

No-go theorems for quantum resource purification: new approach and channel theory

Kun Fang^{1,*} and Zi-Wen Liu^{2,†}

¹*Institute for Quantum Computing, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3G1, Canada*

²*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 2Y5, Canada*

(Dated: October 23, 2020)

It is recently shown that there exist fundamental limits to the accuracy and efficiency of purifying generic noisy resource states in any well-behaved quantum resource theory [Fang/Liu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 060405 (2020)]. Here, we develop a novel and powerful method for analyzing the limitations of quantum resource purification, which not only leads to improved bounds that rule out exact purification for a broader range of noisy states and are tight in certain cases, but also allow us to establish a no-purification theory for quantum channel (dynamical) resources. More specifically, we employ the new method to derive universal bounds on the error and cost of transforming generic noisy channels (multiple instances can be used adaptively, in contrast to the state theory) to some unitary resource channel under any free channel-to-channel map. We address several cases of practical interest in more concrete terms, and discuss the connections and applications of our general results to quantum error correction, quantum Shannon theory, and quantum circuit synthesis.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum technologies, such as quantum computing, quantum communication and quantum cryptography, are an exciting forefront of science that has the potential of achieving substantial advantages over conventional methods and sparking an important technological revolution. However, quantum systems are inherently highly susceptible to noise and errors in real-world scenarios, which often make them unreliable or difficult to scale up. This poses a serious challenge to realizing the potential power of quantum technologies in practice. Note that the noise problem is particularly pressing at the moment, as we are now at a critical juncture where we are starting to make real effort to put the theoretically blueprinted quantum technologies into practice [1, 2]. In order to ease the effects of noise, we would generally need techniques that can “purify” the noisy systems. To this end, methods such as quantum error correction [3] and distillation [4–7] are developed and have become central research topics in quantum information.

Behind the power of quantum technologies is the manipulation and utilization of various forms of quantum “resources” such as entanglement [8], coherence [9], and “magic” [7, 10]. These different kinds a quantum resources can be commonly understood and characterized using the universal framework of “quantum resource theory” (see e.g. [11] for an introduction), which are under active developments in recent years. Recently, Ref. [12] derived universal limitations on the accuracy and efficiency of any free operation that intends to purify generic noisy states in general quantum resource theories, by employing one-shot resource theory [13] ideas. However, the picture provided by Ref. [12] is not complete and there

are two important gaps that we would like to fill. First, the results there assume the input states to be full-rank and it is not known whether there are no-purification rules when the input state is noisy but not full-rank. Second, the theory developed there only applies to static (state) resources, but it is also important to understand the situation of dynamical (channel) resources.

In this work, we develop a new approach to studying the fundamental limits of quantum resource purification tasks that address the above problems. This approach is built upon decompositions of the input that separate out the free parts. As we shall demonstrate, such decompositions link the weight of the free parts, a key quantity which we call *free component*, to the error of purification. We apply this approach to both quantum states and channels, which respectively encode static and dynamical quantum resources. For the state theory, we use the new method to derive new bounds on the error and efficiency of deterministic purification or distillation tasks which significantly improve those in Ref. [12]. More specifically, the new results lift the full-rank assumption and imply no-purification property for a broader range of mixed states; Furthermore, they are quantitatively better and are shown to be tight in certain cases. We use several concrete examples to demonstrate the improvements and show that the new bounds are tight in certain cases. Next, as a major contribution of this work, we develop the no-purification theory for quantum channels. Most importantly, there are two key complications of the channel theory that does not come up in the state theory: i) There are several different ways to define channel fidelity measures; ii) Multiple instances of channels can be used in many presumably inequivalent ways, such as in parallel, sequentially, or adaptively. Using the free component method, we derive bounds on the purification errors and costs for all cases. Note that our framework and results are highly general, not even requiring the standard convexity assumption of resource theories. To be more concrete, we shall discuss the roles and features

* kun.fang@uwaterloo.ca

† zliu1@perimeterinstitute.ca

of common noise channels in different types of channel resource theories. Also, as will be explained, our general results have strong connections or applications to a broad range of fields of great theoretical and practical interest, including quantum error correction, Shannon theory, and circuit synthesis.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we apply the free component method to the state theory, and in particular discuss the improvements over previous results in Ref. [12]. In Sec. III, we establish the no-purification theory for quantum channels using the free component method. We first present general-form results in Sec. III A, and then elaborate on specific scenarios and applications in Sec. III B. Finally in Sec. IV we summarize the work and discuss future directions.

II. STATE THEORY

We first consider state resource theories, which are built upon the notions of *free states* and *free operations* that represent the allowed transformation among states. Any free operation must satisfy the golden rule (see e.g. [11, 14, 15]) that it maps any free state to a free state, i.e. cannot create resource. In other words, this golden rule defines a set of operations that encompasses any legitimate set of free operations.

Let \mathcal{F} denote the set of free states (which is only assumed to be a closed set). The following quantity that we call *free component* will play a central role in our theory:

Definition 1 (Free component). *The free component of quantum state ρ is defined as*

$$\Gamma_\rho := \max \{ \gamma : \rho - \gamma\sigma \geq 0, \sigma \in \mathcal{F} \}. \quad (1)$$

Equivalently,

$$\Gamma_\rho = \max \{ \gamma : \rho = \gamma\sigma + (1 - \gamma)\tau, \sigma \in \mathcal{F}, \text{state } \tau \}. \quad (2)$$

That is, the free component is directly related to the “weight of resource” W , which is recently studied in general resource theory contexts [16, 17], by $\Gamma_\rho = 1 - W_\rho$. Another equivalent form is $\Gamma(\rho) = \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}} 2^{D_{\max}(\sigma|\rho)}$ where D_{\max} is the max-relative entropy. Note that, if \mathcal{F} can be characterized by semidefinite conditions (e.g. in coherence theory $\mathcal{F} = \{ \sigma : \sigma \geq 0, \text{Tr } \sigma = 1, \sigma = \Delta(\sigma) \}$ where Δ is the dephasing channel erasing the off-diagonal entries), then $\Gamma(\rho)$ can be efficiently computed by semidefinite programming (SDP) for given ρ . In the resource theory of thermodynamics, the Gibbs state τ is the only free state and we thus have a closed-form formula for free component as $\Gamma_\rho = \frac{1}{\lambda_{\max}(\rho^{-1}\tau)}$ (where λ^{\max} denotes the largest eigenvalue) if $\text{supp}(\rho) \supseteq \text{supp}(\tau)$ and zero otherwise [18, Theorem 2].

It can be easily seen that the free component obeys the desirable monotonicity property that it cannot be reduced by free operations:

Proposition 2 (Monotonicity). *For any state ρ and any free operation \mathcal{E} , it holds that $\Gamma_\rho \leq \Gamma_{\mathcal{E}(\rho)}$.*

Proof. Suppose Γ_ρ is achieved by $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}$. Then by definition $\rho - \Gamma_\rho\sigma \geq 0$, and thus $\mathcal{E}(\rho) - \Gamma_\rho\mathcal{E}(\sigma) \geq 0$. Since $\mathcal{E}(\sigma) \in \mathcal{F}$ by the golden rule, we have that $\Gamma_{\mathcal{E}(\rho)} \geq \Gamma_\rho$ by definition. \square

Moreover, it is super-multiplicative under composition, i.e. tensor product:

Proposition 3 (Super-multiplicity). *For any quantum states ρ_1, ρ_2 , it holds that $\Gamma_{\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2} \geq \Gamma_{\rho_1} \Gamma_{\rho_2}$.*

Proof. Suppose that the maximization in $\Gamma_{\rho_1}, \Gamma_{\rho_2}$ are respectively achieved by $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathcal{F}$, that is, $\rho_i \geq \lambda_{\rho_i} \sigma_i, i = 1, 2$. It holds that $\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2 \geq (\Gamma_{\rho_1} \sigma_1) \otimes (\Gamma_{\rho_2} \sigma_2) = \Gamma_{\rho_1} \Gamma_{\rho_2} \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2$. Also note that $\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ axiomatically. Therefore, $\Gamma_{\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2} \geq \Gamma_{\rho_1} \Gamma_{\rho_2}$ by definition. \square

Consider the task of purification, namely transforming a noisy state ρ to a certain target pure state $\psi = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ up to some error. Formally, the error of purification is defined by the infidelity with the target state: for input state ρ , transformation operation \mathcal{E} and target pure state ψ , the error $\varepsilon(\rho \xrightarrow{\mathcal{E}} \psi) := 1 - \text{Tr } \psi \mathcal{E}(\rho) = 1 - \langle \psi | \mathcal{E}(\rho) | \psi \rangle$. Also, let f_ψ denote the maximum overlap of pure state $\psi = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ with free states, namely, $f_\psi := \max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}} \text{Tr } \psi \sigma = \max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}} \langle \psi | \sigma | \psi \rangle$. We now prove an improved deterministic no-purification theorem using a method different from Ref. [12], which directly connects the accuracy of purifying a noisy state with its free component.

