incompatible incompatibilities

and how to make them compatible again

Francesco Buscemi, Nagoya University

Quantum TUT Workshop 2024
Toyohashi University of Technology
Toyohashi, 22 February 2024

references

- F.B., E. Chitambar, W. Zhou:
  A complete resource theory of quantum (POVMs) incompatibility as quantum programmability.
  Physical Review Letters 124, 120401 (2020)

- F.B., K. Kobayashi, S. Minagawa, P. Perinotti, A. Tosini:
  Unifying different notions of quantum (instruments) incompatibility into a strict hierarchy of resource theories of communication.
  Quantum 7, 1035 (2023)

POVMs and instruments

in this talk: all sets ($\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}$ etc.) are finite, all spaces ($\mathscr{H}_A, \mathscr{H}_B$ etc.) are finite-dimensional

POVM: family **P** of positive semidefinite operators on $\mathscr{H}$ labeled by set $\mathbb{X}$, i.e., $\mathbf{P} = \{P_x\}_{x\in\mathbb{X}}$, with $P_x \geqslant 0$ and $\sum_x P_x = \mathbb{1}$

interpretation: expected probability of outcome x is $p(x) = \mathrm{Tr}[\varrho\ P_x]$

POVMs and instruments

in this talk: all sets $(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}$ etc.) are finite, all spaces $(\mathscr{H}_A, \mathscr{H}_B$ etc.) are finite-dimensional

POVM: family **P** of positive semidefinite operators on $\mathscr{H}$ labeled by set $\mathbb{X}$, i.e., **P** $= \{P_x\}_{x\in\mathbb{X}}$, with $P_x \geqslant 0$ and $\sum_x P_x = \mathbb{1}$

interpretation: expected probability of outcome x is $p(x) = \mathrm{Tr}[\varrho\ P_x]$

instrument: family $\{\mathcal{I}_x : A \to B\}_{x\in\mathbb{X}}$ of completely positive (CP) linear maps from $\mathscr{B}(\mathscr{H}_A)$ to $\mathscr{B}(\mathscr{H}_B)$, such that $\sum_x \mathcal{I}_x$ is trace-preserving (TP)

interpretation: expected probability of outcome x is $p(x) = \mathrm{Tr}[\mathcal{I}_x(\varrho)]$, and corresponding post-measurement state is $\frac{1}{p(x)}\mathcal{I}_x(\varrho)$

incompatibility

In quantum theory, some measurements necessarily exclude others.

If all measurements were compatible, we would not have QKD, violation of Bell's inequalities, quantum speedups, etc.

Various formalizations:

- preparation uncertainty relations
- measurement (e.g., error-disturbance) uncertainty relations
- incompatibility

compatible POVMs 1/2

Definition

given a family $\{\mathbf{P}^{(i)}\}_{i\in\mathbb{I}} \equiv \{P_x^{(i)}\}_{x\in\mathbb{X},i\in\mathbb{I}}$ of POVMs, all defined on the same system A, we say that the family is **compatible**, whenever there exists

- a "mother" POVM $\mathbf{O} = \{O_w\}_{w\in\mathbb{W}}$ on system A
- a conditional probability distribution $\mu(x|w,i)$

such that

$$P_x^{(i)} = \sum_w \mu(x|w,i) O_w \ ,$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and all $i \in \mathbb{I}$.

But what does it mean, *operationally*, if I say that, e.g., a certain laboratory can only perform compatible measurement?

compatible POVMs 2/2

There's a bipartition hidden in the concept of (in)compatibility:

compatible POVMs 2/2

There's a bipartition hidden in the concept of (in)compatibility:



[F.B., E. Chitambar, W. Zhou; PRL 2020]

the problem

While there is consensus on a single notion of compatibility for POVMs, in the case of instruments, the situation is less clear...

classical compatibility 1/2

Definition (Heinosaari–Miyadera–Reitzner, 2014)

given a family of instruments $\{\mathcal{I}_x^{(i)} : A \to B\}_{x\in\mathbb{X}, i\in\mathbb{I}}$, we say that the family is **classically compatible**, whenever there exist

- a mother instrument $\{\mathcal{H}_w : A \to B\}_{w\in\mathbb{W}}$
- a conditional probability distribution $\mu(x|w,i)$

such that

$$\mathcal{I}_x^{(i)} = \sum_w \mu(x|w,i)\mathcal{H}_w \ ,$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and all $i \in \mathbb{I}$.

