

# Quantum Incompatibility in Parallel vs Antiparallel Spins

Ram Krishna Patra,<sup>1</sup> Kunika Agarwal,<sup>1</sup> Biswajit Paul,<sup>2</sup> Snehasish Roy Chowdhury,<sup>3</sup> Sahil Gopalkrishna Naik,<sup>1</sup> and Manik Banik<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics of Complex Systems, S. N. Bose National Center for Basic Sciences,  
Block JD, Sector III, Salt Lake, Kolkata 700106, India.*

<sup>2</sup>*Department Of Mathematics, Balagarh Bijoy Krishna Mahavidyalaya, Balagarh, Hooghly-712501, West Bengal, India.*

<sup>3</sup>*Physics and Applied Mathematics Unit, 203 B.T. Road Indian Statistical Institute Kolkata, 700108, India.*

We investigate the joint measurability of incompatible quantum observables on ensembles of parallel and antiparallel spin pairs. In parallel configuration, two systems are identically prepared, whereas in antiparallel configuration each system is paired with its spin-flipped counterpart. We demonstrate that the antiparallel configuration enables exact simultaneous prediction of three mutually orthogonal spin components—an advantage unattainable in the parallel case. As we show, this enhanced measurement compatibility in antiparallel configuration is better explained within the framework of generalized probabilistic theories, which allow a broader class of composite structures while preserving quantum descriptions at the subsystem level. Furthermore, this approach extends the study of measurement incompatibility to more general configurations beyond just the parallel and antiparallel cases, providing deeper insights into the boundary between physical and unphysical quantum state evolutions. To this end, we discuss how the enhanced measurement compatibility in antiparallel configuration can be observed on a finite ensemble of qubit states, paving the way for an experimental demonstration of this advantage.

*Introduction.*—Bohr’s complementarity principle, a cornerstone of quantum theory, imposes fundamental limitation on simultaneous measurement of certain observables [1] (see [2] for the history). This is famously exemplified by the trade-off between path information and interference visibility in the double-slit experiment [3–5], as well as by the impossibility of jointly measuring non-commuting observables such as position and momentum, or spin components along different axes [6–8]. Development of generalized measurements, formalized via positive operator-valued measures (POVMs) [9], refined this understanding by demonstrating that incompatible observables can, in fact, be jointly measured—albeit with an inherent degree of fuzziness or imprecision [10–13]. Lately, measurement incompatibility has been shown to be intimately connected to other nonclassical phenomena, such as Bell nonlocality and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering [14–23].

Beyond its foundational significance, measurement incompatibility also plays a critical role in quantum technologies, underpinning key protocols in quantum key distribution, state discrimination, and randomness certification (see [13] and references therein). This recognition has motivated a deeper exploration of incompatibility, including scenarios involving multiple copies of a quantum system [24]. For instance, in a single-copy setting, unsharp spin observables along orthogonal directions become jointly measurable only below certain sharpness thresholds: for two observables along the  $x$  and  $y$  directions, the bound is  $\lambda \leq 1/\sqrt{2}$ , and for three observables along the  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $z$  directions, the bound is  $\lambda \leq 1/\sqrt{3}$  [25]. Remarkably, with access to two identical copies of the quantum state per experimental run, these bounds can be exceeded: joint measurability of three spin observables along three mutually orthogonal space directions becomes possible for sharpness values up to  $\sqrt{3}/2$  [24], enabled by the use of entangled effects in the joint POVM.

In this work, we investigate whether such enhancements persist—or can even be improved—when, instead of two identical

spin states (namely the parallel configuration), each experimental run involves one spin and its flipped counterpart (called the antiparallel configuration). Specifically, we ask: How does this change in configuration affect the joint measurability of three orthogonal spin observables? Are the sharpness thresholds preserved, improved, or degraded? This question is primarily motivated by the observation that the antiparallel spin configuration can outperform the parallel one in certain communication tasks [26]. As we demonstrate, a joint measurement device acting on antiparallel spin pairs can perfectly reproduce the statistics of spin measurements along the  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $z$  directions for all qubit states—surpassing what is achievable in the parallel case. We also analyze how this surprising enhancement of joint measurability can be naturally explained within generalized probabilistic theories (GPTs) framework [27] by considering the minimal tensor product structure for of qubits [28]. Moreover, extending beyond parallel and antiparallel configurations, this framework allows us to consider more general configurations of the form  $\rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes \Lambda(\rho_{\vec{m}})$ , where  $\Lambda$  is a generic positive trace-preserving (PTP) map. As we show, such configurations offer no advantage over the parallel case in enhancing the sharpness parameter for any set of spin observables, provided that  $\Lambda$  is a completely positive trace-preserving (CPTP) map. These findings reveal new facets of quantum incompatibility, shedding light on the subtle boundary between physical (CPTP) and unphysical (non-CP) quantum state evolutions [9, 29–32].

*Measurement compatibility of unsharp spin observables.*—State of a spin- $1/2$  particle is described by a qubit density operator  $\rho_{\vec{m}} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{1} + \vec{m} \cdot \vec{\sigma}) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ , where  $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{R}^3$  with  $|\vec{m}| \leq 1$ , and  $\vec{m} \cdot \vec{\sigma} := m_x \sigma_x + m_y \sigma_y + m_z \sigma_z$ . The state is pure when  $|\vec{m}| = 1$ , and mixed otherwise. A projective measurement of spin along direction  $\hat{n}$  is given by the two-outcome observable  $\sigma_{\hat{n}} \equiv \{P_{\hat{n}}^a = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{1} + a \hat{n} \cdot \vec{\sigma})\}$ , with outcomes  $a \in \{\pm 1\}$ . According to the Born rule, probability of obtaining the outcome ‘ $a$ ’ when measuring  $\rho_{\vec{m}}$  along

$\hat{n}$  is  $p(a|\vec{m}, \hat{n}) = \text{Tr}[\rho_{\vec{m}} P_{\hat{n}}^a] = \frac{1}{2}(1 + a \vec{m} \cdot \hat{n})$ . An unsharp version of this measurement is defined as  $\sigma_{\hat{n}, \lambda} \equiv \{P_{\hat{n}, \lambda}^a = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{1} + \lambda a \hat{n} \cdot \vec{\sigma})\}$ , where  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$  quantifies the measurement's sharpness in the sense that  $(1 + \lambda)/2$  amounts to the 'degree of reality' of the eigenvalues [25]. While  $\lambda = 1$  corresponds to a projective measurement,  $\lambda = 0$  represents a completely uninformative (i.e. random guess) measurement [25]. Although sharp spin observables along distinct directions are not jointly measurable, their unsharp counterparts can be jointly measurable for suitable values of  $\lambda$ .