Theorem 4. *Given any state ρ and any pure state ψ , there is no free operation that transforms ρ to ψ with error smaller than $\Gamma_\rho(1 - f_\psi)$. That is, it holds for any free operation \mathcal{E} that*

$$\varepsilon(\rho \xrightarrow{\mathcal{E}} \psi) \geq \Gamma_\rho(1 - f_\psi). \quad (3)$$

Proof. By the definition of Γ_ρ , there exists free state $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}$ and state τ such that ρ can be decomposed as follows:

$$\rho = \Gamma_\rho \sigma + (1 - \Gamma_\rho) \tau. \quad (4)$$

Let \mathcal{E} be any free operation. By linearity,

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \Gamma_\rho \mathcal{E}(\sigma) + (1 - \Gamma_\rho) \mathcal{E}(\tau). \quad (5)$$

Then it holds that

$$\varepsilon(\rho \xrightarrow{\mathcal{E}} \psi) = 1 - \text{Tr } \mathcal{E}(\rho) \psi \quad (6)$$

$$= 1 - \Gamma_\rho \text{Tr } \mathcal{E}(\sigma) \psi - (1 - \Gamma_\rho) \text{Tr } \mathcal{E}(\tau) \psi \quad (7)$$

$$\geq 1 - \Gamma_\rho f_\psi - (1 - \Gamma_\rho) \quad (8)$$

$$= \Gamma_\rho(1 - f_\psi), \quad (9)$$

where the inequality follows from the fact that $\text{Tr } \mathcal{E}(\sigma) \psi \leq f_\psi$ since $\mathcal{E}(\sigma) \in \mathcal{F}$ by the golden rule, and $\text{Tr } \mathcal{E}(\tau) \psi \leq 1$. \square

This induces a corresponding lower bound on distillation overhead:

Corollary 5. *Consider distillation procedures represented by a free operation that transform n copies of noisy states $\hat{\rho}$ to target pure state ψ within error ϵ . Then n must satisfy:*

$$n \geq \frac{\log \frac{1-f_\psi}{\epsilon}}{\log \frac{1}{\Gamma_{\hat{\rho}}}}. \quad (10)$$

Proof. Note that, due to the super-multiplicity property (Proposition 3), $\Gamma_{\hat{\rho}^{\otimes n}} \geq (\Gamma_{\hat{\rho}})^n$. The rest is similar to the proof of Theorem 2 in Ref. [12]. \square

The new method replaces the minimum eigenvalue of ρ in the corresponding bounds in Ref. [12] by its free component, which represents a significant improvement from both qualitative and quantitative perspectives, as detailed in the following.

First, the range of applicability of the no-purification rule is significantly extended. The proof using the quantum hypothesis testing relative entropy presented in Ref. [12] applies to full-rank input states. However, our new result implies that no-purification actually holds more broadly (see also Ref. [?, Proposition 2]):

Corollary 6. *There is no free operation that exactly transforms state ρ to any pure resource state $\psi \notin \mathcal{F}$ ($f_\psi < 1$ since \mathcal{F} is closed) if $\Gamma_\rho > 0$, i.e. there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that $\rho - \gamma\sigma \geq 0$ for some $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}$.*

Below we give some alternative useful characterizations of the $\Gamma > 0$ condition:

Proposition 7. *For any quantum state ρ , the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) *Free component:* $\Gamma_\rho > 0$;
- (ii) *Support:* There exists $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\text{supp}(\rho) \supseteq \text{supp}(\sigma)$;
- (iii) *Resource monotone:* $\mathfrak{D}_{\min}(\rho) := \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}} D_{\min}(\rho||\sigma) = 0$, where $D_{\min}(\rho||\sigma) := -\log \text{Tr} \Pi_\rho \sigma$ is the min-relative entropy between ρ and σ , and Π_ρ is the projector onto $\text{supp}(\rho)$.

Proof. It is clear that (i) implies (ii) and (ii) implies (iii). It remains to show that (iii) implies (i). Suppose (iii) holds, then there exists $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $D_{\min}(\rho||\sigma) = 0$. By definition, we have $\text{Tr}(I - \Pi_\rho)\sigma = 0$. That is, $\ker(\rho) \perp \text{supp}(\sigma)$, and equivalently, $\text{supp}(\rho) \supseteq \text{supp}(\sigma)$. If $\rho = \sigma$, then (i) holds. Otherwise, we have $D_{\max}(\sigma||\rho) > 0$. (Note that $D_{\max}(\sigma||\rho) = 0$ if and only if $\rho = \sigma$.) This implies that there exists $t > 1$ such that $\sigma \leq t\rho$. Let $p = 1/t$ and $\sigma = (t\rho - \sigma)/(t-1)$. Then we have $p \in (0, 1)$, $\sigma \geq 0$, $\text{Tr} \sigma = 1$ and $\rho = p\sigma + (1-p)\sigma$. Thus (i) holds as well. \square

It is clear that for pure resource state $\psi \notin \mathcal{F}$, we have $\Gamma_\psi = 0$, so the no-purification bounds can only be non-trivial for mixed states. Meanwhile, it can be immediately seen (e.g. from (ii)) that the $\Gamma > 0$ condition is weaker than full-rank. In fact, it holds as long as the support of ρ contains some free state in its support, which is generically the case for mixed states in normal resource theories. Still, note that it does not necessarily hold for mixed states. For a concrete example, consider coherence theory: consider $\rho = \frac{1}{2}(|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| + |\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2|)$ where $|\psi_1\rangle = \frac{|0\rangle+|1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$, $|\psi_2\rangle = \frac{|2\rangle+|3\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |2\rangle, |3\rangle$ form an orthonormal basis. It can be verified that ρ is mixed but $\Gamma_\rho = 0$ because any decreasing of the diagonal entries will make the matrix negative. It would be interesting to further understand and characterize the $\Gamma > 0$ condition in specific theories. Furthermore, note that the new result also applies to continuous variables, or infinite-dimensional quantum systems.

We remark that if we only require the purification transformation to succeed with some probability (the probabilistic setting), the $\Gamma > 0$ condition does not always imply no-purification and it seems that the full-rank condition cannot be alleviated. For example, consider the following flagged state

$$\rho = p|0\rangle\langle 0|_F \otimes \psi_A + (1-p)|1\rangle\langle 1|_F \otimes \tau_A, \quad (11)$$

where ψ is the target pure state and τ is a state such that $\Gamma_\tau > 0$. Then $\Gamma_\rho > 0$ (ρ is not full rank), but we can obtain ψ with probability p by measuring F (which is conventionally free) and postselect on 0.

Second, the new bounds are quantitatively better than the corresponding bounds in Ref. [12] for full-rank input states. It is first straightforward to see that $\Gamma_\rho \geq \lambda_\rho^{\min}$ where λ_ρ^{\min} denotes the minimum non-zero eigenvalue of ρ , because $\rho \geq \lambda_\rho^{\min} \cdot I \geq \lambda_\rho^{\min} \cdot \sigma$ for any state σ where I denotes the identity matrix on $\text{supp}(\rho)$. So by definition, $\Gamma_\rho \geq \lambda_\rho^{\min}$. In sum, the new bounds completely cover the previous ones.

In particular, when the noisy state ρ is close to free states \mathcal{F} , the minimum eigenvalue λ_ρ^{\min} could still be small but Γ_ρ approaches one. This indicates that the new bound will exhibit much tighter behaviors in the large error regime, especially when ρ approaches \mathcal{F} . Importantly, the bound on distillation overhead Corollary 5 indicates that $n \rightarrow \infty$, i.e. the number of copies needed diverges, as $\hat{\rho}$ approaches \mathcal{F} because $\Gamma_{\hat{\rho}} \rightarrow 1$. This cannot be deduced from results in Ref. [12].

Below we discuss some concrete examples of practical interest, which demonstrate that the new bounds strictly outperform the corresponding bounds in Ref. [12] and could be tight in important scenarios.

