible solution as such shift also satisfies Eq. (95c). Meanwhile, the objective function $\text{Tr} [M J_{A_0A_1B_0B_1}^{\mathcal{N}}]$ remains unchanged. Rewrite $P_{A_0B_0} := P_{A_0B_0B_1} - \pi_{A_0} \otimes P_{B_0B_1}$ and $Q_{A_0B_0} := Q_{A_0A_1B_0} - \pi_{B_0} \otimes Q_{A_0A_1}$. Thus, the final dual SDP is

$$\mathfrak{D}_{\max}^{\leftrightarrow}(\mathcal{N}_{A_0B_0 \rightarrow A_1B_1}) = \log \max \text{Tr} [M_{A_0A_1B_0B_1} J_{A_0A_1B_0B_1}^{\mathcal{N}}]$$

$$\text{s.t. } \text{Tr } N_{A_0B_0} = 1, P_{B_0B_1} = 0, Q_{A_0A_1} = 0,$$

$$0 \leq M_{A_0A_1B_0B_1} \leq N_{A_0B_0} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_1B_1} + P_{A_0B_0B_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_1} + Q_{A_0A_1B_0} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B_1}.$$