

The state of a quantum system is not a complete description for retrodiction

Mingxuan Liu,¹ Ge Bai,^{1,2,*} and Valerio Scarani^{1,3}

¹Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, 117543 Singapore, Singapore

²Thrust of Artificial Intelligence, Information Hub,

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

³Department of Physics, National University of Singapore, 2 Science Drive 3, Singapore 117542

(Dated: February 17, 2025)

A mixed quantum state can be taken as capturing an unspecified form of ignorance; or as describing the lack of knowledge about the true pure state of the system (“proper mixture”); or as arising from entanglement with another system that has been disregarded (“improper mixture”). These different views yield identical density matrices and therefore identical predictions for future measurements. But when used as prior beliefs for inferring the past state from later observations (“retrodiction”), they lead to different updated beliefs. This is a purely quantum feature of Bayesian agency. Based on this observation, we establish a framework for retrodicting on any quantum belief and we prove a necessary and sufficient condition for the equivalence of beliefs. We also illustrate how these differences have operational consequences in quantum state recovery.

Introduction—Mixed states describe incomplete knowledge of the system S under study. The missing pieces of information are also physical, and can be described as a system R , correlated with S but to which the agent does not have access. In classical physics, these correlations can always be interpreted as introducing a label: the system S is in one among several possible pure states, but we ignore which one. In quantum physics, there is another possibility: the systems S and R may be entangled, and the joint system may even be in a pure state. D’Espagnat named these two possibilities proper mixtures and improper mixtures, respectively [1].

Despite their distinct interpretations, proper and improper mixtures are usually thought to be indistinguishable [2–4]: both are represented by identical density matrices and therefore yield the same *predictions* for quantum measurements. This indistinguishability has led some to view the distinction as purely interpretative (“going to the Church of the Larger Hilbert Spaces”, as allegedly first quipped by John Smolin), with no operational consequences. However, things become subtle when considering *retrodiction*: inference about the past based on current knowledge, here specifically past state inference [5–7], and recovery of irreversible processes [8–14]. The common tool for retrodiction is Bayes’ rule, for which several quantum extensions have been proposed [15–27]. Essentially, Bayes’ rule is a belief update, and it requires the agent to choose a prior belief about the initial state of the system.

In this Letter, we show that proper and improper mixtures serve as different prior beliefs for quantum state retrodiction. Such a difference is a purely quantum feature, due to the aforementioned possibility of having mixed knowledge about a subsystem while having maximal knowledge on the global system; and to the possibil-

ity of different preparations for the same mixture. Building on this observation, we then propose a unique approach for retrodicting with any quantum beliefs and identify equivalence relations between them. Our observation not only refreshes the conceptual understanding of quantum mixtures, but also demonstrates their operational significance in practice.

Distinction between proper and improper mixtures—We start with an example of one qubit. An agent describes the state prepared by a device as the maximally mixed state $\mathbb{1}/2$ (we don’t need to specify whether this description is an a priori belief, or arises through some form of tomography). This knowledge is compatible with several scenarios. Let us look at just two:

1. The device is designed to prepare only the states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$. The agent thus believes that, in each round, the state of the system is either $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$ with $1/2$ probability each, viewing the mixture as a *proper mixture*.
2. The device is an entanglement source that always outputs two qubits S and R , but the agent sees only qubit S . The agent believes that system to be half of a maximally entangled state $(|00\rangle_{SR} + |11\rangle_{SR})/\sqrt{2}$, viewing the mixed state of S as an *improper mixture*.

While these two choices of the agent do not affect any prediction, we turn our attention to retrodiction. Suppose the agent makes a measurement on the prepared state in the Pauli-Z eigenbasis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$, and wants to infer what has been prepared by the device. In case 1, if the outcome is $+1$ (or -1), the agent infers with certainty that the prepared state was $|0\rangle$ (or $|1\rangle$). By contrast, in case 2, no measurement outcome can modify the belief that the device prepares always a maximally entangled state, because this state is pure. If asked in what state the system S was, the agent

will answer $\mathbb{1}/2$ in every round, irrespective of the measurement outcome.

Thus the beliefs in a proper or improper mixture, though identical for all predictions, lead to different updates of our knowledge about the past. That this must be the case follows from the conjunction of two well-known statements. On the one hand, from quantum theory, the purification principle [28–30] states that every mixed state of system S can be seen as the marginal of a pure joint state of S with another system R . On the other hand, a tenet of Bayesian inference [31–33] is that certainty is immune to updates: no amount of evidence can alter a belief of maximal information (classically, an event with prior probability one). From these, our main observation follows: if a mixture is of unknown origin or is believed to be a proper mixture, the agent admits an element of ignorance that could be updated by further evidence; if the agent’s belief is a pure state (albeit involving a system they may know nothing about), this is maximal information and cannot be modified by any further evidence.

This observation holds for any formulation of the quantum Bayes’ rule, since it only requires the property that certainty is immune to updates. In the following, we focus on a specific formulation of quantum Bayes’ rule, the Petz map (also known as Petz transpose map and Petz recovery map) [34, 35], which adheres to a set of axioms similar to the classical Bayes’ rule [27].

Formulation of quantum beliefs—We denote by $S(\mathcal{H})$ the set of density matrices on Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . All quantum processes can be described by completely positive trace-preserving (CPTP) maps.