**Definition 1** (Busch et al. [11]). *A set of unsharp spin observables  $\mathcal{S}_N := \{\sigma_{\hat{n}_j, \lambda}\}_{j=1}^N$  is jointly measurable if there exists a POVM  $\mathcal{G} \equiv \{\pi_{\vec{a}} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2) \mid \pi_{\vec{a}} \geq 0, \& \sum_{\vec{a}} \pi_{\vec{a}} = \mathbf{1}\}$ , with outcome strings  $\vec{a} = [a_1, \dots, a_N]$ , such that each observable appears as a marginal, i.e.  $P_{\hat{n}_j, \lambda}^{a_j} = \sum_{\vec{a} \setminus a_j} \pi_{\vec{a}}$  for all  $j$ , where  $\vec{a} \setminus a_j$  denotes summation over all components except  $a_j$ .*

$\mathcal{L}(\star)$  denotes the space of linear operators on the corresponding Hilbert space. It was shown in [25] that spin observables along the  $x$  and  $y$  directions are jointly measurable for  $\lambda \leq 1/\sqrt{2}$ , while joint measurability of three mutually orthogonal observables along  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $z$  holds for  $\lambda \leq 1/\sqrt{3}$ . For more general conditions on the joint measurability of pairs and triples of spin measurements along arbitrary directions, we refer the reader to [25] (see also [33–35] for related results).

*Measurement compatibility in multi-copy setting.*—Recently, Carmeli et al. [24] investigated the enhancement of measurement compatibility in a multi-copy setting, wherein the experimenter has access to multiple copies of a quantum state per measurement run. It is straightforward that any pair of incompatible observables becomes jointly measurable with perfect sharpness when two copies are available—simply by measuring each observable separately. The scenario becomes nontrivial when more than two observables are involved. For instance, given three observables but only two copies of the state, a naive strategy would be to measure one observable sharply on one copy and jointly measure the other two unsharply on the second. This, however, introduces an asymmetry favoring the first observable (see Fig. 1). However, Carmeli et al. showed that a more symmetric and efficient strategy is possible, one that exploits entangled across the copies while constructing the joint POVM. This motivates the following notion:

**Definition 2** (Carmeli et al. [24]). *The set of spin observables  $\mathcal{S}_N$  is said to be  $k$ -copy jointly measurable if there exists a POVM  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \equiv \{\tilde{\pi}_{\vec{a}} \in \mathcal{L}((\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes k}) \mid \tilde{\pi}_{\vec{a}} \geq 0 \& \sum_{\vec{a}} \tilde{\pi}_{\vec{a}} = \mathbf{1}^{\otimes k}\}$  on  $k$  copies of the system, such that for all states  $\rho_{\vec{m}}$  and all  $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ ,  $\text{Tr}[\rho_{\vec{m}} P_{\hat{n}_j, \lambda}^{a_j}] = \sum_{\vec{a} \setminus a_j} \text{Tr}[\rho_{\vec{m}}^{\otimes k} \tilde{\pi}_{\vec{a}}]$ .*

Notably, unsharp spin measurements along three orthogonal directions become jointly measurable on two copies for the sharpness values up-to  $\lambda = \sqrt{3}/2$  [24]. Denoting the spin observables along  $\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{z}$  as  $X, Y, Z$  respectively, the associated joint measurement is described by a POVM

$\mathcal{G}^\dagger \equiv \{\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\dagger \mid i, j, k \in \{\pm 1\}\}$ , with the effects given by

$$\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\dagger := \frac{1}{32} \left( 4 \mathbf{1}^{\otimes 2} + \sqrt{3} (i \{\{X, \mathbf{1}\}\} + j \{\{Y, \mathbf{1}\}\} + k \{\{Z, \mathbf{1}\}\}) + ij \{\{X, Y\}\} + jk \{\{Y, Z\}\} + ki \{\{Z, X\}\} \right), \quad (1)$$

where  $\{\{U, V\}\} := U \otimes V + V \otimes U$ . For a detailed treatment of multi-copy incompatibility and more analysis on their structures, we refer the reader to [24]. In the following, we rather proceed to the central contributions of the present work.

*Measurement compatibility in antiparallel spins.*—We start by investigating the maximum value of  $\lambda$  for which the statistics of  $X^\lambda, Y^\lambda$ , and  $Z^\lambda$  on  $\rho_{\vec{m}}$ , can be reproduced given two copies of the system in antiparallel configuration— $\rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes \rho_{-\vec{m}}$ , where  $\rho_{-\vec{m}} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{1} - \vec{m} \cdot \vec{\sigma})$ . At this point it is worth recalling a result by Gisin and Popescu [26], which depicts that antiparallel spins can encode more classical information than parallel ones. In the following we demonstrate that these two configurations also differ fundamentally in their joint measurability behavior.