Example 1 (Magic state distillation). Consider T -states $|T\rangle = T|+\rangle = (|0\rangle + e^{i\pi/4}|1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ contaminated by depolarizing or dephasing noise, given by

$$\tau = (1 - \zeta)|T\rangle\langle T| + \zeta \frac{I}{2}, \quad (12)$$




FIG. 1. The cross section of the Bloch sphere through the center perpendicular to the Z axis. The blue square represents the corresponding cross section of the stabilizer hull (STAB). $\bar{\tau}$ is actually $|T\rangle$ subject to $p = 1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ depolarizing noise and lies on the edge of STAB. τ is the noisy input state that lies between $|T\rangle$ and $\bar{\tau}$.

where ζ is the noise strength, as the input. Note that we are interested in $\zeta \in (0, 1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2})$ so that τ is a mixed state outside of the stabilizer hull. On the one hand, it can be directly checked that $\lambda_{\tau}^{\min} = \zeta/2$. On the other hand, Γ_{τ} is bounded as follows. Consider the free state

$$\bar{\tau} = \frac{1}{2}(|+\rangle\langle+| + T^2|+\rangle\langle+|T^{\dagger 2}) = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1-i \\ 1+i & 2 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{F}, \quad (13)$$

which sits at the edge of the stabilizer hull closest to $|T\rangle$ (as depicted in Fig. 1). Then by the definition of Γ , we have

$$\Gamma_{\tau} \geq \max\{\gamma : \tau - \gamma\bar{\tau} \geq 0\} = \max\left\{\gamma : \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \beta & \alpha \end{pmatrix} \geq 0\right\}. \quad (14)$$

with $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \gamma)$ and $\beta = \frac{1-\zeta}{2}e^{-i\pi/4} - \gamma\frac{1-i}{4}$. By solving the determinant we obtain that, in the range $\zeta \in (0, 1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2})$,

$$\Gamma_{\tau} \geq (2 + \sqrt{2})\zeta, \quad (15)$$

which also outperforms $\lambda_{\tau}^{\min} = \zeta/2$ and thus the previous error bound for any pure target state by a constant factor. As a sanity check, the bound indeed approaches 1 as $\zeta \rightarrow 1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ in contrast to the λ^{\min} bound. This implies the expected phenomenon that the total distillation overhead blows up as τ approaches the stabilizer hull (see Corollary 5). In particular, for the standard task of distilling T -states, we thus obtain an improved bound on the overhead following the proof of Theorem 3 of Ref. [12]:

Corollary 8. *Consider the following common formulation of magic state distillation task: given n copies of noisy states τ , output an m -qubit state τ such that $\text{Tr} \tau_i T = \langle T | \tau_i | T \rangle \geq 1 - \epsilon, \forall i = 1, \dots, m$ where $\tau_i = \text{Tr}_{\bar{i}} \tau$*

is the i -th qubit, by some free (stabilizer-preserving) operation. Then n must satisfy:

$$n \geq \frac{\log \frac{(4-2\sqrt{2})^m - 1}{(4-2\sqrt{2})^m m \epsilon}}{\log \frac{2-\sqrt{2}}{2\zeta}}. \quad (16)$$

Example 2 (Coherence). Consider maximally coherent qubit state $|+\rangle = (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ contaminated by different important noise channels, including depolarizing noise, dephasing noise, and amplitude damping noise, as the input.

For the depolarizing noise (here the dephasing noise has an equivalent effect), the noisy state is given by $\rho = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1-\mu \\ 1-\mu & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, where $\mu \in (0, 1)$ is the noise strength. Then $\lambda_{\rho}^{\min} = \mu/2$, and it can be easily calculated that $\Gamma_{\rho} = \mu$. That is, the new error bound is twice the previous one for any pure target state.

For the amplitude damping noise, the new bound has a more remarkable advantage. Here the noisy state is given by $\rho = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1+\nu & \sqrt{1-\nu} \\ \sqrt{1-\nu} & 1-\nu \end{pmatrix}$, where $\nu \in (0, 1)$ is the noise strength. Then $\lambda_{\rho}^{\min} = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \sqrt{1-\nu+\nu^2})$. We numerically solve Γ_{ρ} , and the comparison between λ_{ρ}^{\min} and Γ_{ρ} is illustrated in Fig. 2(b) (note that the values plotted are all multiplied by a factor 1/2; see below). Note that, as ν increases, i.e. ρ is more heavily damped towards the free state $|0\rangle$, the error of purification is expected to grow. As can be seen from Fig. 2(b), as $\nu \rightarrow 1$, λ_{ρ}^{\min} vanishes and thus the corresponding becomes trivial, but Γ_{ρ} indeed keeps growing. So this is an important case where the new Γ bound behaves significantly better compared to the λ^{\min} bound.

Let's explicitly consider $|+\rangle$ as the target state. It is known that the optimal fidelity of transforming ρ to $|+\rangle$ by free operations (MIO) can be solved by SDP [19, Theorem 3]

$$\max \left\{ \text{Tr} G \rho : 0 \leq G \leq I, \Delta(G) = \frac{I}{2} \right\}. \quad (17)$$

In Fig. 2, we plot the optimal error obtained by the above SDP as well as the Γ and λ^{\min} lower bounds for comparison. In particular, for depolarizing or dephasing noise, the Γ bound turns out to be tight, i.e. can be achieved, for any noise strength.

Example 3 (Covariant quantum error correction). Lastly, we briefly remark that our bounds are suited to the study of the limit of quantum error correction with constraints. An important case that plays fundamental roles in quantum computing and physics and has drawn considerable interest recently is covariant (symmetry-constrained) quantum error correction [20–25]. Following arguments in Ref. [24], the decoding or recovery can often be understood as a resource purification task and thus our no-purification theorems apply. Under the notations in Ref. [24], we directly find the following bound:




FIG. 2. Comparisons between the optimal achievable error of a standard purification task and the lower bounds induced by Γ (this work) and λ^{\min} (Ref. [12]) in coherence theory. The task is to recover the maximally coherent qubit state $|+\rangle$ under typical noise channels: (a) depolarizing and dephasing noise; (b) amplitude damping noise. The green and blue dashed lines are respectively Γ and λ^{\min} lower bounds, and the red line is the minimum error achieved by MIO computed by SDP Eq. (17). In (a) the green dashed line actually overlaps with the red line, indicating that the free component bound is tight.

Corollary 9. *Let G be a compact continuous symmetry group. Suppose G -covariant encoding operation $\mathcal{E}_{L \rightarrow S}$ defines an ϵ -correctable code on physical system S , and that the noise \mathcal{N} is G -covariant. Then*

$$\epsilon \geq \max_{\psi_L} \Gamma_{\mathcal{N} \circ \mathcal{E}(\psi_L)} (1 - f_{\psi_L}), \quad (18)$$

where ψ_L is a logical pure state.

See Sec. III B 2 for related discussions and results. Further analysis of the bound for specific noises and comparisons with the existing bounds will be left for future work.

III. CHANNEL THEORY

Here, we extend the no-purification theory to quantum channels. The channel analog of purification is to transform a noisy channel (or noisy channels, as will be discussed) to a unitary (noiseless) channel, or equivalently, to simulate the unitary channel by the noisy ones. We employ the above methods to study such problems in the channel resource theory setting where the resource objects are quantum channels instead of states. We first present error bounds in the most general forms, and then specifically investigate the adaptive or sequential simulation setting, which represents an important difference from states. To demonstrate the practical relevance of the general no-go rules and bounds, we discuss them in more specific contexts, and outline the applications to quantum error correction, gate and circuit synthesis, and channel capacities.

Note that we often specify the input and output systems of channels in the subscripts (a channel \mathcal{N} from

system A to system B is denoted as $\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}$, and if the input and output systems are the same one A it is simply denoted as \mathcal{N}_A), but when there is no ambiguity we shall omit the labels.

A. General theory and results

1. Setups and basic error bounds

For channel resource theories, the building blocks analogous to free states and free operations are *free channels* and *free superchannels*, where superchannels map channels to channels. Now the golden rule is that any free superchannel must map a free channel to another free channel. Note that, axiomatically, if \mathcal{N}_1 and \mathcal{N}_2 are free, then the two types of composition $\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2$ and $\mathcal{N}_2 \circ \mathcal{N}_1$ are free. See e.g. [26, 27] for more comprehensive discussions of the general framework of channel resource theories.

Let \mathcal{F} be the set of free channels (which is only assumed to be a closed set). Given linear maps \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} , the order $\mathcal{N} - \mathcal{M} \geq 0$ means $\mathcal{N} - \mathcal{M}$ is a completely positive map. We now define the channel version of free component as follows:

Definition 10 (Channel free component). *The free component of quantum channel \mathcal{N} is defined as*

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}} := \max \{ \gamma : \mathcal{N} - \gamma \mathcal{M} \geq 0, \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{F} \}. \quad (19)$$

Equivalently,

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}} = \max \{ \gamma : \mathcal{N} = \gamma \mathcal{M} + (1 - \gamma) \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{F}, \text{channel } \mathcal{R} \}. \quad (20)$$

Also note that

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}} = \Gamma_{\Phi_{\mathcal{N}}}, \quad (21)$$

where $\Phi_{\mathcal{N}} := \mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B} \otimes \text{id}_R(\Phi_{AR})$ ($\Phi_{AR} = \sum_j |j\rangle_A |j\rangle_R / \sqrt{d}$ is a maximally entangled state between A and a system R of the same dimension d) is the Choi state of \mathcal{N} , and the set of free states is $\{\Phi_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{F}\}$, because $\mathcal{N} \geq \gamma \mathcal{M}$ is equivalent to $\Phi_{\mathcal{N}} \geq \gamma \Phi_{\mathcal{M}}$. Similar to the state case, as long as \mathcal{F} can be characterized by semidefinite conditions, then $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}}$ can be efficiently computed by SDP.