As a generalization of Bayes’ rule, the Petz map is a rule for updating quantum beliefs, which are described by density operators. For a process \mathcal{E} from system S to system T , the agent chooses an initial belief $\beta_S \in S(\mathcal{H}_S)$. After obtaining the output state $\sigma \in S(\mathcal{H}_T)$, the Petz map produces the updated belief about S [34, 35]

$$\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{E},\beta_S}(\sigma) := \sqrt{\beta_S} \mathcal{E}^\dagger \left(\mathcal{E}(\beta_S)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma \mathcal{E}(\beta_S)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \sqrt{\beta_S} \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{E}^\dagger is the adjoint map of \mathcal{E} defined by the unique linear map satisfying $\text{Tr}[\mathcal{E}(X)^\dagger Y] = \text{Tr}[X^\dagger \mathcal{E}^\dagger(Y)]$, for all operators X and Y .

This is the conventional definition of belief update when the quantum Bayes’ rule given by the Petz map. Since it depends on the prior belief on the system alone, it is clearly unable to distinguish the two cases discussed above, since the density matrix of the system is the same in both cases. For that, we need to incorporate possible correlations, classical or quantum, to the description of the be-

lief. Thus, we describe our prior belief as a joint state β on S and an additional system R . We still work under the assumption that only the output of the process \mathcal{E} acting on S is available to the agent, while system R is hidden. Thus, the complete process is described as $(\mathcal{E} \otimes \text{id}) \circ \text{Tr}_R \equiv \mathcal{E} \otimes \text{Tr}$. The resulting belief update on the joint system is then described by the *prior-extended Petz map* $\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{E} \otimes \text{Tr}, \beta}$. The updated belief induced on the system S alone then follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{\text{ext}}^{\mathcal{E},\beta}(\sigma) &:= (\text{Tr}_R \circ \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{E} \otimes \text{Tr}, \beta})(\sigma) \\ &= \text{Tr}_R \left[\sqrt{\beta} \left(\mathcal{E}^\dagger(\mathcal{E}(\beta_S)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma \mathcal{E}(\beta_S)^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \otimes \mathbf{1}_R \right) \sqrt{\beta} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\beta_S := \text{Tr}_R[\beta]$. We will adopt the definition introduced here as the *retrodiction map* throughout the remainder of the paper. The original case Eq. (1) is recovered when the belief features no correlation between S and R , i.e. for $\beta = \beta_S \otimes \beta_R$ (the system R becomes then irrelevant for retrodicting on S).

Let us now first revisit our earlier examples of a proper and an improper mixtures using these tools. The measurement in the $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ basis can be written as a CPTP map from system S to a classical system as

$$\mathcal{E}_{0/1}(\rho) := \langle 0|\rho|0\rangle |0\rangle\langle 0| + \langle 1|\rho|1\rangle |1\rangle\langle 1|, \quad (3)$$

where $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ is a basis of the classical system. A distinction arises when choosing the belief for retrodicting $\mathcal{E}_{0/1}$ as a proper or improper mixture. For the case 1 of a proper mixture, since the device prepares either $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$, the randomness in the device can be modeled as a perfect coin: the device flips a coin and prepares either $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ according to the outcome. Therefore, we choose the belief as

$$\beta_1 := \frac{1}{2} |0\rangle\langle 0|_S \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_{R_1} + \frac{1}{2} |1\rangle\langle 1|_S \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_{R_1} \quad (4)$$

where R_1 is a classical system that represents the internal coin of the device, which is hidden from the agent. We use the notation $|0\rangle_{R_1}, |1\rangle_{R_1}$ to emphasize the additional system is classical. Our retrodiction map then yields the belief update

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{ext}}^{\mathcal{E}_{0/1}, \beta_1}(|0\rangle\langle 0|) = |0\rangle\langle 0|, \quad \mathcal{R}_{\text{ext}}^{\mathcal{E}_{0/1}, \beta_1}(|1\rangle\langle 1|) = |1\rangle\langle 1|, \quad (5)$$

which matches our earlier discussion. On the other hand, in the case 2 of the improper mixture, the prior belief is described by the entangled state

$$\beta_2 := |\Phi^+\rangle\langle \Phi^+|_{SR_2}, \quad |\Phi^+\rangle := \frac{|00\rangle + |11\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \quad (6)$$

The prior-extended Petz map returns the same state, since it is a pure state; consequently, our

Initial belief	Measure 0/1		Measure +/-	
	0	1	+	-
No extra system β_S	$ 0\rangle\langle 0 $	$ 1\rangle\langle 1 $	$ +\rangle\langle + $	$ -\rangle\langle - $
$\{ 0\rangle, 1\rangle\}$ ensemble β_1	$ 0\rangle\langle 0 $	$ 1\rangle\langle 1 $	$\mathbb{1}_S/2$	$\mathbb{1}_S/2$
Improper mixture β_2	$\mathbb{1}_S/2$	$\mathbb{1}_S/2$	$\mathbb{1}_S/2$	$\mathbb{1}_S/2$
Haar random β_{Haar}	$\frac{ 0\rangle\langle 0 + \mathbb{1}}{3}$	$\frac{ 1\rangle\langle 1 + \mathbb{1}}{3}$	$\frac{ +\rangle\langle + + \mathbb{1}}{3}$	$\frac{ -\rangle\langle - + \mathbb{1}}{3}$