**Theorem 1.** *The observables  $X^\lambda, Y^\lambda$ , and  $Z^\lambda$  are jointly measurable on antiparallel spin pairs for all  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the set of operators  $\{\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\dagger \mid i, j, k \in \{\pm 1\}\} \subset \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)$ , defined as

$$\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\dagger := \frac{1}{16} \left( 2 \mathbf{1}^{\otimes 2} + i \{\{X, \mathbf{1}\}\} + j \{\{Y, \mathbf{1}\}\} + k \{\{Z, \mathbf{1}\}\} - ij \{\{X, Y\}\} - jk \{\{Y, Z\}\} - ki \{\{Z, X\}\} \right), \quad (2)$$

where  $\{\{U, V\}\} := U \otimes V - V \otimes U$ . Each of the operators in Eq.(2) is positive and they sums to the identity, i.e.  $\sum_{i,j,k \in \{\pm 1\}} \Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\dagger = \mathbf{1}^{\otimes 2}$ , thereby forming a valid POVM  $\mathcal{G}^\dagger \equiv \{\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\dagger\}$ . Some interesting feature of this particular POVM is discussed in Appendix I. Acting on the antiparallel state  $\rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes \rho_{-\vec{m}}$ , we obtain  $\text{Tr}[\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\dagger (\rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes \rho_{-\vec{m}})] = \frac{1}{8} (1 + im_x + jm_y + km_z + ijm_x m_y + jkm_y m_z + kim_z m_x)$ . Now, summing over  $j, k$ , we get  $\sum_{j,k \in \{\pm 1\}} \text{Tr}[\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\dagger (\rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes \rho_{-\vec{m}})] = \frac{1}{2} (1 + im_x)$ , recovering the outcome probabilities for the projective measurement  $X$  on  $\rho_{\vec{m}}$ . Analogous results hold for  $Y$  and  $Z$ . Thus the sharp observables  $X, Y$ , and  $Z$  are jointly measurable on antiparallel spin pair, thus completing the proof. ■

As noted, leveraging entangled effects in multi-copy scenarios is crucial for extending the range of allowed sharpness values in both parallel and antiparallel cases. However, the superiority of the antiparallel configuration warrants a broader explanation. Here, the framework of GPTs offers valuable insight. Originally formulated in the 1960s [36–39] and recently revitalized [40–42], GPTs provide a unifying operational framework that characterizes physical theories via their allowed preparations, transformations, and measurements. A GPT also specify the composition rules constrained by no-signaling principle,




Figure 1. (Color online) Two-copy incompatibility of three unsharp Spin observables  $\{X^\lambda, Y^\lambda, Z^\lambda\}$ . (a) Naive strategy: Observable  $X^\lambda$  is measured on one copy with sharpness value  $\lambda = 1$  with red and blue bar respectively denoting the probability of outcomes  $+1$  &  $-1$  on the given state. The other two observables are jointly measured on the remaining copy with sharpness value  $\lambda = 1/\sqrt{2}$ , with blue (red) part in the red (blue) bar indicating the ‘unsharpness’ in the corresponding outcome. (b) Parallel configuration: All three observables can be jointly measured on two-copies with sharpness value  $\lambda = \sqrt{3}/2$ . (c) Antiparallel configuration: All three observables can be jointly measured with sharpness value  $\lambda = 1$ .

that prohibits any superluminal communication. Under the assumption of tomographic locality—where global states are fully specified by local measurements [43]—composite systems lie between the minimal and maximal tensor products [28]. Here, we recall the minimal tensor product construction for two qubits.

**Definition 3.** *In the minimal tensor product framework, the state space is given by the set of separable states:  $\text{StateSpace} = \text{Sep}(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2) \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)$ . The corresponding effect space consists of all operators  $\Pi \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)$  satisfying  $0 \leq \text{Tr}[\Pi\Omega] \leq 1$  for all  $\Omega \in \text{Sep}(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)$ .*

While the state space of minimal composition is restricted, the effect space is enlarged compared to standard quantum theory [44–48]. This asymmetry leads to enhanced compatibility for certain measurements, as shown below.

**Theorem 2.** *The observables  $X^\lambda, Y^\lambda$ , and  $Z^\lambda$  are 2-copy compatible for all  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$  in the minimal tensor product GPT.*

*Proof.* Consider the set of operators  $\{\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\# \mid i, j, k = \pm 1\} \subset \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)$ , defined as

$$\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\# := \frac{1}{16} \left( 2 \mathbf{1}^{\otimes 2} + i \{ \{ X, \mathbf{1} \} \} + j \{ \{ Y, \mathbf{1} \} \} + k \{ \{ Z, \mathbf{1} \} \} + ij \{ \{ X, Y \} \} + jk \{ \{ Y, Z \} \} + ki \{ \{ Z, X \} \} \right). \quad (3)$$

Although these operators are not positive and thus invalid in quantum theory, they are legitimate effects in the minimal composition GPT (see Appendix II). Furthermore, as they sum to the identity operator, i.e.  $\sum_{i,j,k} \Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\# = \mathbf{1}^{\otimes 2}$ , therefore the collection  $\mathcal{G}^\# \equiv \{\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\#\}$  defines a valid measurement in minimal composition GPT. Moreover, a straightforward calculation shows that  $\sum_{j,k=\pm 1} \text{Tr}(\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\# \rho_{\vec{m}}^{\otimes 2})$  reproduce the statistics of the observable  $X$  on the qubit state  $\rho_{\vec{m}}$ . Similarly, summing over the indices  $k, i$  and  $i, j$  reproduce the statistics of  $Y$  and  $Z$ , respectively. This completes the proof. ■

The enhanced joint measurability of three mutually orthogonal spin observables on 2-copy states in Theorem 2, compared to the POVM  $\mathcal{G}^\#$ , is mathematically intuitive. In quantum theory, including the construction of  $\mathcal{G}^\#$ , measurement effects must lie within the cone of positive operators on  $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ . In contrast, under the minimal tensor product composition of GPTs, the effect space is enlarged to include not only all positive operators but also the entanglement witnesses operators—Hermitian operators that are not positive yet yield valid probabilities on all separable states [49].