Note the monotonicity property:

Proposition 11 (Monotonicity). *For any quantum channel \mathcal{N} and free superchannel Π , it holds that $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}} \leq \Gamma_{\Pi(\mathcal{N})}$.*

Proof. Same as Proposition 2. \square

And now for channels, we need to consider sequential composition in addition to parallel composition represented by tensor product (more discussions later). The channel free component is super-multiplicative under both types of composition:

Proposition 12 (Super-multiplicity). *For any quantum channels $\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2$, it holds that $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2} \geq \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_1} \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_2}$ and $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_2 \circ \mathcal{N}_1} \geq \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_1} \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_2}$.*

Proof. Suppose that the maximization in $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_1}, \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_2}$ are respectively achieved by $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2 \in \mathcal{F}$, that is, $\mathcal{N}_i \geq \lambda_{\mathcal{N}_i} \mathcal{M}_i, i = 1, 2$. It holds that $\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2 \geq (\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_1} \mathcal{M}_1) \otimes (\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_2} \mathcal{M}_2) = \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_1} \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_2} \mathcal{M}_1 \otimes \mathcal{M}_2$, and similarly, $\mathcal{N}_2 \circ \mathcal{N}_1 \geq (\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_2} \mathcal{M}_2) \circ (\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_1} \mathcal{M}_1) = \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_1} \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_2} \mathcal{M}_2 \circ \mathcal{M}_1$. Also note that $\mathcal{M}_1 \otimes \mathcal{M}_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{M}_1 \circ \mathcal{M}_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ axiomatically. Therefore, $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2} \geq \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_1} \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_2}$ and $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_2 \circ \mathcal{N}_1} \geq \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_1} \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_2}$ by definition. \square

Here we are interested in the channel simulation task of transforming a given quantum channel \mathcal{N} to a target unitary channel \mathcal{U} via some superchannel up to some error that is measured by certain choices of channel distances. Let $F(\rho, \sigma) = \|\sqrt{\rho} \sqrt{\sigma}\|_1^2$ be the Uhlmann fidelity between general states ρ and σ . Consider the following three typical versions of channel fidelity that are commonly used:

- Worst-case (entanglement) fidelity:

$$F_W(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) := \inf_{\rho_{AR}} F(\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B} \otimes \text{id}_R(\rho_{AR}), \mathcal{M}_{A \rightarrow B} \otimes \text{id}_R(\rho_{AR})), \quad (22)$$

where the optimization includes system R . Note that it is equivalent to optimize over pure input states due to the joint concavity of fidelity F [28].

- Choi fidelity:

$$F_C(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) := F(\Phi_{\mathcal{N}}, \Phi_{\mathcal{M}}) \quad (23)$$

where $\Phi_{\mathcal{E}} := \mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow B} \otimes \text{id}_R(\Phi_{AR})$ denotes the Choi state of \mathcal{E} ($\Phi_{AR} = \sum_j |j\rangle_A |j\rangle_R / \sqrt{d}$ is a maximally entangled state between A and a system R of the same dimension d).

- Average-case fidelity [29]:

$$F_A(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) := \int d\psi F(\mathcal{N}(\psi), \mathcal{M}(\psi)), \quad (24)$$

where the integral is over the Haar measure on the input state space.

The corresponding versions of infidelity are then

$$\varepsilon_x(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) := 1 - F_x(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}), \quad x \in \{W, C, A\}. \quad (25)$$

Also, a standard measure of distance between channels is given by the diamond norm distance:

$$\varepsilon_{\diamond}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) := \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{N} - \mathcal{M}\|_{\diamond}, \quad (26)$$

where $\|\mathcal{E}\|_{\diamond} := \sup_{\rho_{AR}} \|\mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow B} \otimes \text{id}_R(\rho_{AR})\|_1$. Again, it is equivalent to optimize over pure input states due to the convexity of trace norm $\|\cdot\|_1$. All the above channel distance measures are symmetric in its arguments.

Note that these channel distance measures are commonly used in different scenarios [29]. For example, the worst-case entanglement fidelity and the diamond norm error are commonly used in quantum computation scenarios like circuit synthesis (see e.g. [30, 31], Sec. III B 4) and approximate quantum error correction (see e.g. [32], Sec. III B 2); the Choi fidelity is used in quantum Shannon theory to evaluate the performance of quantum communication (see e.g. [33, 34], Sec. III B 3); the average-case fidelity is easier to estimate in experiments (see e.g. [35–38]).

In this work, we are mostly interested in the case where an argument is a unitary channel \mathcal{U} . Note that for pure state ψ , we have the inequality [3]

$$1 - F(\rho, \psi) \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \psi\|_1 \leq \sqrt{1 - F(\rho, \psi)}, \quad (27)$$

so it holds that

$$\varepsilon_W(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{U}) \leq \varepsilon_{\diamond}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{U}) \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon_W(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{U})}. \quad (28)$$

Also, it is known [29, 39] that the average-case fidelity and the Choi fidelity have the following direct relation:

$$F_A(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{U}) = \frac{F_C(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{U})d + 1}{d + 1}, \quad (29)$$

and thus

$$\varepsilon_A(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{U}) = \frac{d}{d + 1} \varepsilon_C(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{U}), \quad (30)$$

where d is the dimension of the input system. Furthermore, it is clear from definition that

$$F_C(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) \geq F_W(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}), \quad (31)$$

$$\varepsilon_C(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) \leq \varepsilon_W(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}), \quad (32)$$

for any channels \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} . To summarize, for the case of comparing with unitary channel \mathcal{U} which is of interest in this work, the four channel distance measures are ordered as follows:

$$\varepsilon_{\diamond}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{U}) \geq \varepsilon_W(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{U}) \geq \varepsilon_C(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{U}) = \frac{d + 1}{d} \varepsilon_A(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{U}). \quad (33)$$

We are interested in the task of using channel \mathcal{N} to simulate unitary target channel \mathcal{U} via transformation superchannel Π . The (different versions of) simulation error is simply given by

$$\varepsilon_x(\mathcal{N} \xrightarrow{\Pi} \mathcal{U}) := \varepsilon_x(\Pi(\mathcal{N}), \mathcal{U}), \quad x \in \{W, C, A, \diamond\}. \quad (34)$$

Also define corresponding versions of the maximum overlap of channel \mathcal{N} with free channels as

$$f_{\mathcal{N}}^x := \max_{\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{F}} F_x(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}), \quad x \in \{W, C, A\}. \quad (35)$$

Our final bounds are in terms of the Choi overlap $f_{\mathcal{U}}^C$ of the target unitary channel \mathcal{U} . Note the following simple fact:

Proposition 13 (Faithfulness). *For quantum channels \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} ,*

$$F^{\text{W}}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) = F^{\text{C}}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) = F^{\text{A}}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) = 1 \quad (36)$$

if and only if $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M}$. As a consequence,

$$f_{\mathcal{N}}^{\text{W}} = f_{\mathcal{N}}^{\text{C}} = f_{\mathcal{N}}^{\text{A}} = 1 \quad (37)$$

if and only if $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{F}$, given that \mathcal{F} is closed.

We now present error bounds for these channel error measures. For the Choi and average-case fidelities, note the following linearity property:

Lemma 14 (Linearity). *For any unitary channel \mathcal{U} , the Choi and average-case fidelities $F_{\text{C}}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{U})$ and $F_{\text{A}}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{U})$ are linear in \mathcal{N} , i.e. given $\mathcal{N} = p\mathcal{N}_1 + (1-p)\mathcal{N}_2$ for $p \in [0, 1]$ and channels $\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2$, it holds for $x \in \{\text{C}, \text{A}\}$ that*

$$F_x(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{U}) = pF_x(\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{U}) + (1-p)F_x(\mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{U}). \quad (38)$$

Proof. First consider the Choi fidelity. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} & F_{\text{C}}(p\mathcal{N}_1 + (1-p)\mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{U}) \\ &= F(\Phi_{p\mathcal{N}_1 + (1-p)\mathcal{N}_2}, \Phi_{\mathcal{U}}) \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

$$= \text{Tr}(\Phi_{p\mathcal{N}_1 + (1-p)\mathcal{N}_2} \Phi_{\mathcal{U}}) \quad (40)$$

$$= p \text{Tr}(\Phi_{\mathcal{N}_1} \Phi_{\mathcal{U}}) + (1-p) \text{Tr}(\Phi_{\mathcal{N}_2} \Phi_{\mathcal{U}}) \quad (41)$$

$$= pF_{\text{C}}(\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{U}) + (1-p)F_{\text{C}}(\mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{U}), \quad (42)$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that $\Phi_{\mathcal{U}} = \mathcal{U} \otimes \text{id}(\Phi)$ is a pure state, and the third equality follows from the linearity of the trace function. Then due to Eq. (29), we conclude that F_{A} has the same linearity property. \square

Collectively, our best bounds are as follows:

Theorem 15. *Given any quantum channel \mathcal{N} and any unitary target channel \mathcal{U} , it holds for any free superchannel Π that*

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{\diamond}(\mathcal{N} \xrightarrow{\Pi} \mathcal{U}) &\geq \varepsilon_{\text{W}}(\mathcal{N} \xrightarrow{\Pi} \mathcal{U}) \\ &\geq \varepsilon_{\text{C}}(\mathcal{N} \xrightarrow{\Pi} \mathcal{U}) \geq \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}}(1 - f_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{C}}), \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

and

$$\varepsilon_{\text{A}}(\mathcal{N} \xrightarrow{\Pi} \mathcal{U}) \geq \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}}(1 - f_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{A}}) = \frac{d}{d+1} \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}}(1 - f_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{C}}), \quad (44)$$

where d is the dimension of the input system of \mathcal{U} .