TABLE I: Comparison of updated beliefs on system S after measurements among different initial beliefs. In all cases, the marginal state of the belief on system S is the same: $\beta_S = \text{Tr}_{R_1}[\beta_1] = \text{Tr}_{R_2}[\beta_2] = \text{Tr}_R[\beta_{\text{Haar}}] := \mathbb{1}/2$. The prior belief on the system alone is updated to the state revealed by the measurement, for all measurements. By contrast, the proper mixture β_1 (4) is always updated to a state diagonal in the basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$. The improper mixture β_2 (6) is not updated because it arises from a pure state, i.e. from certainty. Update for prior β_{Haar} (10) shows some bias towards the outcome of the measurement.

retrodition map maps all outcomes back to the initial belief:

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{ext}}^{\mathcal{E}_{0/1}, \beta_2}(|0\rangle\langle 0|) = \mathcal{R}_{\text{ext}}^{\mathcal{E}_{0/1}, \beta_2}(|1\rangle\langle 1|) = \frac{\mathbb{1}}{2} \quad (7)$$

We stress again that the fact that a pure state cannot be updated is common to classical and quantum information. What is purely quantum is the fact that this induces no update also for a mixed state, the state of the subsystem under study.

Finally, having an explicit form of the quantum Bayes' rule, we can also discuss another choice of prior belief: the choice of not caring how the ignorance came about and taking the density matrix at face value—in practice here, using $\beta_S := \mathbb{1}_S/2$ as prior into the original Petz map. This belief behaves as β_1 for the $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ measurement, but would be inequivalent if other measurements were considered, for instance that on the Pauli-X eigenbasis $\{|+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$. The examples are summarized in Table I, together with a fourth one that we'll introduce later.

Equivalence between quantum beliefs—The examples above reveal a structure of quantum beliefs, not restricted to density matrices on the system of interest, but involving an additional latent system that could be classical or quantum. For example, an arbitrary pure state ensemble $\{|\psi_x\rangle, p(x)\}$ that averages to the desired density matrix of system S (see Ref. [2] for a classification of such ensembles), or even an interpolation between proper and improper beliefs. Other than enumerating various categories of beliefs, we would like a clear identification: what are the possible beliefs that leads to inequivalent retrodictions? The following theorem, whose proof is in Supplemental

Material [36], answers this question by giving the equivalence condition between quantum beliefs.

Definition 1. β and γ are equivalent beliefs if they give the same retrodition map for all channels, namely $\mathcal{R}_{\text{ext}}^{\mathcal{E}, \beta} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{ext}}^{\mathcal{E}, \gamma}$ for all CPTP map \mathcal{E} .

Theorem 1. For channels from \mathcal{H}_S to \mathcal{H}_T , two beliefs $\beta \in S(\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_{R_1})$ and $\gamma \in S(\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_{R_2})$ are equivalent if and only if

$$\text{Tr}_{R_1 R'_1} \left[\left| \sqrt{\beta} \right\rangle\left\langle \sqrt{\beta} \right| \right] = \text{Tr}_{R_2 R'_2} \left[\left| \sqrt{\gamma} \right\rangle\left\langle \sqrt{\gamma} \right| \right] \quad (8)$$

where the double-ket notation is defined as $|A\rangle := \sum_{i,j,k,l} \langle i, j |_{SR} A |k, l\rangle_{SR} |i, j, k, l\rangle_{SR' R'}$, with systems S' and R' being isomorphic to S and R , respectively.

Notice that $\beta_S = \gamma_S$ is expected (after all, equivalent beliefs should lead to equivalent predictions), but we had not imposed it as a constraint in the definition: it follows from the theorem as a necessary condition. Some sufficient conditions for equivalence are:

1. $\beta \in S(\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_{R_1})$ and $\beta \otimes \sigma \in S(\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_{R_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{R_2})$ are equivalent beliefs for any $\sigma \in S(\mathcal{H}_{R_2})$.
2. For any isometry $V : \mathcal{H}_{R_1} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{R_2}$, $\beta \in S(\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_{R_1})$ and $(\mathbb{1}_S \otimes V)\beta(\mathbb{1}_S \otimes V^\dagger) \in S(\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_{R_2})$ are equivalent beliefs.
3. More generally, let \mathcal{P} be a reversible channel acting on system R , i.e. there exists a CPTP map \mathcal{Q} such that $\mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{I}_R$, the identity map on system R . Then, β and $(\mathcal{I}_S \otimes \mathcal{P})(\beta)$ are equivalent beliefs.

Condition 1 states that considering an uncorrelated additional system does not affect one's retrodition as one would expect. Condition 2 states that quantum belief is invariant under a local isometry on its reference system, which indicates that an improper mixture represents a certain quantum belief regardless of which purification is chosen. Condition 3 is the combination of the former two, because every reversible channel can be decomposed into a tensor product with an additional system followed by an isometry [37].

A proper mixture is described by giving a state ensemble $\{|\psi_x\rangle, p(x)\}$. It corresponds to the belief that the state is in $|\psi_x\rangle$ with confidence $p(x)$. This can be described by the joint state $\beta = \sum_x p(x) |\psi_x\rangle\langle \psi_x|_S \otimes |x\rangle\langle x|_R$, where $\{|x\rangle\}$ is an orthonormal basis of a classical system R . For this class of beliefs, the equivalence condition given by Theorem 1 leads to the following result.