This observation further offers deeper insight into the enhancement of joint measurability in the antiparallel configuration, as established in Theorem 1. Recall that a linear map  $\Lambda : \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2)$  is positive if it maps density operators to density operators, i.e.,  $\Lambda : \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ . However, physical realisability requires complete positivity, meaning  $\text{id}_d \otimes \Lambda$  must also map  $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)$  into itself for all  $d \geq 2$ . By the Choi–Jamiołkowski (CJ) isomorphism, it suffices to consider  $d = 2$  for qubit maps [31, 32]. Here, we restrict attention to trace-preserving maps, that satisfy  $\text{Tr}[\Lambda(A)] = \text{Tr}[A]$ ,  $\forall A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ . For a map  $\Lambda$  its dual map  $\Lambda^*$  is defined via  $\text{Tr}[\Lambda\Lambda(B)] = \text{Tr}[\Lambda^*(A)B]$ ,  $\forall A, B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ . Of particular relevance is the spin-flip map  $F$ , defined by  $F(\rho_{\vec{m}}) := \rho_{-\vec{m}}$ , which satisfies  $F = F^*$  and  $F \circ F = \text{id}_2$ , where  $\circ$  denotes sequential composition. A direct calculation shows that  $\text{id}_2 \otimes F(\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\#) = \Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\#$ , implying the identity  $\text{Tr}[\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\# \rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes \rho_{\vec{m}}] = \text{Tr}[\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\# \rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes \rho_{-\vec{m}}]$ , thereby elucidating the mathematical structure behind the improved joint measurability in the antiparallel setting.

*Incompatibility in generic configuration of spin pairs.*—The preceding discussion naturally leads to the broader question of multi-copy joint measurability. In particular, one may ask: how does the sharpness parameter vary for a given set of observables  $\mathcal{S}_N = \{\sigma_{\hat{n}_{j,\lambda}}\}_{j=1}^N$ , such that joint measurability is achieved when two copies of the system are available per experimental run in the configuration  $\rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes \Lambda(\rho_{\vec{m}})$ , with  $\Lambda$  being a CPTP or a PTP map? In what follows, we establish a general result addressing this question.

**Theorem 3.** *The optimal sharpness parameter  $\lambda'_{opt}$ , ensuring joint measurability of an observable set  $\mathcal{S}_N$  on the configuration  $\rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes \Lambda(\rho_{\vec{m}})$ , is always upper bounded by the corresponding optimal value  $\lambda_{opt}$  for the parallel configuration, whenever  $\Lambda$  is a CPTP map.*

*Proof.* Given two systems prepared, in configuration  $\rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes \Lambda(\rho_{\vec{m}})$ , let the POVM  $\mathcal{G} \equiv \{\pi_{\vec{a}} \geq 0 \mid \sum_{\vec{a}} \pi_{\vec{a}} = \mathbb{I}^{\otimes 2}\}$  ensure joint measurability of  $\mathcal{S}_N = \{\sigma_{\hat{n}_j, \lambda}\}_{j=1}^N$  for the optimal sharpness value  $\lambda'_{\text{opt}}$ . Thus we have  $\text{Tr}[\rho_{\vec{m}} P_{\hat{n}_j, \lambda'_{\text{opt}}}^{a_j}] = \sum_{\vec{a} \setminus a_j} \text{Tr}[\rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes \Lambda(\rho_{\vec{m}}) \tilde{\pi}_{\vec{a}}]$ ,  $\forall a_j$ . Using the map  $\Lambda^*$ , dual to  $\Lambda$ , we have  $\text{Tr}[\rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes \Lambda(\rho_{\vec{m}}) \tilde{\pi}_{\vec{a}}] = \text{Tr}[\rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes \rho_{\vec{m}} \{\text{id}_2 \otimes \Lambda^*(\tilde{\pi}_{\vec{a}})\}]$ . Now,  $\Lambda^*$  being a CP map ensures that  $\text{id}_2 \otimes \Lambda^*(\tilde{\pi}_{\vec{a}})$ 's are positive operator for all  $\vec{a}$ . Furthermore,  $\Lambda^*$  being unital (i.e.  $\Lambda^*(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1}$ ) ensures that  $\mathcal{G}^* \equiv \{\text{id}_2 \otimes \Lambda^*(\tilde{\pi}_{\vec{a}})\}_{\vec{a}}$  forms a measurement, and thus warrants the sharpness parameter value to be atleast  $\lambda'_{\text{opt}}$  on parallel configuration. This completes the proof. ■

To surpass the joint measurability sharpness threshold achieved for a given set of observables  $\mathcal{S}_N$  on the parallel configuration, one must consider a configuration of the form  $\rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes \Lambda(\rho_{\vec{m}})$ , where  $\Lambda$  is a positive but not completely positive map. However, not all such configurations might yield an advantage for every choice of  $\mathcal{S}_N$ . As an illustrative example, consider the family of maps defined by  $F_\mu(\rho_{\vec{m}}) := \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{1} - \mu \vec{m} \cdot \vec{\sigma})$ , where  $\mu \in [0, 1]$ . This map can be interpreted as a probabilistic mixture of the identity map and the universal spin-flip map, i.e.,  $F_\mu = \frac{1-\mu}{2} \text{id}_2 + \frac{1+\mu}{2} F$ , ensuring them to be PTP for all  $\mu \in [0, 1]$ . Furthermore,  $F_\mu$ 's are known to be CPTP for  $\mu \in [0, 1/3]$  [50–52]. Now considering the configuration  $\rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes F_\mu(\rho_{\vec{m}})$ , with the set of observables  $\mathcal{S}_N = \{X^\lambda, Y^\lambda, Z^\lambda\}$  we have the following result (proof is presented in the Appendix III).

**Proposition 1.** *Given the configuration  $\rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes F_\mu(\rho_{\vec{m}})$  per experimental run, the observables  $X^\lambda, Y^\lambda$ , and  $Z^\lambda$  are jointly measurable for all  $\lambda \in [0, (1 + \mu)/2]$ .*

The configuration  $\rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes F_\mu(\rho_{\vec{m}})$ , thus, offers an advantage over the parallel configuration for joint measurability of  $\{X^\lambda, Y^\lambda, Z^\lambda\}$  whenever  $\mu > \sqrt{3} - 1$ . Whether this configuration yields an advantage in the intermediate range  $\mu \in (1/3, \sqrt{3} - 1]$  for some other sets of observables is remained to be explored further.