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of Theorem 4. By the definition of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}}$, there exists free channel $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{F}$ and channel \mathcal{R} such that \mathcal{N} can be decomposed as follows:

$$\mathcal{N} = \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}}\mathcal{M} + (1 - \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}})\mathcal{R}. \quad (45)$$

Let Π be any free superchannel. By the linearity of superchannels,

$$\Pi(\mathcal{N}) = \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}}\Pi(\mathcal{M}) + (1 - \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}})\Pi(\mathcal{R}). \quad (46)$$

Then for $x \in \{\text{C}, \text{A}\}$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_x(\mathcal{N} \xrightarrow{\Pi} \mathcal{U}) &= 1 - F_x(\Pi(\mathcal{N}), \mathcal{U}) \\ &= 1 - F_x(\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}}\Pi(\mathcal{M}) + (1 - \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}})\Pi(\mathcal{R}), \mathcal{U}) \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

$$= 1 - \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}}F_x(\Pi(\mathcal{M}), \mathcal{U}) - (1 - \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}})F_x(\Pi(\mathcal{R}), \mathcal{U}) \quad (49)$$

$$\geq 1 - \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}}f_{\mathcal{U}}^x - (1 - \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}}) \quad (50)$$

$$= \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}}(1 - f_{\mathcal{U}}^x), \quad (51)$$

where the third line follows from the linearity property Lemma 14, and the inequality follows from the fact that $F_{\text{C}}(\Pi(\mathcal{M}), \mathcal{U}) \leq f_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{C}}$ since $\Pi(\mathcal{M}) \in \mathcal{F}$ by the golden rule, and $F_{\text{C}}(\Pi(\mathcal{R}), \mathcal{U}) \leq 1$. Then by Eq. (33) we obtain Eq. (43), and Eq. (44) follows from the relation Eq. (29) and is essentially the same bound as the last one of Eq. (43) upto a dimension factor. \square

Note that the best bounds we can get for all error measures are in terms of the Choi overlap $f_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{C}}$. A natural question is whether one can directly use $f_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{W}}$ in the bound for ε_{W} , which would improve the bound. The problem is we do not have a linearity property analogous to Lemma 14 for the worst-case fidelity F_{W} , so the third line does not go through.

As long as the target channel $\mathcal{U} \notin \mathcal{F}$, it is clear by definition that $f_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{C}} < 1$. That is, for any channel \mathcal{N} satisfying the $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}} > 0$ condition and any resource unitary channel, all the above error bounds are nontrivial and thus imply a non-zero error.

2. Multiple channel uses and adaptive channel simulation

Now we discuss the scenario where one takes multiple noisy channels as inputs and intends to simulate some unitary channel, which is analogous to the standard task of distilling high-quality resources from many noisy resources in the state setting. However, the multiple instance setting represents a very important difference between channels and states. The composition of multiple states has a simple parallel structure represented by tensor products. In contrast, multiple channels can be used sequentially and adaptively, which is not simply described by tensor products and may be more powerful the parallel scheme. Whether the adaptive scheme can outperform the parallel one is a crucial problem in many research areas about quantum channels, such as channel simulation, discrimination, and estimation (see e.g. [40–48]).

First, note that the parallel use of multiple channels $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_n$ is again represented by tensor product and thus can be simply regarded as a single channel




FIG. 3. Quantum comb. Given input channels $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_n$, the general map that outputs a channel can be represented by a quantum comb (grey area) realized by channels $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_{n+1}$, and the input channels are used by inserting them into the slots.

$\mathcal{N} = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{N}_i$. Therefore, the results above can be directly applied. In addition to error bounds, using the super-multiplicity property (Proposition 12), we directly bound the cost or overhead of unitary channel simulation, defined by the number of instances of a certain channel needed to simulate some unitary channel, under parallel strategies.

Corollary 16 (Parallel simulation cost). *Suppose some free superchannel Π transforms n instances of noisy channels \mathcal{N} to target unitary channel \mathcal{U} with a certain type of error $\epsilon_x \geq \epsilon_x(\mathcal{N} \xrightarrow{\Pi} \mathcal{U}), x \in \{\diamond, W, C\}$. Then n must satisfy:*

$$n \geq \frac{\log \frac{1-f_{\mathcal{U}}^C}{\epsilon_x}}{\log \frac{1}{\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}}}}. \quad (52)$$

The bound in terms of error measured by ϵ_A is equivalent to the ϵ_C case.

Now we consider the adaptive scheme, which represents the most general way to use multiple input channels to simulate an output channel. Here, the action on input channels $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_n$ is represented by a “quantum comb” [49, 50] realized by channels $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_{n+1}$, and the input channels are inserted into the slots (as depicted in Fig. 3). In resource theory contexts, we again have a golden rule on the comb that the comb maps free channels to a free channel, that is, if one inserts free channels $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_n \in \mathcal{F}$ in the slots of comb Π_n then the overall channel $\Pi_n[\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_n] \in \mathcal{F}$. Note that, in the case where the comb is realized by free channels $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_{n+1} \in \mathcal{F}$ (and suppose the identities on the ancilla systems are considered free, which is common), it obviously obey the golden rule, because axiomatically the composition of free channels is free. However, the converse is not necessarily true, that is, free comb is a more general notion than free realization.

Note that the channel free component obeys the following monotonicity property under free combs:

Proposition 17 (Monotonicity). *For any channels $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_n$ and free comb Π_n acting on n channels, it holds that $\Gamma_{\Pi_n[\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_n]} \geq \prod_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_i}$.*

Proof. Suppose the quantum comb Π_n is realized by channels \mathcal{E}_i with $i = 1, \dots, n+1$, as depicted in Fig. 3. We emphasize that \mathcal{E}_i are not necessarily free channels themselves; the only requirement here is that the whole comb obeys the golden rule, i.e. $\Pi_n[\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_n] \in \mathcal{F}$ as long as $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_n \in \mathcal{F}$. Suppose that the maximization in $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_i}$ is achieved by $\mathcal{M}_i \in \mathcal{F}$, that is, $\mathcal{N}_i \geq \lambda \mathcal{M}_i, \forall i$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_n[\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_n] &= \mathcal{E}_{n+1} \circ (\mathcal{N}_n \otimes \text{id}_n) \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{E}_2 \circ (\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \text{id}_1) \circ \mathcal{E}_1 \quad (53) \end{aligned}$$

$$\geq \prod_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_i} \mathcal{E}_{n+1} \circ (\mathcal{M}_n \otimes \text{id}_n) \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{E}_2 \circ (\mathcal{M}_1 \otimes \text{id}_1) \circ \mathcal{E}_1 \quad (54)$$

$$= \prod_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_i} \Pi_n[\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_n], \quad (55)$$

where the inequality follows from the fact that channel tensorizations and compositions preserve the channel order $\mathcal{N} \geq \lambda \mathcal{M}$. Recall that $\Pi_n[\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_n] \in \mathcal{F}$ since $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_n \in \mathcal{F}$. Therefore we have $\Gamma_{\Pi_n[\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_n]} \geq \prod_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_i}$ by definition. \square

Now for input channels $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_n$, comb Π_n and unitary target channel \mathcal{U} , the simulation error is defined as

$$\epsilon_x([\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_n] \xrightarrow{\Pi_n} \mathcal{U}) := \epsilon_x(\Pi_n[\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_n], \mathcal{U}), \quad (56)$$

for $x \in \{\diamond, W, C, A\}$.