Corollary 1. *Two pure state ensembles $\{|\psi_x\rangle, p(x)\}$ and $\{|\phi_y\rangle, q(y)\}$ are equivalent beliefs if and only if their second moments are equal, namely*

$$\sum_x p(x) |\psi_x\rangle\langle\psi_x|^{\otimes 2} = \sum_y q(y) |\phi_y\rangle\langle\phi_y|^{\otimes 2}. \quad (9)$$

See Supplemental Material [36] for its proof and generalization to ensembles of mixed states. As an example of this corollary, the following ensembles are shown to be equivalent:

1. Haar-random distribution over pure qubit states:

$$\beta_{\text{Haar}} := \int_{\text{Haar}} d\psi |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_S \otimes |\underline{\psi}\rangle\langle\underline{\psi}|_R, \quad (10)$$

where the integral is over the Haar measure and $\{|\underline{\psi}\rangle\}$ is an orthonormal basis for the infinite dimensional classical system R , satisfying $\langle\underline{\psi}|\underline{\psi}'\rangle = 0$ as soon as $|\psi\rangle \neq |\psi'\rangle$.

2. The pure state ensemble consisting of eigenstates of the three Pauli matrices with uniform probability: $\beta_{\text{XYZ}} := \frac{1}{6} \sum_{s \in \mathbf{P}} |s\rangle\langle s|_S \otimes |\underline{s}\rangle\langle\underline{s}|_R$ where $\mathbf{P} := \{0, 1, +, -, +i, -i\}$.

This is because the set $\{|s\rangle\langle s|\}_{s \in \mathbf{P}}$ with uniform probability is a projective 2-design and thus satisfies [38, 39]

$$\int_{\text{Haar}} d\psi |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \otimes |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| = \frac{1}{6} \sum_{s \in \mathbf{P}} |s\rangle\langle s| \otimes |s\rangle\langle s|, \quad (11)$$

which is Eq. (9) applied to ρ_{Haar} and ρ_{XYZ} . The same conclusion naturally generalizes to other projective 2-designs. The resulting updated beliefs after Pauli-Z or -X measurements are listed in Table I.

Consequences—We have shown the distinction between proper and improper mixture in quantum retrodiction. This distinction between proper and improper mixtures is a unique quantum feature: classically, all mixtures are proper, and the consideration of a system alone, or being correlated with another system, makes no difference for Bayesian retrodiction [36]. Note that quantum retrodiction sometimes also refers to parameter estimation [40–42]: fundamentally, this is a combination of the *predictive* formalism of quantum mechanics with classical Bayes’ theorem; hence, our findings do not alter any results in this branch.

More generally, different results in retrodiction demonstrated in this Letter rely on different subjective understandings of quantum mixtures. A pragmatist may take our observation as yet another discussion about foundations that has no practical consequence. However, they may lead

to differences in *action*, notably when retrodiction is used as a recovery channel after dissipation [8–12]. A notable feature of the Petz map is that it is always CPTP, and thus can be implemented deterministically [43, 44], with applications to error correction [8, 13, 14] and reversing dissipative dynamics [45, 46]. Depending on the application, there is not a unique way to choose the prior belief for the Petz map, and according to our results, a wider range of beliefs involving an additional system may be considered. An example of recovering a depolarizing channel using different beliefs is shown in Fig. 1. Future work will aim to investigate the general effect of extended beliefs and the possible application of these results in various information recovery tasks.

Conclusion—We have observed that beliefs about how a mixture arises, indistinguishable from the predictive perspective, serve as fundamentally different priors for retrodiction in quantum information. This is due to purely quantum features: the fact that different preparations may lead to the same mixture, and the fact that a mixture can be even seen as the partial state of a joint pure state. In the latter case, strikingly, no later evidence can update the belief, since it is rooted in a state of maximal knowledge.

By extending quantum beliefs to include correlations with latent systems, we introduced the prior-extended Petz map and the corresponding retrodiction map on the system. We also formulated an equivalence condition for quantum beliefs. This study not only enriches the conceptual understanding of quantum mixtures, but also opens new avenues for exploring the role of subjective beliefs and agency in quantum information.

This project is supported by the National Research Foundation, Singapore through the National Quantum Office, hosted in A*STAR, under its Centre for Quantum Technologies Funding Initiative (S24Q2d0009). V.S. acknowledges support from the Ministry of Education, Singapore, under the Tier 2 grant “Bayesian approach to irreversibility” (Grant No. MOE-T2EP50123-0002).

* baige.research@outlook.com

- [1] B. d. Espagnat, *Conceptual foundations of quantum mechanics*, 2nd ed. (W. A. Benjamin, Advanced Book Program, Reading, Mass, 1976).
- [2] L. P. Hughston, R. Jozsa, and W. K. Wootters, A complete classification of quantum ensembles having a given density matrix, *Physics Letters A* **183**, 14 (1993).
- [3] K. Kirkpatrick, Indistinguishability and improper mixtures, arXiv preprint quant-ph/0109146 (2001).