*Measurement compatibility on sub-ensemble of states.*— Can the advantage established in Theorem 1 be experimentally demonstrated? To address this, we introduce the notion of joint measurability for a set of spin observables on an ensemble of states  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ .

**Definition 4.** *A set of spin observables  $\mathcal{S}_N$  is jointly measurable on  $\mathcal{E}$  if there exists a POVM  $\mathcal{G} \equiv \{\pi_{\vec{a}} \geq 0 \mid \sum_{\vec{a}} \pi_{\vec{a}} = \mathbf{1}\}$  such that,  $\text{Tr}[\rho_{\vec{m}} P_{\hat{n}_j, \lambda}^{a_j}] = \sum_{\vec{a} \setminus a_j} \text{Tr}[\rho_{\vec{m}} \pi_{\vec{a}}]$ ,  $\forall \rho_{\vec{m}} \in \mathcal{E}$  for all  $j$ .*

Similarly, the notion of  $k$ -copy joint measurability (Definition 2) can be extended to a given state ensemble  $\mathcal{E}$ . This motivates the question of selecting an appropriate ensemble to establish the advantage of the antiparallel configuration over the parallel one in the joint measurability of three mutually orthogonal spin observables. According to Theorem 1, for any such ensemble, the joint measurability of  $\{X, Y, Z\}$  is always




Figure 2. (Color online) On any ensemble  $\mathcal{E}_{GC}$  on a great circle of the Bloch sphere, and on the ensemble  $\mathcal{E}_{Tet}$  both the parallel and antiparallel configuration ensure compatibility of  $\{X^\lambda, Y^\lambda, Z^\lambda\}$  for sharpness parameter  $\lambda = 1$ . On the ensemble  $\mathcal{E}_{Oct}$  antiparallel ensures compatibility up-to  $\lambda = 1$  [a consequence of Theorem 1], whereas parallel configuration allows compatibility up-to  $\lambda \approx 0.866$ .

ensured with sharpness  $\lambda = 1$  in the antiparallel configuration. If a suitably chosen finite ensemble satisfies  $\lambda < 1$  for the parallel configuration, it would provide a viable candidate for experimentally demonstrating the measurement compatibility advantage of the antiparallel configuration. Notably, such an advantage is not expected when the states in  $\mathcal{E}$  lie on a great circle, as a unitary transformation always exists that maps a pure qubit state to its orthogonal counterpart on a great circle of the Bloch sphere [53–55]. A natural choice for the state ensemble is  $\mathcal{E}_{Tet} \equiv \{\rho_{\vec{m}_i} \mid \vec{m}_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(\pm 1, \pm 1, \pm 1), \text{ with } m_x m_y m_z = +1\}$ . Strikingly, parallel configuration reproduces statistics of  $\{X, Y, Z\}$  are perfectly reproduced on this ensemble (see Appendix IV). We thus consider an alternative symmetric ensemble,  $\mathcal{E}_{Oct} \equiv \{\rho_{\vec{m}_i} \mid \text{eigenstates of } X, Y, Z\}$  (see Fig. 2). Since measurement compatibility on a subset of states is a weaker requirement than compatibility on all states, the optimal sharpness parameter  $\lambda$  ensuring the compatibility of  $\{X^\lambda, Y^\lambda, Z^\lambda\}$  on parallel configuration states selected from an ensemble may generally exceed the optimal value  $\lambda = \sqrt{3}/2$  derived by Carmeli et al. For a given set of observables  $\mathcal{S}_N$  and state ensemble  $\mathcal{E}$ , determining this optimal sharpness parameter can be formulated as a semidefinite programming (SDP) problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Maximize : } \lambda \\ & \text{Subject to : } \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2) \ni \pi_{\vec{a}} \geq 0 \ \& \ \sum_{\vec{a}} \pi_{\vec{a}} = \mathbf{1}^{\otimes 2}; \\ & \lambda \geq 0; \ \text{Tr}[\rho_{\vec{m}} P_{\hat{n}_j, \lambda}^{a_j}] = \sum_{\vec{a} \setminus a_j} \text{Tr}[\rho_{\vec{m}}^{\otimes 2} \pi_{\vec{a}}], \ \forall \rho_{\vec{m}} \in \mathcal{E} \ \& \ \forall j. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Solving this problem for  $\{X^\lambda, Y^\lambda, Z^\lambda\}$  with the ensemble  $\mathcal{E}_{Oct}$ , we obtain  $\lambda \approx 0.866 \approx \sqrt{3}/2$ , which in fact matches the Carmeli et al. bound for all states. Thus, this particular ensemble is well-suited for an experimental demonstration of the enhancement of measurement compatibility in the antiparallel configuration.

*Discussions.*— We have explored a novel facet of quantum incompatibility, a fundamental concept in quantum foundations and quantum information science. Specifically, we have

demonstrated that the manifestation of incompatibility differs when two copies of a system are prepared in parallel versus antiparallel configurations. Notably, our findings reveal that three mutually orthogonal spin observables can be jointly compatible in the antiparallel configuration, raising intriguing information-theoretic questions. This foundational insight may have implications for quantum estimation theory and quantum metrology. Our work also opens several questions for further research. While our analysis focuses on three mutually orthogonal Pauli observables, it is worthwhile to investigate more general scenarios involving a larger set of observables. Additionally, when considering multiple copies of a system, a mix of parallel and antiparallel configurations could be explored to determine the optimal sharpness parameter for joint compatibility. A natural extension would be to study cases where a joint PTP map acts on a subset of the systems. Finally, generalizing these findings to higher-dimensional systems remains an important direction for future work.