classical compatibility 2/2



crucially:

- II is classical: no shared entanglement, communication is classical
- the box is II→I non-signaling:communication goes only from I to II; see [Ji and Chitambar; PRA 2021]

alternative: marginalizing the mother

alternative: marginalizing the mother

- in the case of POVMs: without loss of generality (because classical information can be copied), one can consider only marginalizations, i.e.,

$$P_x^{(i)} = \sum_{x_j : j \neq i} O_{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n}$$

alternative: marginalizing the mother

- in the case of POVMs: without loss of generality (because classical information can be copied), one can consider only marginalizations, i.e.,

$$P_x^{(i)} = \sum_{x_j : j \neq i} O_{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n}$$

- the notion of "parallel compatibility" for instruments applies the same intuition to the quantum outputs too

parallel compatibility 1/2

Definition (Heinosaari–Miyadera–Ziman, 2015)

given a family of instruments $\{\mathcal{I}_x^{(i)} : A \to B_i\}_{x\in\mathbb{X}, i\in\mathbb{I}}$, we say that the family is **parallelly compatible**, whenever there exist

- a mother instrument $\left\{\mathcal{H}_w : A \to \bigotimes_{i\in\mathbb{I}} B_i\right\}_{w\in\mathbb{W}}$
- a conditional probability distribution $\mu(x|w,i)$

such that

$$\mathcal{I}_x^{(i)} = \sum_w \mu(x|w,i)[\mathrm{Tr}_{B_i^c} \circ \mathcal{H}_w] , \qquad B_i^c := \bigotimes_{i'\in\mathbb{I}: i'\neq i} B_{i'} ,$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and all $i \in \mathbb{I}$.

parallel compatibility 2/2



parallel compatibility VS classical compatibility





- parallel compatibility is both $\mathbf{I}\to\mathbf{II}$ and $\mathbf{II}\to\mathbf{I}$ signaling; therefore, parallel compatibility $\not\Longrightarrow$ classical compatibility

parallel compatibility VS classical compatibility





- parallel compatibility is both $\mathbf{I}\rightarrow\mathbf{II}$ and $\mathbf{II}\rightarrow\mathbf{I}$ signaling; therefore, parallel compatibility $\not\Rightarrow$ classical compatibility
- non-disturbing instruments are never parallelly compatible; therefore, classical compatibility $\not\Rightarrow$ parallel compatibility

parallel compatibility VS classical compatibility





- parallel compatibility is both $\mathbf{I}\to\mathbf{II}$ and $\mathbf{II}\to\mathbf{I}$ signaling; therefore, parallel compatibility $\not\Rightarrow$ classical compatibility
- non-disturbing instruments are never parallelly compatible; therefore, classical compatibility $\not\Rightarrow$ parallel compatibility
- parallel compatibility is more closely related to quantum no-broadcasting than it is to measurement compatibility

bridging the two camps

q-compatibility

Definition

given a family of instruments $\{\mathcal{I}_x^{(i)} : A \to B_i\}_{x\in\mathbb{X}, i\in\mathbb{I}}$, we say that the family is **q-compatible**, whenever there exist

- a mother instrument $\{\mathcal{H}_w : A \to C\}_{w\in\mathbb{W}}$
- a conditional probability distribution $\mu(x|w,i)$
- a family of postprocessing channels $\{\mathcal{D}^{(x,w,i)} : C \to B_i\}_{x\in\mathbb{X}, w\in\mathbb{W}, i\in\mathbb{I}}$

such that

$$\mathcal{I}_x^{(i)} = \sum_w \mu(x|w,i)[\mathcal{D}^{(x,w,i)} \circ \mathcal{H}_w] \ ,$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and all $i \in \mathbb{I}$.

q-compatibility as a circuit



Special cases:

- classical compatibility: when $C \equiv B_i$ for all i and $\mathcal{D}^{(x,w,i)} = \text{id}$
- parallel compatibility: when $C \equiv \bigotimes_i B_i$ and $\mathcal{D}^{(x,w,i)} = \mathrm{Tr}_{B_i^c}$

incompatibility-non-increasing operations

free operations for classical incompatibility



free operations for classical incompatibility



- all cassically compatible devices can be created for free
- if the initial device (the dark gray inner box) is classically compatible, the final device is also classically compatible

free operations for q-incompatibility



free operations for q-incompatibility



- all q-compatible devices can be created for free
- if the initial device (the dark gray inner box) is q-compatible, the final device is also q-compatible

beyond q-compatibility

simultaneous VS sequential compatibility

compatibility of POVMs is always, w.l.o.g., simultaneous compatibility (again, because classical information can be copied)

simultaneous VS sequential compatibility

compatibility of POVMs is always, w.l.o.g., simultaneous compatibility (again, because classical information can be copied)

for instruments, it is more subtle: for example, consider the following two instruments

$$\mathcal{I}_1(\bullet) = pU_1 \bullet U_1^\dagger \qquad \mathcal{J}_1(\bullet) = |0\rangle\langle 0| \bullet |0\rangle\langle 0|$$
$$\mathcal{I}_2(\bullet) = (1-p)U_2 \bullet U_2^\dagger \qquad \mathcal{J}_2(\bullet) = |1\rangle\langle 1| \bullet |1\rangle\langle 1|$$

the corresponding POVMs, i.e., $\{p\mathbb{1}, (1-p)\mathbb{1}\}$ and $\{|0\rangle\langle 0|, |1\rangle\langle 1|\}$ are compatible, but the two instruments are not (they are not even q-compatible)

simultaneous VS sequential compatibility

compatibility of POVMs is always, w.l.o.g., simultaneous compatibility (again, because classical information can be copied)

for instruments, it is more subtle: for example, consider the following two instruments

$$\mathcal{I}_1(\bullet) = pU_1 \bullet U_1^\dagger \qquad \mathcal{J}_1(\bullet) = |0\rangle\langle 0| \bullet |0\rangle\langle 0|$$
$$\mathcal{I}_2(\bullet) = (1-p)U_2 \bullet U_2^\dagger \qquad \mathcal{J}_2(\bullet) = |1\rangle\langle 1| \bullet |1\rangle\langle 1|$$

the corresponding POVMs, i.e., $\{p\mathbb{1}, (1-p)\mathbb{1}\}$ and $\{|0\rangle\langle 0|, |1\rangle\langle 1|\}$ are compatible, but the two instruments are not (they are not even q-compatible)

except that, in a sense, they actually *are* compatible!
just not simultaneously so: do $\mathcal{I}$, keep the outcome, undo the unitary, and finally do $\mathcal{J}$

simultaneous VS sequential compatibility

compatibility of POVMs is always, w.l.o.g., simultaneous compatibility (again, because classical information can be copied)

for instruments, it is more subtle: for example, consider the following two instruments

$$\mathcal{I}_1(\bullet) = pU_1 \bullet U_1^\dagger \qquad \mathcal{J}_1(\bullet) = |0\rangle\langle 0| \bullet |0\rangle\langle 0|$$
$$\mathcal{I}_2(\bullet) = (1-p)U_2 \bullet U_2^\dagger \qquad \mathcal{J}_2(\bullet) = |1\rangle\langle 1| \bullet |1\rangle\langle 1|$$

the corresponding POVMs, i.e., $\{p\mathbb{1}, (1-p)\mathbb{1}\}$ and $\{|0\rangle\langle 0|, |1\rangle\langle 1|\}$ are compatible, but the two instruments are not (they are not even q-compatible)

except that, in a sense, they actually *are* compatible!
just not simultaneously so: do $\mathcal{I}$, keep the outcome, undo the unitary, and finally do $\mathcal{J}$

remark: reversing the order (i.e., first $\mathcal{J}$, then $\mathcal{I}$) the same construction does not work

no-exclusivity

Definition

an instrument $\{\mathcal{I}_x : A \to B_1\}_{x\in\mathbb{X}}$ **does not exclude** another instrument $\{\mathcal{J}_y : A \to B_2\}_{y\in\mathbb{Y}}$, whenever there exist

- a mother instrument $\{\mathcal{H}_w : A \to C\}_{w\in\mathbb{W}}$
- a conditional probability distribution $\mu(x|w)$
- a family of postprocessing channels $\{\mathcal{D}^{(x,w)} : C \to B_1\}_{x\in\mathbb{X},w\in\mathbb{W}}$
- a family of instruments $\{\mathcal{K}_y^{(w)} : C \to B_2\}_{w\in\mathbb{W},y\in\mathbb{Y}}$

such that

$$\mathcal{I}_x = \sum_w \mu(x|w)[\mathcal{D}^{(x,w)} \circ \mathcal{H}_w] \, , \qquad \mathcal{J}_y = \sum_w \mathcal{K}_y^{(w)} \circ \mathcal{H}_w \, ,$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and all $y \in \mathbb{Y}$.