FIG. 1: Comparison between different priors for recovering a depolarization error $\mathcal{D}(\rho) := 0.9\rho + 0.1\mathbb{1}/2$. The proper and improper mixtures chosen here are Eq. (4) and Eq. (6) respectively. In all cases, the marginal states of the belief on system S are the same: $\beta_S = \text{Tr}_{R_1}[\beta_1] = \text{Tr}_{R_2}[\beta_2] = \text{Tr}_R[\beta_{\text{Haar}}] := \mathbb{1}_S/2$. The figures show the intersection of the Bloch sphere with the x - z plane. The dashed line is the original Bloch sphere. The yellow line shows the transformed Bloch sphere after applying \mathcal{D} . The green line constitutes the recovered states $(\mathcal{R}_{\text{ext}}^{\mathcal{D},\beta} \circ \mathcal{D})(\rho)$. The red circles, green dots, yellow plus signs and blue minus signs represent the states $|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |+\rangle, |-\rangle$ as prepared, after the channel and after the recovery, respectively.

- [4] L. Castellani, All quantum mixtures are proper, *International Journal of Quantum Information* **21**, 2350019 (2023).
- [5] S. M. Barnett, D. T. Pegg, and J. Jeffers, Bayes' theorem and quantum retrodiction, *Journal of Modern Optics* **47**, 1779 (2000).
- [6] C. A. Fuchs, Quantum mechanics as quantum information (and only a little more) (2002), arXiv:quant-ph/0205039 [quant-ph].
- [7] I. Guevara and H. Wiseman, Quantum state smoothing, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 180407 (2015).
- [8] H. Barnum and E. Knill, Reversing quantum dynamics with near-optimal quantum and classical fidelity, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **43**, 2097 (2002).
- [9] D. Sutter, O. Fawzi, and R. Renner, Universal recovery map for approximate markov chains, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **472**, 20150623 (2016).
- [10] D. Sutter, M. Tomamichel, and A. W. Harrow, Strengthened monotonicity of relative entropy via pinched petz recovery map, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **62**, 2907 (2016).
- [11] H. Kwon, R. Mukherjee, and M. S. Kim, Reversing lindblad dynamics via continuous petz recovery map, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 020403 (2022).
- [12] M. Junge, R. Renner, D. Sutter, M. M. Wilde, and A. Winter, Universal recovery maps and approximate sufficiency of quantum relative entropy, *Annales Henri Poincaré* **19**, 2955 (2018).
- [13] G. Zheng, W. He, G. Lee, and L. Jiang, Near-optimal performance of quantum error correction codes, *Physical Review Letters* **132**, 250602 (2024).
- [14] D. Biswas, G. M. Vaidya, and P. Mandayam, Noise-adapted recovery circuits for quantum error correction, *Physical Review Research* **6**, 043034 (2024).
- [15] C. M. Caves, Quantum mechanics of measurements distributed in time: a path-integral formulation, *Physical Review D* **33**, 1643 (1986).
- [16] C. Gardiner and P. Zoller, *Quantum noise: a handbook of Markovian and non-Markovian quantum stochastic methods with applications to quantum optics* (Springer Science & Business Media, 2004).
- [17] G. Lüders, Concerning the state-change due to the measurement process, *Annalen der Physik* **518**, 663 (2006), reprint of [G. Lüders, *Ann. Phys. (Leipzig)* **8**, 322–328 (1951)]. Translation and discussion by K. A. Kirkpatrick.
- [18] M. Ozawa, Quantum state reduction and the quantum Bayes principle, in *Quantum Communication, Computing, and Measurement 2* (Kluwer/Plenum, 2000) pp. 233–241.
- [19] C. A. Fuchs, Quantum foundations in the light of quantum information, arXiv preprint quant-ph/0106166 (2001).
- [20] R. Schack, T. A. Brun, and C. M. Caves, Quantum Bayes rule, *Physical Review A* **64**, 014305 (2001).
- [21] M. K. Warmuth, A Bayes rule for density matrices, *Advances in neural information processing systems* **18** (2005).
- [22] M. S. Leifer and R. W. Spekkens, Towards a formulation of quantum theory as a causally neutral theory of bayesian inference, *Physical Review A* **88**, 052130 (2013).
- [23] J. Surace and M. Scandi, State retrieval beyond Bayes' retrodiction, arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.09899 (2022).
- [24] M. Tsang, Generalized conditional expectations for quantum retrodiction and smoothing, *Physical Review A* **105**, 042213 (2022).
- [25] A. J. Parzygnat and B. P. Russo, A non-commutative Bayes' theorem, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **644**, 28 (2022).
- [26] A. J. Parzygnat and J. Fullwood, From time-reversal symmetry to quantum bayes' rules, *PRX Quantum* **4**, 020334 (2023).
- [27] A. J. Parzygnat and F. Buscemi, Axioms for retrodiction: achieving time-reversal symmetry with a prior, *Quantum* **7**, 1013 (2023).