KA acknowledges support from the CSIR project 09/0575(19300)/2024-EMR-I. SRC acknowledges support from University Grants Commission, India (reference no. 211610113404). SGN acknowledges support from the CSIR project 09/0575(15951)/2022-EMR-I. MB acknowledges funding from the National Quantum Mission.

### APPENDIX I: STRUCTURE OF THE POVM $\mathcal{G}^\natural$

All the effects  $\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\natural$ 's are rank one, and can be expressed as  $\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\natural \propto \zeta_{[i,j,k]} \langle \zeta |$  with

$$|\zeta_{[i,j,k]}\rangle := \frac{1}{2}(|\psi^-\rangle - i|\phi^-\rangle + \mathbf{i}j|\phi^+\rangle + k|\psi^+\rangle), \quad (5)$$

where  $|\phi^\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle)$ ,  $|\psi^\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle \pm |10\rangle)$ , &  $\mathbf{i} = \sqrt{-1}$ . Representing  $\zeta_{[i,j,k]} \equiv \zeta_l$ , with  $l :=$




Figure 3. (Color online) Orthogonality relations among the vectors  $\{\zeta_{[i,j,k]} \equiv \zeta_l\}$ . Each vertex is orthogonal to the vertices connected through face diagonal. For instance,  $\zeta_1$  is orthogonal to  $\{\zeta_2, \zeta_4, \zeta_7\}$ , whereas  $\zeta_6$  is orthogonal to  $\{\zeta_0, \zeta_3, \zeta_5\}$ .

$2(i+1) + (j+1) + (k+1)/2$ , when these vectors are depicted as the vertices of a cube, each vertex becomes orthogonal to the vertices connected through face diagonal (see Fig. 3).

### APPENDIX II: POSITIVITY OF $\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\#$ 'S ON SEPARABLE STATES

The operators  $\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\#$  can be re-expressed as,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\# &= \frac{1}{16} \left( \mathbf{1} \otimes (2\mathbf{1} + iX + jY + kZ) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + X \otimes i(\mathbf{1} + jY + kZ) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + Y \otimes j(\mathbf{1} + kZ + iX) + Z \otimes k(\mathbf{1} + iX + jY) \right). \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

We can apply the CJ isomorphism to express  $\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\# \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)$  as a Choi operator of some linear map  $\Lambda_{[i,j,k]} : \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2) \mapsto \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ , i.e.

$$\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\# = \text{id}_2 \otimes \Lambda_{[i,j,k]} (|\psi^-\rangle \langle \psi^-|). \quad (7)$$

Usually the Choi operator is defined by acting the linear map on one part of the unnormalized state  $|\phi^+\rangle \langle \phi^+| = \sum_{i,j=0}^1 |i\rangle \langle j| \otimes |i\rangle \langle j|$ . Here we equivalently use the unnormalized singlet state  $|\psi^-\rangle \langle \psi^-|$  for convenience, which in Pauli Basis reads as,

$$|\psi^-\rangle \langle \psi^-| = \mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{1} - X \otimes X - Y \otimes Y - Z \otimes Z. \quad (8)$$

Note that  $\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\#$  will yield positive probabilities on all two qubit separable states  $\Omega \in \text{Sep}(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)$  if and only if it provides positive probabilities on all product states of the form  $\rho_{\vec{r}} \otimes \rho_{\vec{s}}$ , where  $\vec{r}$  and  $\vec{s}$  denote the respective Bloch vectors. The overlap of  $\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\#$  on an arbitrary product state  $\rho_{\vec{r}} \otimes \rho_{\vec{s}}$  can be written as  $\text{Tr} [\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\# (\rho_{\vec{r}} \otimes \rho_{\vec{s}})] = \text{Tr} [|\psi^-\rangle \langle \psi^-| \{ \rho_{\vec{r}} \otimes \Lambda_{[i,j,k]}^* (\rho_{\vec{s}}) \}]$ , where  $\Lambda_{[i,j,k]}^*$  denotes the dual map of  $\Lambda_{[i,j,k]}$ . Substituting  $\rho_{\vec{r}} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{1} + \vec{r} \cdot \vec{\sigma})$  and using Eq.(8) we obtain

$$\text{Tr} [\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\# (\rho_{\vec{r}} \otimes \rho_{\vec{s}})] = 2 \text{Tr} [\rho_{-\vec{r}} \Lambda_{[i,j,k]}^* (\rho_{\vec{s}})]. \quad (9)$$

Now  $\text{Tr} [\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\# (\rho_{\vec{r}} \otimes \rho_{\vec{s}})] \geq 0 \forall \rho_{\vec{r}}, \rho_{\vec{s}}$  if and only if  $\Lambda_{[i,j,k]}^*$  or equivalently its dual map  $\Lambda_{[i,j,k]}$  is a positive map. From Eqs.(6),(7),& (8) we obtain the action of the map  $\Lambda_{[i,j,k]}$  on Pauli basis as

$$\Lambda_{[i,j,k]}(\mathbf{1}) = (2\mathbf{1} + iX + jY + kZ)/16, \quad (10a)$$

$$\Lambda_{[i,j,k]}(X) = -i(\mathbf{1} + jY + kZ)/16, \quad (10b)$$

$$\Lambda_{[i,j,k]}(Y) = -j(\mathbf{1} + kZ + iX)/16, \quad (10c)$$

$$\Lambda_{[i,j,k]}(Z) = -k(\mathbf{1} + iX + jY)/16. \quad (10d)$$

Thus,  $\Lambda_{[i,j,k]}$  acting on an arbitrary qubit state  $\rho_{\vec{s}}$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{[i,j,k]}(\rho_{\vec{s}}) &= \frac{1}{32} \left( (2 - is_x - js_y - ks_z)\mathbf{1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + i(1 - js_y - ks_z)X \right. \\ &\quad \left. + j(1 - ks_z - is_x)Y + k(1 - is_x - js_y)Z \right). \quad (11) \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to verify that the right-hand side is a positive operator for all  $i, j, k$  and for any Bloch vector  $\vec{s}$  satisfying  $s_x^2 + s_y^2 + s_z^2 \leq 1$ . This confirms that the map  $\Lambda_{[i,j,k]}$  is positive, and consequently,  $\{\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\#\}$  constitutes a valid measurement in the minimal composition of two qubits.