By a little tweak of the proofs above, we establish bounds on the error and cost for adaptive simulation, which match those for the parallel case:

Corollary 18 (Adaptive simulation error). *Given any input channels $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_n$ and any unitary target channel \mathcal{U} , it holds for any free comb Π_n that*

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{\diamond}([\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_n] \xrightarrow{\Pi_n} \mathcal{U}) &\geq \epsilon_W([\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_n] \xrightarrow{\Pi_n} \mathcal{U}) \\ &\geq \epsilon_C([\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_n] \xrightarrow{\Pi_n} \mathcal{U}) \geq \prod_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_i} (1 - f_{\mathcal{U}}^C), \quad (57) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_A([\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_n] \xrightarrow{\Pi_n} \mathcal{U}) &\geq \prod_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_i} (1 - f_{\mathcal{U}}^A) = \frac{d}{d+1} \prod_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_i} (1 - f_{\mathcal{U}}^C), \quad (58) \end{aligned}$$

where d is the dimension of the input system of \mathcal{U} .

Proof. Simply note that, according to Eq. (55), we have the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi[\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_n] &= \prod_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_i} \Pi[\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_n] + \left(1 - \prod_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_i}\right) \mathcal{R}, \quad (59) \end{aligned}$$

for some channel \mathcal{R} . By following the arguments in the proof of Theorem 15, one can establish similar error bounds where $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}}$ is replaced by $\prod_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_i}$. \square

Therefore, we can establish the same bound on the simulation cost for the adaptive scheme:

Corollary 19 (Adaptive simulation cost). *Suppose some free comb Π_n transforms n instances of noisy channels $\hat{\mathcal{N}}$ to target unitary channel \mathcal{U} with a certain type of error $\epsilon_x \geq \epsilon_x([\hat{\mathcal{N}}, \dots, \hat{\mathcal{N}}] \xrightarrow{\Pi_n} \mathcal{U}), x \in \{\diamond, W, C\}$. Then n must satisfy:*

$$n \geq \frac{\log \frac{1-f_{\mathcal{U}}^C}{\epsilon_x}}{\log \frac{1}{\Gamma_{\hat{\mathcal{N}}}}}. \quad (60)$$

The bound in terms of error measured by ϵ_A is equivalent to the ϵ_C case.

In sum, an observation is that the simulation cost asymptotically scales at least as $\Omega(\log(1/\epsilon_x))$ as target error $\epsilon_x \rightarrow 0$ even if we allow adaptive usages of the input channels, no matter which kind of error measure x is chosen.

3. No-purification conditions

Here, we discuss the situations where no-go rules are in place for channel resource purification, i.e. no unitary resource channels can be exactly simulated. For both the cases of single and multiple input channels, the basic statement goes as follows:

Corollary 20. *There is no free superchannel (or comb) that exactly transforms channel \mathcal{N} (or a collection of channels $\{\mathcal{N}_i\}_i$) to any unitary resource channel $\mathcal{U} \notin \mathcal{F}$ ($f_{\psi} < 1$ since \mathcal{F} is closed) if $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}} > 0$, i.e. there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that $\mathcal{N} - \gamma\mathcal{M} \geq 0$ for some $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{F}$ (or $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_i} > 0, \forall i$).*

Now similar to Proposition 7, we give a series of alternative characterizations of the $\Gamma = 0$ condition, which could be illustrative or useful in certain scenarios:

Proposition 21. *For any quantum channel \mathcal{N} , the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) *Free component:* $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}} > 0$;
- (ii) *Worst case:* For any ρ , $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N} \otimes \text{id}(\rho)} > 0$, where the set of free states is $\{\mathcal{M} \otimes \text{id}(\rho) : \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{F}\}$:
 - (a) *Support:* There exists $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that, for any ρ , $\text{supp}(\mathcal{N} \otimes \text{id}(\rho)) \supseteq \text{supp}(\mathcal{M} \otimes \text{id}(\rho))$;
 - (b) *Resource monotone:* $\mathfrak{D}_{\min}(\mathcal{N}) := \min_{\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{F}} D_{\min}(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{M}) = 0$, where $D_{\min}(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{M}) := \sup_{\rho} D_{\min}(\mathcal{N} \otimes \text{id}(\rho) \parallel \mathcal{M} \otimes \text{id}(\rho))$, (or equivalently optimizing over pure input states) is the (worst-case) channel min-relative entropy between \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} [51, 52].

(iii) *Choi state:* $\Gamma_{\Phi_{\mathcal{N}}} > 0$, where $\Phi_{\mathcal{N}} = \mathcal{N} \otimes \text{id}(\Phi)$ is the Choi state of \mathcal{N} , and the set of free states is $\{\Phi_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{F}\}$:

- (a) *Support:* There exists $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\text{supp}(\Phi_{\mathcal{N}}) \supseteq \text{supp}(\Phi_{\mathcal{M}})$;
- (b) *Resource monotone:* $\mathfrak{D}'_{\min}(\mathcal{N}) := \min_{\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{F}} D_{\min}(\Phi_{\mathcal{N}} \parallel \Phi_{\mathcal{M}}) = 0$ where $D_{\min}(\Phi_{\mathcal{N}} \parallel \Phi_{\mathcal{M}})$ is the Choi-state channel min-relative entropy between \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} .

Proof. (i) and (iii) are equivalent since the Choi isomorphism equalizes the complete-positive order between channels and the positive order between their Choi states (noting that $\mathcal{N} \geq \gamma\mathcal{M}$ is equivalent to $\Phi_{\mathcal{N}} \geq \gamma\Phi_{\mathcal{M}}$). Then (ii) provides a possibly useful intermediate characterization. The characterizations in terms of support and monotone comes from Proposition 7. \square

So in the channel theory, the counterparts of min-relative entropy monotones also nicely contrast noisy entities with pure ones.

B. Some specific scenarios and applications

1. Overview: channel resource theories and practical noises

To be more concrete, let us consider some specific cases of practical interest. Here we give some basic discussions on typical noise models and the corresponding no-purification bounds in the contexts of different kinds of channel resource theories.

At a high level, we may classify channel resource theories into two kinds:

- **Error correction or communication theories.** In such theories, one is interested in the noise channels and their abilities to simulate noiseless channels so as to preserve or transmit information. The overall target channel is usually the identity channel, representing no error or loss of quantum information occurring. The set of free channels commonly involve e.g. certain constant (replacer) channels which represent complete loss of information. Here the free channels are generally directly induced by physical restrictions on the implementable operations that e.g. perform the tasks of encoding and decoding.
- **Resource generation theories.** Such theories are based on some resource theory that can be understood at the level of states (such as entanglement, coherence, magic). The features of channels and simulation tasks of interest are related to their ability of generating the state resource. Here the set of free channels are derived from state theories and thus obey the resource non-generating property (for example, id is axiomatically free). A typical scenario of this kind is synthesis, where a common

task is to simulate, or “synthesize” some complicated target channel by elementary resource channels. See further discussions in the next part.

In some sense, theories of the first kind are intrinsically based on channels, and those of the second kind are induced by state theories. Such classification may help elucidate the interplay between channel and state resource theories.

Now we discuss typical noisy channels of interest in these two kinds of channel resource theories respectively and present some elementary analysis. First, consider the first kind, where id is a resource. Here one is interested in the simulation ability of noise channels themselves. A general observation is that, for stochastic noise $\mathcal{N}_\mu = (1-\mu)\text{id} + \mu\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ where $\mu \in (0, 1)$ is the noise strength, if the noise channel $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ is considered free in the theory under study, then $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_\mu} \geq \mu$, which can be directly used to establish bounds on simulation error and cost. We list a few important noise models that are special cases: (i) Depolarizing noise: $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(\rho) = I/d$ is just a constant channel that outputs the maximally mixed state; (ii) Erasure noise: $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(\rho) = |\perp\rangle\langle\perp|$ is also a constant channel that outputs an orthogonal garbage state; For these two cases $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ is normally free as it essentially erases information completely. (iii) Dephasing noise: $\tilde{\mathcal{N}} = \Delta$ which erases the off-diagonal entries and thus is typically free in quantum scenarios since all coherence-related information is lost. (iv) Pauli noise: $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(\rho) = \sum_i \mu_i P_i \rho P_i$ where $\forall i \mu_i \geq 0, \sum_i \mu_i = \mu$ and P_i 's are non-identity Pauli operators (note that this model encompasses the depolarizing and dephasing noises); Here $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ is a stabilizer operation, and thus the global Pauli noise has free component in the stabilizer theory, leading to limitations on stabilizer quantum error correction. We shall demonstrate the connections to quantum error correction in more detail in Sec. III B 2. Another important and relevant scenario of this kind is communication or Shannon theory, which we shall discuss more specifically in Sec. III B 3.