- [28] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Probabilistic theories with purification, *Physical Review A—Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics* **81**, 062348 (2010).
- [29] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Informational derivation of quantum theory, *Physical Review A—Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics* **84**, 012311 (2011).
- [30] G. M. D’Ariano, G. Chiribella, and P. Perinotti, *Quantum theory from first principles: an informational approach* (Cambridge University Press, 2017).
- [31] J. Pearl, *Probabilistic reasoning in intelligent systems: networks of plausible inference* (Morgan Kaufmann, 1988).
- [32] R. Jeffrey, *The logic of decision* (McGraw-Hill, 1965).
- [33] E. T. Jaynes, *Probability Theory: The Logic of Science* (Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- [34] D. Petz, Sufficient subalgebras and the relative entropy of states of a von Neumann algebra, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **105**, 123 (1986).
- [35] D. Petz, Sufficiency of channels over von Neumann algebras, *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics* **39**, 97 (1988).
- [36] See the Supplementary Material for details.
- [37] M. E. Shirokov, Reversibility conditions for quantum channels and their applications, *Sbornik: Mathematics* **204**, 1215 (2013).
- [38] Mutually unbiased bases are complex projective 2-designs, in *Proceedings. International Symposium on Information Theory, 2005. ISIT 2005.* (IEEE, 2005) pp. 1740–1744.
- [39] A. Ambainis and J. Emerson, Quantum t-designs: t-wise independence in the quantum world, in *Twenty-Second Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity (CCC’07)* (IEEE, 2007) pp. 129–140.
- [40] S. M. Barnett, D. T. Pegg, J. Jeffers, and O. Jedrkiewicz, Master equation for retrodiction of quantum communication signals, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 2455 (2001).
- [41] A. Chefles and M. Sasaki, Retrodiction of generalized measurement outcomes, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 032112 (2003).
- [42] S. Gammelmark, B. Julsgaard, and K. Mølmer, Past quantum states of a monitored system, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 160401 (2013).
- [43] M. Wilde, Recoverability in quantum information theory, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* **471**, 20150338 (2015).
- [44] A. Gilyén, S. Lloyd, I. Marvian, Y. Quek, and M. M. Wilde, Quantum algorithm for petz recovery channels and pretty good measurements (2020), arXiv:2006.16924 [quant-ph].
- [45] H. Kwon and M. S. Kim, Fluctuation theorems for a quantum channel, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 031029 (2019).
- [46] F. Buscemi and V. Scarani, Fluctuation theorems from bayesian retrodiction, *Phys. Rev. E* **103**, 052111 (2021).
- [47] H. Chan and A. Darwiche, On the revision of probabilistic beliefs using uncertain evidence, *Artificial Intelligence* **163**, 67 (2005).

Proof of retrodictive equivalence for classical extended priors

In classical Bayesian inference, correlation between prior belief of the system S and other system R does not affect retrodiction. This can be observed by the assuming all the operators in Eq. (2) commute, or can be understood with classical Bayes' rule.

Consider a prior belief $\gamma(a)$ defined solely on the system S , and a forward process with transition probabilities from a to b being $\varphi(b|a)$. For an observation $b = b_0$, the Bayes' rule gives the probability

$$q_1(a|b_0) = \frac{\varphi(b_0|a)\gamma(a)}{\sum_{a'} \varphi(b_0|a')\gamma(a')} \quad (12)$$

To match the quantum reverse process, here we use a generalization of the Bayes' rule when the observation on b_0 is not given by a single value, but a soft evidence $r(b)$, which is a probability distribution. The posterior probability of system S is given by [31, 32, 47]:

$$q_1(a) = \sum_b \frac{\varphi(b|a)\gamma(a)}{\sum_{a'} \varphi(b|a')\gamma(a')} r(b) \quad (13)$$

Now, consider another prior belief $\gamma(a, c)$ that is a joint distribution over the systems S and R . Since the value of b depends only on a , after incorporating the value c of system R , the forward transition probabilities are $\Phi(b|a, c) = \varphi(b|a)$. The posterior distribution is then:

$$\begin{aligned} q_2(a, c) &= \sum_b \frac{\Phi(b|a, c)\gamma(a, c)}{\sum_{a', c'} \Phi(b|a', c')\gamma(a', c')} p(b) \\ &= \sum_b \frac{\varphi(b|a)\gamma(a, c)}{\sum_{a', c'} \varphi(b|a')\gamma(a', c')} p(b) \\ &= \sum_b \frac{\varphi(b|a)\gamma(a, c)}{\sum_{a'} \varphi(b|a')\gamma(a')} p(b) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

By summing over c , it is evident that

$$q_2(a) = \sum_c q_2(a, c) = q_1(a) \quad (15)$$

Thus, any extended prior belief $\gamma(a, c)$, which includes correlations with an auxiliary system R , yields the same retrodictive outcome as the marginal prior $\gamma(a)$ defined solely on S .

Equivalence condition for quantum beliefs

Proof of Theorem 1. We first prove the necessity: if β and γ are equivalent, then Eq. (8) holds.

Take an informationally complete POVM $\{F_k\}_{k=1}^{d_S^2}$ in system S . Take the following set of channels:

$$\mathcal{E}_0(\rho) := \text{Tr}[\rho] \mathbb{1}_T / d_T \quad (16)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_k(\rho) := \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[\rho] \mathbb{1}_T / d_T + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[F_k \rho] |0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[(\mathbb{1}_S - F_k)\rho] |1\rangle\langle 1| \quad (17)$$

where $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$ are two perfectly distinguishable states in system T . These channels have the property that $\mathcal{E}_k(\rho)$ is full-rank for any k and ρ .