### APPENDIX III: COMPATIBILITY OF $\{X, Y, Z\}$ ON $\rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes F_\mu(\rho_{\vec{m}})$ CONFIGURATION

While performing the measurement  $\mathcal{G}^\natural$  on two qubits prepared in configuration  $\rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes F_\mu(\rho_{\vec{m}})$  the probability of clicking the  $\Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\natural$  is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} p_{ijk} &= \text{Tr} \left[ \Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\natural \rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes F_\mu(\rho_{\vec{m}}) \right] \\ &= \frac{(1+\mu)}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\natural \rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes \rho_{-\vec{m}} \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{(1-\mu)}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \Pi_{[i,j,k]}^\natural \rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes \rho_{\vec{m}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Summing over the indices  $j, k$  we obtain  $\sum_{j,k} p_{ijk} = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{(1+\mu)}{2} im_x \right)$  – statistics of the unsharp observable  $X^{(1+\mu)/2}$ . Similarly, summing over the indices  $k, i$  and  $i, j$  we obtain the statistics of the observables  $Y^{(1+\mu)/2}$  and  $Z^{(1+\mu)/2}$  respectively. Accordingly, the configuration  $\rho_{\vec{m}} \otimes F_\mu(\rho_{\vec{m}})$  becomes advantageous over the parallel one whenever  $\frac{(1+\mu)}{2} > \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ , implying  $\mu > \sqrt{3} - 1$ .

### APPENDIX IV: COMPATIBILITY OF $\{X, Y, Z\}$ ON PARALLEL CONFIGURATION OF $\mathcal{E}_{Tet}$

The measurement that produce statistics of  $\{X, Y, Z\}$  on Parallel configuration of  $\mathcal{E}_{Tet}$  was found using SDP as mentioned in the main manuscript. Here we give the numerical form of the explicit measurement.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{[i,j,k]}^{Tet} &:= \frac{1}{4} \left[ a_{ijk} \mathbf{1}^{\otimes 2} + d(ijk) \left( X^{\otimes 2} + Y^{\otimes 2} + Z^{\otimes 2} \right) \right. \\ &\quad + b_{ijk} \left( i\{\{X, \mathbf{1}\}\} + j\{\{Y, \mathbf{1}\}\} + k\{\{X, \mathbf{1}\}\} \right) \\ &\quad \left. + c_{ijk} \left( ij\{\{X, Y\}\} + jk\{\{Y, Z\}\} + ki\{\{Z, X\}\} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where,  $d \approx 0.11582$  and

$$\begin{array}{ll} \underline{ijk = +1} & \underline{ijk = -1} \\ a_{ijk} \approx 0.84746, & a_{ijk} \approx 0.15265, \\ b_{ijk} \approx 0.38850, & b_{ijk} \approx -0.01350, \\ c_{ijk} \approx 0.22430, & c_{ijk} \approx 0.00779. \end{array}$$

[1] N. Bohr, The Quantum Postulate and the Recent Development of Atomic Theory, *Nature* **121**, 580–590 (1928).

- [2] A. De Gregorio, Bohr’s way to defining complementarity, *Stud. Hist. Philos. Sci.* **B 45**, 72–82 (2014).
- [3] W. K. Wootters and W. H. Zurek, Complementarity in the double-slit experiment: Quantum nonseparability and a quantitative statement of Bohr’s principle, *Phys. Rev. D* **19**, 473 (1979).
- [4] M. O. Scully and H. Walther, Quantum optical test of observation and complementarity in quantum mechanics, *Phys. Rev. A* **39**, 5229 (1989).
- [5] M. O. Scully, B.-G. Englert, and H. Walther, Quantum optical tests of complementarity, *Nature* **351**, 111–116 (1991).
- [6] E. B. Davies, *Quantum Theory of Open Systems* (Academic Press, 1976).
- [7] P. J. Lahti, Uncertainty and complementarity in axiomatic quantum mechanics, *Int. J. Theo. Phys.* **19**, 789–842 (1980).
- [8] P. Busch, Indeterminacy relations and simultaneous measurements in quantum theory, *Int. J. Theo. Phys.* **24**, 63–92 (1985).
- [9] K. Kraus, *States, Effects, and Operations: Fundamental Notions of Quantum Theory* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1983).
- [10] P. Mittelstaedt, A. Prieur, and R. Schieder, Unsharp particle-wave duality in a photon split-beam experiment, *Found. Phys.* **17**, 891–903 (1987).
- [11] P. Busch, P. J. Lahti, and P. Mittelstaedt, *The Quantum Theory of Measurement* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1996).
- [12] T. Heinosaari, T. Miyadera, and M. Ziman, An invitation to quantum incompatibility, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **49**, 123001 (2016).
- [13] O. Gühne, E. Haapasalo, T. Kraft, J.-P. Pellonpää, and R. Uola, Colloquium: Incompatible measurements in quantum information science, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **95**, 011003 (2023).
- [14] M. M. Wolf, D. Perez-Garcia, and C. Fernandez, Measurements Incompatible in Quantum Theory Cannot Be Measured Jointly in Any Other No-Signaling Theory, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 230402 (2009).
- [15] M. Banik, M. R. Gazi, S. Ghosh, and G. Kar, Degree of complementarity determines the nonlocality in quantum mechanics, *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 052125 (2013).
- [16] P. Busch, T. Heinosaari, J. Schultz, and N. Stevens, Comparing the degrees of incompatibility inherent in probabilistic physical theories, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **103**, 10002 (2013).
- [17] N. Brunner, D. Cavalcanti, S. Pironio, V. Scarani, and S. Wehner, Bell nonlocality, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **86**, 419 (2014).
- [18] M. Quintino, T. Vértesi, and N. Brunner, Joint Measurability, Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Steering, and Bell Nonlocality, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 160402 (2014).
- [19] R. Uola, T. Moroder, and O. Gühne, Joint Measurability of Generalized Measurements Implies Classicality, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 160403 (2014).
- [20] R. Uola, C. Budroni, O. Gühne, and J.-P. Pellonpää, One-to-One Mapping between Steering and Joint Measurability Problems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 230402 (2015).
- [21] M. Banik, Measurement incompatibility and Schrödinger-Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering in a class of probabilistic theories, *J. Math. Phys.* **56**, 052101 (2015).
- [22] G. Kar, S. Ghosh, S. Choudhary, and M. Banik, Role of Measurement Incompatibility and Uncertainty in Determining Nonlocality, *Mathematics* **4**, 52 (2016).
- [23] R. Uola, A. C. S. Costa, H. C. Nguyen, and O. Gühne, Quantum steering, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **92**, 015001 (2020).
- [24] C. Carmeli, T. Heinosaari, D. Reitzner, J. Schultz, and A. Toigo, Quantum Incompatibility in Collective Measurements, *Mathematics* **4**, 54 (2016).
- [25] P. Busch, Unsharp reality and joint measurements for spin observables, *Phys. Rev. D* **33**, 2253 (1986).