For the second kind, the input channels of practical interest are usually not the noise channels themselves but resource-generating channels contaminated by noises. For example, consider $\mathcal{N}_\mu \circ \mathcal{G} = (1-\mu)\mathcal{G} + \mu\tilde{\mathcal{N}} \circ \mathcal{G}$ where \mathcal{N}_μ is a stochastic noise and \mathcal{G} is a noiseless resource-generating channel. Also note that, in contrast to the first kind, the theory is commonly built upon a clear notion of free states. Then a general observation for this case is that if $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ always output a free state, then $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_\mu \circ \mathcal{G}} \geq \mu$. Again, this holds for the depolarizing and erasures noises in normal theories where the maximally mixed state and the garbage state are free (note that the bound can be loose in e.g. magic theory; see Sec. III B 4). Then by definition, it also applies to dephasing noise in theories where the diagonal states are free (such as coherence and $U(1)$ -asymmetry). As mentioned, a particularly important problem in such theories is synthesis. In Sec. III B 4, we shall discuss the implications of our general results to practical synthesis problems in more

detail.

Notably, certain communication problems and synthesis correspond to adaptive channel simulation, which cannot be understood in the single-channel or parallel simulation schemes.

2. Quantum error correction

As a cornerstone of quantum computing and information [3], quantum error correction serves to tackle noise and errors in physical systems by the idea of encoding the quantum information in a suitable way and then decoding or recovering it after noise and errors occur. It is clearly important to understand various kinds of limits on quantum error correction procedures. Our results here are relevant to the scenario where the error correction procedures obey certain rules or constraints, such as stabilizer [3, 53] and covariant quantum error correction [20–25] which play important roles in quantum computing and physics. Noting that the task is essentially to simulate an identity channel on the logical system L , our general results indicate universal limitations on the accuracy and efficiency of quantum error correction with constraints when the system is subject to generic non-unitary noises:

Corollary 22 (Constrained quantum error correction). *Suppose that the encoder and decoder are free channels (subject to certain resource theory constraints). Then the worst-case error (which is the standard choice of error measure for approximate quantum error correction and defines the notion of ϵ -correctable) of the error correction procedure for noise channel \mathcal{N}_S acting on the physical system S obeys:*

$$\epsilon_W(\mathcal{N}_S \rightarrow \text{id}_L) \geq \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_S}(1 - f_{\text{id}_L}^C). \quad (61)$$

In particular, consider the independent (memoryless) noise model where the noise channel \mathcal{N} acts independently on each subsystem (e.g. qubit), i.e. the overall noise channel has the form $\mathcal{N}_S = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{N}_i$ where i labels the physical subsystems. Then

$$\epsilon_W(\mathcal{N}_S \rightarrow \text{id}_L) \geq (\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}})^n (1 - f_{\text{id}_L}^C), \quad (62)$$

and thus to achieve target error $\epsilon_W \geq \epsilon_W(\mathcal{N}_S \rightarrow \text{id}_L)$, the number of physical subsystems n obeys:

$$n \geq \frac{\log \frac{1 - f_{\text{id}_L}^C}{\epsilon_W}}{\log \frac{1}{\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}}}}. \quad (63)$$

In the case of stochastic noise $\mathcal{N} = (1-\mu)\text{id} + \mu\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ where $\tilde{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathcal{F}$, $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}}$ in the above bounds can be replaced by μ .

As mentioned, this general result applies to the important cases of stabilizer and covariant quantum error correction, the encoding and decoding operations of which are respectively Clifford [53] and covariant [24] (or free in

channel theories of magic and asymmetry, respectively). Note that in covariant quantum error correction, under the commonly-held assumption that the noise \mathcal{N}_S is covariant, we have the stronger conclusion that the error bound Eq. (61) holds for any decoder, i.e. the code is no better than $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_S}(1 - f_{\text{id}_L}^C)$ -correctable [24]. For independent Pauli and erasure noises in the stabilizer case, and depolarizing, dephasing, and erasure noises in the covariant case, $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}}$ can be replaced by μ in the bounds. Here we only discussed rather simple and general cases for illustration purposes, and the analysis is expected to be crude. It would be interesting to investigate more complicated noise models and perform more refined analysis of the bounds in specific scenarios, and compare to existing error correction methods.

3. Quantum Shannon theory

The central problem in quantum Shannon theory is to determine the capability of quantum channels to reliably transmit information. Depending on the purpose of transmission (e.g. transmitting classical or quantum information) and the resources that can be used at hand, there are many different variants of channel capacities, each of which corresponds to a channel simulation task in the language of resource theory (see e.g. [26, 54, 55]).

Here we discuss quantum capacities, which correspond to the task of transforming a given channel to an identity channel between two distant users. Note that we need to distinguish the identity channel shared between distant labs from the local identity channel whose input and output systems belong to the same lab. The former is regarded as the ideal resource while the latter is completely free. In resource theory language, channel capacities are determined by the choice of free superchannels or combs Π which correspond to specific coding strategies. Some important cases include [56–59]:

- Unassisted code: superchannel Π can be decomposed into an encoder $\mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow A'}$ by Alice composed with a decoder $\mathcal{D}_{B \rightarrow B'}$ by Bob, i.e., $\Pi = \mathcal{D}_{B \rightarrow B'} \mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow A'}$;
- Entanglement-assisted code: superchannel Π acts as $\Pi[\mathcal{N}](\rho_A) = \mathcal{D}_{B\bar{B} \rightarrow B'} \mathcal{N}_{A' \rightarrow B} \mathcal{E}_{A\bar{A} \rightarrow A'}(\rho_A \otimes \omega_{\bar{A}\bar{B}})$ with encoder $\mathcal{E}_{A\bar{A} \rightarrow A'}$, decoder $\mathcal{D}_{B\bar{B} \rightarrow B'}$ and shared quantum state $\omega_{\bar{A}\bar{B}}$;
- Non-signalling assisted code: superchannel Π is non-signalling from Alice and Bob and vice-versa;
- Two-way classical communication assisted code: quantum comb Π can be realized by LOCC (local operation and classical communication) operations $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_{n+1}$ between Alice and Bob (see Fig. 3).

Once the free superchannels or combs are set, the set of free channels is then implicitly defined as the channels that can be generated via these superchannels or combs.

Note that the first three coding strategies correspond to parallel channel simulation while the last one corresponds to adaptive channel simulation.

The performance of quantum communication can be characterized by an achievable triplet (n, k, ϵ) , meaning that there exists a Π -assisted coding strategy that uses n instances of the resource channel to transmit k qubits, or simulate id_{2^k} (identity channel on the system of dimension 2^k), within ϵ error (here we consider Choi error, which is the standard choice of error measure for quantum communication). Then by Corollary 18, we can obtain the following bounds on these parameters for general quantum communication in the non-asymptotic regime:

Corollary 23 (Quantum communication). *Suppose (n, k, ϵ_C) is an achievable quantum communication triplet by noise channel \mathcal{N} with an Π -assisted code. Then the Choi error ϵ_C obeys:*

$$\epsilon_C \geq (\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}})^n (1 - f_{\text{id}_{2^k}}^C). \quad (64)$$

In other words, the minimum number of channel uses required to enable reliable transmission of k qubits within Choi error ϵ_C must satisfy:

$$n \geq \frac{\log \frac{1 - f_{\text{id}_{2^k}}^C}{\epsilon_C}}{\log \frac{1}{\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}}}}. \quad (65)$$

As the quantum capacity concerns the maximum number of qubit that can be reliably transmitted per use of the channel, we can equivalently obtain a non-trivial trade-off (which can be interpreted as a bound on the non-asymptotic Π -assisted quantum capacity):

$$\frac{k}{n} \leq -\frac{1}{n} \log \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_C}{(\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}})^n} \right) \quad \text{if } \epsilon_C \leq (\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}})^n. \quad (66)$$

We now discuss in more detail the two-way assisted quantum capacity, which is of particular importance due to its close relation to the practical scenario of distributed quantum computing and quantum key distribution. Due to the notorious difficulty of adaptive communication strategies and the involved structure of LOCC operations, this quantum communication scenario is not well understood in spite of its practical importance. The corresponding asymptotic setting that assumes infinite access to the resource channels was recently investigated in Refs. [57–59] by a relaxation of LOCC operations to the mathematically more tractable PPT operations. In this case, we have the maximum overlap $f_{\text{id}_m}^C \leq \frac{1}{m}$ [60]. Also note that, since PPT operations are semidefinite representable, $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}}$ here can be efficiently computed by

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}} = \max \left\{ \text{Tr } W : \Phi_{\mathcal{N}} \geq W, W \geq 0, \right. \\ \left. W^{T_B} \geq 0, \text{Tr}_B W_{AB} = (\text{Tr } W_{AB}) I_A / |A| \right\}, \quad (67)$$

where $\Phi_{\mathcal{N}}$ is the Choi state of $\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}$. Fitting these parameters into Corollary 23 can help us do analysis beyond the asymptotic treatment and understand the intricate tradeoff between different operational parameters of concern.