Since β and γ are equivalent, they should give the same Petz map for any channel \mathcal{E}_k . From Eq. (2), that is to say, for any Hermitian operator σ ,

$$\text{Tr}_{R_1} \left[\sqrt{\beta} \left(\mathcal{E}_k^\dagger \left(\mathcal{E}_k(\beta_S)^{-1/2} \sigma \mathcal{E}_k(\beta_S)^{-1/2} \right) \otimes \mathbb{1}_{R_1} \right) \sqrt{\beta} \right] = \text{Tr}_{R_2} \left[\sqrt{\gamma} \left(\mathcal{E}_k^\dagger \left(\mathcal{E}_k(\gamma_S)^{-1/2} \sigma \mathcal{E}_k(\gamma_S)^{-1/2} \right) \otimes \mathbb{1}_{R_2} \right) \sqrt{\gamma} \right] \quad (18)$$

Notice that $\mathcal{E}_0^\dagger(\tau) = \text{Tr}[\tau] \mathbb{1}_S / d_T$, so for $k = 0$ and $\text{Tr}[\sigma] \neq 0$, the above equation gives

$$\text{Tr}[\sigma] \text{Tr}_{R_1}[\beta] = \text{Tr}[\sigma] \text{Tr}_{R_2}[\gamma] \quad (19)$$

which implies $\beta_S = \gamma_S$. For $k = 1, \dots, d_S^2$, consider Eq. (18) taking $\sigma = \mathcal{E}_k(\beta_S)^{1/2} |0\rangle\langle 0| \mathcal{E}_k(\beta_S)^{1/2}$:

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{R_1} \left[\sqrt{\beta} \left(\mathcal{E}_k^\dagger (|0\rangle\langle 0|) \otimes \mathbb{1}_{R_1} \right) \sqrt{\beta} \right] = \mathrm{Tr}_{R_2} \left[\sqrt{\gamma} \left(\mathcal{E}_k^\dagger (|0\rangle\langle 0|) \otimes \mathbb{1}_{R_2} \right) \sqrt{\gamma} \right] \quad (20)$$

Since $\mathcal{E}_k^\dagger (|0\rangle\langle 0|) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}_S/d_T + \frac{1}{2} F_k$, and by $\beta_S = \gamma_S$,

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{R_1} \left[\sqrt{\beta} (F_k \otimes \mathbb{1}_{R_1}) \sqrt{\beta} \right] = \mathrm{Tr}_{R_2} \left[\sqrt{\gamma} (F_k \otimes \mathbb{1}_{R_2}) \sqrt{\gamma} \right] \quad (21)$$

Since $\{F_k\}$ is informationally complete, for any i, j , there exist scalars c_{ijk} satisfying $|i\rangle\langle j| = \sum_k c_{ijk} F_k$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{i,j} \mathrm{Tr}_{R_1} \left[\sqrt{\beta} (|i\rangle\langle j| \otimes \mathbb{1}_{R_1}) \sqrt{\beta} \right] \otimes |i\rangle\langle j|_{S'} = \sum_{i,j} \mathrm{Tr}_{R_2} \left[\sqrt{\gamma} (|i\rangle\langle j| \otimes \mathbb{1}_{R_2}) \sqrt{\gamma} \right] \otimes |i\rangle\langle j|_{S'} \quad (22)$$

This equation is equivalent to Eq. (8). To show this, note the left hand side of Eq. (8) is

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{R_1 R_1'} \left[\left| \sqrt{\beta} \right\rangle\right\rangle \left\langle\left\langle \sqrt{\beta} \right| \right] = \sum_{i,j,k,l,i',k'} \langle i, j | \sqrt{\beta} |k, l\rangle \left(\langle i', j | \sqrt{\beta} |k', l\rangle \right)^* |i, k\rangle\langle i', k'|_{S S'} \quad (23)$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,l,i',k'} \langle i, j | \sqrt{\beta} |k, l\rangle \langle k', l | \sqrt{\beta} |i', j\rangle |i, k\rangle\langle i', k'|_{S S'} \quad (24)$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,i',k'} \langle i, j | \sqrt{\beta} (|k\rangle\langle k'| \otimes \mathbb{1}_{R_1}) \sqrt{\beta} |i', j\rangle |i, k\rangle\langle i', k'|_{S S'} \quad (25)$$

$$= \sum_{i,j,k,i',k'} (|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \langle j |) \sqrt{\beta} (|k\rangle\langle k'| \otimes \mathbb{1}_{R_1}) \sqrt{\beta} (|i'\rangle\langle i'| \otimes |j\rangle) \otimes |k\rangle\langle k'|_{S S'} \quad (26)$$

$$= \sum_{k,k'} \mathrm{Tr}_{R_1} \left[\sqrt{\beta} (|k\rangle\langle k'| \otimes \mathbb{1}_{R_1}) \sqrt{\beta} \right] \otimes |k\rangle\langle k'|_{S S'} \quad (27)$$

which is equal to the left hand side of Eq. (22). Similarly, the right hand sides of Eq. (8) and Eq. (22) are equal, too. Therefore, Eqs. (8) and (22) are equivalent, and we have proved the necessity.

Next, we show the sufficiency: if Eq. (8) holds, then β and γ are equivalent.

First, taking the partial trace over S' in both sides of Eq. (8), we obtain $\beta_S = \gamma_S$.