- [26] N. Gisin and S. Popescu, Spin Flips and Quantum Information for Antiparallel Spins, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 432–435 (1999).
- [27] M. Plávala, General probabilistic theories: An introduction, *Physics Reports* **1033**, 1–64 (2023).
- [28] I. Namioka and R. Phelps, Tensor products of compact convex sets, *Pac. J. Math.* **31**, 469–480 (1969).
- [29] W. F. Stinespring, Positive functions on  $C^*$ -algebras, *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.* **6**, 211–216 (1955).
- [30] E. P. Wigner, *Group theory and its applications to the quantum mechanics of atomic spectra [English version]* (Academic Press Inc., New York, 1959).
- [31] A. Jamiolkowski, Linear transformations which preserve trace and positive semidefiniteness of operators, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **3**, 275–278 (1972).
- [32] M.-D. Choi, Completely positive linear maps on complex matrices, *Linear Algebra Its Appl.* **10**, 285–290 (1975).
- [33] Y.-C. Liang, R. W. Spekkens, and H. M. Wiseman, Specker’s parable of the overprotective seer: A road to contextuality, non-locality and complementarity, *Physics Reports* **506**, 1–39 (2011).
- [34] R. Pal and S. Ghosh, Approximate joint measurement of qubit observables through an Arthur–Kelly model, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **44**, 485303 (2011).
- [35] R. Uola, K. Luoma, T. Moroder, and T. Heinosaari, Adaptive strategy for joint measurements, *Phys. Rev. A* **94**, 022109 (2016).
- [36] G. Ludwig, Attempt of an axiomatic foundation of quantum mechanics and more general theories, ii, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **4**, 331–348 (1967).
- [37] G. Ludwig, Attempt of an axiomatic foundation of quantum mechanics and more general theories. iii, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **9**, 1–12 (1968).
- [38] B. Mielnik, Geometry of quantum states, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **9**, 55–80 (1968).
- [39] G. Mackey, *The Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics: A Lecture-note Volume*, The mathematical physics monograph series (W.A. Benjamin, 1977).
- [40] L. Hardy, Quantum Theory From Five Reasonable Axioms, [arXiv:quant-ph/0101012](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0101012) (2001).
- [41] J. Barrett, Information processing in generalized probabilistic theories, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 032304 (2007).
- [42] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Informational derivation of quantum theory, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 012311 (2011).
- [43] L. Hardy, Reformulating and Reconstructing Quantum Theory, [arXiv:1104.2066](https://arxiv.org/abs/1104.2066) (2011).
- [44] M. Kläy, C. Randall, and D. Foulis, Tensor products and probability weights, *Int. J. Theo. Phys.* **26**, 199–219 (1987).
- [45] H. Barnum, S. Beigi, S. Boixo, M. B. Elliott, and S. Wehner, Local Quantum Measurement and No-Signaling Imply Quantum Correlations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 140401 (2010).
- [46] G. de la Torre, L. Masanes, A. J. Short, and M. P. Müller, Deriving Quantum Theory from Its Local Structure and Reversibility, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 090403 (2012).
- [47] S. G. Naik, E. P. Lobo, S. Sen, R. K. Patra, M. Alimuddin, T. Guha, S. S. Bhattacharya, and M. Banik, Composition of Multipartite Quantum Systems: Perspective from Timelike Paradigm, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 140401 (2022).
- [48] R. K. Patra, S. G. Naik, E. P. Lobo, S. Sen, G. L. Sidhardh, M. Alimuddin, and M. Banik, Principle of Information Causality Rationalizes Quantum Composition, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 110202 (2023).
- [49] V. Paulsen, *Completely Bounded Maps and Operator Algebras* (Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- [50] V. Bužek, M. Hillery, and R. F. Werner, Optimal manipulations with qubits: Universal-NOT gate, *Phys. Rev. A* **60**, R2626 (1999).
- [51] F. De Martini, V. Bužek, F. Sciarrino, and C. Sias, Experimental realization of the quantum universal NOT gate, *Nature* **419**, 815–818 (2002).
- [52] M. Ricci, F. Sciarrino, C. Sias, and F. De Martini, Teleportation Scheme Implementing the Universal Optimal Quantum Cloning Machine and the Universal NOT Gate, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 047901 (2004).
- [53] H. K. Lo, Classical-communication cost in distributed quantum-information processing: A generalization of quantum-communication complexity, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 012313 (2000).
- [54] A. K. Pati, Minimum classical bit for remote preparation and measurement of a qubit, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 014302 (2000).
- [55] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, B. M. Terhal, and W. K. Wootters, Remote State Preparation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 077902 (2001).