no-exclusivity as a circuit



no-exclusivity VS q-compatibility





in the definition of no-exclusivity, the post-processing box at I can be an instrument

no-exclusivity VS q-compatibility





in the definition of no-exclusivity, the post-processing box at **I** can be an instrument

intuition: the information necessary to reconstruct the result of one instrument (i.e., the non-exclu**ding** one) can be extracted with a disturbance “small enough” to not exclude the other instrument (i.e., the non-exclud**ed** one)

formulating resource theories of incompatibility

a hierarchy of incompatibility preorders

given two families of instruments $\{\mathcal{I}_x^{(i)} : A \to B_i\}_{x\in\mathbb{X}, i\in\mathbb{I}}$ and $\{\mathcal{J}_y^{(j)} : C \to D_j\}_{y\in\mathbb{Y}, j\in\mathbb{J}}$, we say

$$\{\mathcal{I}_x^{(i)} : A \to B_i\} \text{ is **more incompatible/exclusive** than } \{\mathcal{J}_y^{(j)} : C \to D_j\}$$

whenever the former can be transformed into the latter by means of a corresponding free operation

a hierarchy of incompatibility preorders

given two families of instruments $\{\mathcal{I}_x^{(i)} : A \to B_i\}_{x\in\mathbb{X}, i\in\mathbb{I}}$ and $\{\mathcal{J}_y^{(j)} : C \to D_j\}_{y\in\mathbb{Y}, j\in\mathbb{J}}$, we say

$\{\mathcal{I}_x^{(i)} : A \to B_i\}$ is **more incompatible/exclusive** than $\{\mathcal{J}_y^{(j)} : C \to D_j\}$

whenever the former can be transformed into the latter by means of a corresponding free operation

more classically incompatible $\implies$ more q-incompatible $\implies$ more exclusive

a hierarchy of incompatibility preorders

given two families of instruments $\{\mathcal{I}_x^{(i)} : A \to B_i\}_{x\in\mathbb{X}, i\in\mathbb{I}}$ and $\{\mathcal{J}_y^{(j)} : C \to D_j\}_{y\in\mathbb{Y}, j\in\mathbb{J}}$, we say

$\{\mathcal{I}_x^{(i)} : A \to B_i\}$ is **more incompatible/exclusive** than $\{\mathcal{J}_y^{(j)} : C \to D_j\}$

whenever the former can be transformed into the latter by means of a corresponding free operation

more classically incompatible $\implies$ more q-incompatible $\implies$ more exclusive

$\rightsquigarrow$ this is now an instance of *statistical comparison*: a complete family of monotones can be constructed and a Blackwell–like theorem proved

further details on arXiv:2211.09226

conclusion

take home messages

- no need to argue about the “correct” definition of compatibility for instruments: q-compatibility provides an overarching framework

take home messages

- no need to argue about the "correct" definition of compatibility for instruments: q-compatibility provides an overarching framework
- as such, we can think of it as a resource, and construct a whole hierarchy of complete resource theories of incompatibility, all of which fall back on the same notion of compatibility of POVMs in the case of instruments with trivial quantum output

take home messages

- no need to argue about the “correct” definition of compatibility for instruments: q-compatibility provides an overarching framework
- as such, we can think of it as a resource, and construct a whole hierarchy of complete resource theories of incompatibility, all of which fall back on the same notion of compatibility of POVMs in the case of instruments with trivial quantum output
- for instruments, simultaneous compatibility is not the end of the story: we also have a notion of sequential compatibility, i.e., no-exclusivity

take home messages

- no need to argue about the "correct" definition of compatibility for instruments: q-compatibility provides an overarching framework

- as such, we can think of it as a resource, and construct a whole hierarchy of complete resource theories of incompatibility, all of which fall back on the same notion of compatibility of POVMs in the case of instruments with trivial quantum output

- for instruments, simultaneous compatibility is not the end of the story: we also have a notion of sequential compatibility, i.e., no-exclusivity

thank you for your attention