Second, Eq. (8) implies Eq. (22), which further implies that for any operator F , one has

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{R_1} \left[\sqrt{\beta} (F \otimes \mathbb{1}_{R_1}) \sqrt{\beta} \right] = \mathrm{Tr}_{R_2} \left[\sqrt{\gamma} (F \otimes \mathbb{1}_{R_2}) \sqrt{\gamma} \right] \quad (28)$$

Third, for any given channel \mathcal{E} from S to T and any state $\sigma \in S(\mathcal{H}_T)$, let $F = \mathcal{E}^\dagger (\mathcal{E}(\beta_S)^{-1/2} \sigma \mathcal{E}(\beta_S)^{-1/2}) = \mathcal{E}^\dagger (\mathcal{E}(\gamma_S)^{-1/2} \sigma \mathcal{E}(\gamma_S)^{-1/2})$, then Eq. (28) gives

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{R_1} \left[\sqrt{\beta} \left(\mathcal{E}^\dagger \left(\mathcal{E}(\beta_S)^{-1/2} \sigma \mathcal{E}(\beta_S)^{-1/2} \right) \otimes \mathbb{1}_{R_1} \right) \sqrt{\beta} \right] = \mathrm{Tr}_{R_2} \left[\sqrt{\gamma} \left(\mathcal{E}^\dagger \left(\mathcal{E}(\gamma_S)^{-1/2} \sigma \mathcal{E}(\gamma_S)^{-1/2} \right) \otimes \mathbb{1}_{R_2} \right) \sqrt{\gamma} \right] \quad (29)$$

Eq. (29) holding for any \mathcal{E} and σ indicates that β and γ are equivalent quantum beliefs. \square

Equivalence condition for ensembles of states

Here, we consider a generalization to ensembles of possibly mixed states, such as $\{\rho_x, p(x)\}$ with ρ_x having confidence $p(x)$. This may be described by the joint state $\beta = \sum_x p(x) \rho_x \otimes |x\rangle\langle x|_R$, where $\{|x\rangle\}$ is an orthonormal basis of classical system R . The equivalence condition between such beliefs is the following.

Corollary 2. *Two ensembles $\{\rho_x, p(x)\}$ and $\{\sigma_y, q(y)\}$ are equivalent beliefs if and only if*

$$\sum_x p(x) \sqrt{\rho_x} \otimes \sqrt{\rho_x} = \sum_y q(y) \sqrt{\sigma_y} \otimes \sqrt{\sigma_y} \quad (30)$$

Proof. The two beliefs are represented by the joint states

$$\beta_1 := \sum_x p(x) \rho_x \otimes |\underline{x}\rangle\langle\underline{x}|_{R_1}, \quad \beta_2 := \sum_y q(y) \sigma_y \otimes |\underline{y}\rangle\langle\underline{y}|_{R_2} \quad (31)$$

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{R_1 R'_1} \left[\left| \sqrt{\beta_1} \right\rangle\right\rangle \left\langle\left\langle \sqrt{\beta_1} \right| \right] = \mathrm{Tr}_{R_1 R'_1} \left[\sum_{x, x'} \left| \sqrt{p(x)} \sqrt{\rho_x} \otimes |\underline{x}\rangle\langle\underline{x}|_{R_1} \right\rangle\right\rangle \left\langle\left\langle \sqrt{p(x')} \sqrt{\rho_{x'}} \otimes |\underline{x}'\rangle\langle\underline{x}'|_{R_1} \right| \right] \quad (32)$$

$$= \mathrm{Tr}_{R_1 R'_1} \left[\sum_{x, x'} \sqrt{p(x)p(x')} |\sqrt{\rho_x}\rangle \langle\sqrt{\rho_{x'}}| \otimes |\underline{x}\rangle_{R_1 R'_1} \langle\underline{x}'|_{R_1 R'_1} \right] \quad (33)$$

$$= \sum_{x, x'} \sqrt{p(x)p(x')} |\sqrt{\rho_x}\rangle \langle\sqrt{\rho_{x'}}| \delta_{xx'} \quad (34)$$

$$= \sum_x p(x) |\sqrt{\rho_x}\rangle \langle\sqrt{\rho_x}| \quad (35)$$

Similarly,

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{R_2 R'_2} \left[\left| \sqrt{\beta_2} \right\rangle\right\rangle \left\langle\left\langle \sqrt{\beta_2} \right| \right] = \sum_y q(y) |\sqrt{\sigma_y}\rangle \langle\sqrt{\sigma_y}|. \quad (36)$$

The equivalence condition in Theorem 1 is therefore equivalent to

$$\sum_x p(x) |\sqrt{\rho_x}\rangle \langle\sqrt{\rho_x}| = \sum_y q(y) |\sqrt{\sigma_y}\rangle \langle\sqrt{\sigma_y}| \quad (37)$$

$$\iff \sum_x p(x) \sqrt{\rho_x} \otimes \sqrt{\rho_x}^T = \sum_y q(y) \sqrt{\sigma_y} \otimes \sqrt{\sigma_y}^T \quad (38)$$

$$\iff \sum_x p(x) \sqrt{\rho_x} \otimes \sqrt{\rho_x} = \sum_y q(y) \sqrt{\sigma_y} \otimes \sqrt{\sigma_y} \quad (39)$$

which is Eq. (30). □

Taking $\rho_x = |\psi_x\rangle\langle\psi_x|$ and $\sigma_y = |\phi_y\rangle\langle\phi_y|$ in Corollary 2 gives Corollary 1.