4. Noisy circuit synthesis

The problem of approximating some desired transformation by quantum circuits consisted of certain elementary gates, commonly studied under the name of quantum circuit or gate or unitary synthesis (or sometimes known as “compiling”), is crucial to the practical implementation of quantum computation. Depending on the practical setting, it is often the case that some gates are considered particularly costly as compared to other gates, and thus we are mostly interested in the amount of costly gates needed for the desired synthesis task. A key observation here is that such synthesis tasks can be formalized as adaptive channel simulation problems, where free gates form a comb and the costly gates are input channels that are inserted into the slots of the comb. A particularly important case is “Clifford+ T ”, where we would like to decompose the target transformation into Clifford gates, which are assumed to be free since they can be rather easily implemented fault-tolerantly, and the “expensive” T -gates $T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\pi/4} \end{pmatrix}$. Note that the T -gates are often implemented by “state injection” gadgets [61] that make use of T -states produced by magic state distillation (studied in Sec. II), which is a resource-intensive procedure. Therefore, the key figure of merit we would like to optimize is the number of T -gates used (namely the “ T -count”); see e.g. [62–68] for a host of previous studies related to this problem. Notably, resource theory is helpful for finding good bounds on T -counts in certain cases [69, 70].

Existing literature on the synthesis problem mostly focuses on the noiseless scenario, where the elementary gates are unitary. Since practical devices will generally be quite noisy (especially in the near-term), it could be interesting to directly consider noisy gates as the elementary components of the circuit for synthesis. We note that this noisy synthesis setting is fundamentally different from the noiseless one, as will be discussed later. Similarly, the key question is how many noisy resource gates are needed to approximate a target unitary. Based on the observation mentioned earlier which links the synthesis problem to adaptive channel simulation, we establish the following universal lower bounds on such “noisy gate count” from Corollary 19 (note that for synthesis problems we often use the diamond norm error):

Corollary 24 (Noisy gate count). *Consider the synthesis task of simulating unitary channel \mathcal{U} by channel (noisy gate) \mathcal{G} and arbitrary use of a set of free channels which compose a free comb, within diamond norm error ϵ_\diamond . Then the number of instances of \mathcal{G} needed must satisfy:*

$$n \geq \frac{\log \frac{1-f_{\mathcal{U}}^C}{\epsilon_\diamond}}{\log \frac{1}{\Gamma_{\mathcal{G}}}}. \quad (68)$$




FIG. 4. Noisy Clifford+ T synthesis. (a) Free component of the noisy T -gate $\mathcal{N}_\mu \circ T$, where T is followed by depolarizing noise of strength μ . (b) Lower bounds on the noisy T -count (the number of $\mathcal{N}_\mu \circ T$) needed to simulate a CCZ gate within diamond norm error ϵ , depicted for noise strength $\mu = 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4$.

We now investigate the Clifford+ T case specifically, where the T -gate is contaminated by noise, and we are interested in the number of such noisy T -gates, or the “noisy T -count”. Let $\mathcal{C}_n = \{\mathcal{U}_j\}_{j=1}^N$ be the n -qubit Clifford group consisting of N discrete elements. Let the set of free channels be the convex hull of \mathcal{C}_n , i.e. $\mathcal{F} = \text{conv}(\mathcal{C}_n)$, meaning that we allow mixtures of Clifford gates. Any free channel $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{F}$ can be written as a convex combination $\mathcal{M} = \sum_{j=1}^N p_j \mathcal{U}_j$ with $p_j \geq 0$ and $\sum_{j=1}^N p_j = 1$. For condition $\mathcal{N} \geq \gamma \mathcal{M}$, we can replace $q_j = \gamma p_j$ and obtain an equivalent condition $\mathcal{M} \geq \sum_{j=1}^N q_j \mathcal{U}_j$ with $q_j \geq 0$ and $\gamma = \sum_{j=1}^N q_j$. Therefore, the free component can be computed by a semidefinite program

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}} = \max \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^N q_j : \Phi_{\mathcal{N}} \geq \sum_{j=1}^N q_j \Phi_{\mathcal{U}_j}, q_j \geq 0 \right\}, \quad (69)$$

where $\Phi_{\mathcal{N}}$ and $\Phi_{\mathcal{U}_j}$ are the Choi states of \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{U}_j respectively. As a concrete example, consider T gate followed by depolarizing noise $\mathcal{N}_\mu(\rho) = (1-\mu)\rho + \mu I/2$ as the elementary channel. Its free component $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_\mu \circ T}$ is computed by the SDP Eq. (69) where $N = 24$ (see e.g. [71] for an explicit enumeration of \mathcal{C}_1), and depicted in Fig. 4(a). When $\mu \geq 1 - \sqrt{3}/3 \approx 0.42$ we see that $\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_\mu \circ T} = 1$, as \mathcal{N}_μ compresses the entire Bloch sphere into the stabilizer octahedron so any output is a stabilizer state. Note that this explicit calculation improves the general bound μ as discussed in Sec. III B 1. In Fig. 4(b), as an example, we plot the lower bounds on the noisy T -count in order to approximate a CCZ gate, obtained from Corollary 24 (where we used $f_{\text{CCZ}}^W \leq 9/16$ [70, Eq.(33)]).

Recently, Ref. [72, Proposition 26] also gave an expression for the noisy gate counts in magic theory of odd dimensions using the mana monotone. Note that our result applies to any dimension, and is expected to outperform the mana bound especially in the small target error regime. In particular, our bound implies diverg-

ing cost as the target error $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, which is in line with intuitions, but the mana bound cannot.

Finally, we would like to remark that the noisy synthesis results here are fundamentally different from the existing ones on noiseless synthesis, in spite of some apparent relations. Most notably, it is known that for any universal gate set, the number of gates needed to approximate all unitaries up to error ϵ (which can essentially be measured by any channel error measure discussed earlier) scales at least as $\Omega(\log(1/\epsilon))$ [73] (note that the well-known Solovay–Kitaev theorem [3, 30, 31] concerns the upper bound). Although the $\Omega(\log(1/\epsilon))$ scaling is similar to our lower bound on noisy gate counts, there are two key differences: (i) Our noisy synthesis bound concerns the number of resource gates needed and say nothing about the number of free gates, while the noiseless synthesis bound counts the total number of gates; (ii) Our noisy synthesis bound is universal for *any* target resource unitary, while the noiseless synthesis bound concerns the worst case and there could well be target unitaries with lower or even trivial cost (some target unitaries can be exactly simulated, such as T in Clifford+ T). Relatedly, the geometric covering argument used in Ref. [73] is not useful for the noisy case. In general, the noiseless and noisy synthesis and gate counts are fundamentally disparate problems contingent on different factors. This can again be seen from Clifford+ T , where intricate number theory properties and techniques play decisive roles in the noiseless case [62–66] while being irrelevant in the noisy case.

IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We introduced a simple, universal way to understand and analyze the limitations on deterministic quantum resource purification tasks, based on the notion of “free component” of noisy resources, that apply to virtually any resource theory. We developed the theory in detail for both quantum states and channels. For the state theory, our new results significantly improve over corresponding ones in Ref. [12] in terms of both the no-go regime and the quantitative limits. Another major contribution of this work was to establish the no-purification theory for quantum channels. In particular, we dealt with subtleties of channel theory about error measures and new possibility of adaptively using multiple resources. We demonstrated broad theoretical and practical relevance of our results by discussing their applications to several key areas of quantum information and technologies. In summary, we established a more comprehensive and powerful theory of the universal no-purification rules based on the new free component approach, and demon-

strated its broad relevance in quantum information and physics.

An important future work is to further apply and analyze our bounds and associated parameters in specific theories and problems. The discussions on applications we gave here mainly serve to establish initial connections and are at a rather basic level. Further developing the connections to these important practical problems would be a potentially fruitful direction to go. In particular, for the extensively studied topics of quantum error correction and Shannon theory, it would be nice to further optimize the bounds and bridge them with existing results in specific scenarios. We eventually hope that our demonstrations here will spark explorations of further applications or consequences of the no-purification rules in quantum information and physics.

Finally, we mention some other interesting relevant problems. First, here we considered channel simulation with a single target channel, but most generally the output can also be a comb [49]; It would be interesting to further study the no-purification bounds for this case and explore their relevance. Second, there is still little understanding about purification for continuous variables. To our knowledge, there is not yet satisfactory counterparts of magic state distillation protocols that can achieve arbitrary accuracy, and we do not have a satisfactory understanding of fault tolerance, for continuous variables. To further study purification and distillation e.g. via bosonic quantum error correction could be important for continuous variable and optical quantum computing.

Note added. After completing our draft, we became aware of an independent work by Regula and Takagi [74], which considers related problems and methods.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Newton Cheng, Gilad Gour, Liang Jiang, Seth Lloyd, Milad Marvian, Kyungjoo Noh, and Sisi Zhou for discussions and feedback, Bartosz Regula and Ryuji Takagi for discussions and correspondence about their work [74], and especially Andreas Winter for discussions about the initial ideas. KF is supported by the Institute for Quantum Computing, University of Waterloo. Research at the Institute for Quantum Computing is supported by Industry Canada. ZWL is supported by Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported in part by the Government of Canada through the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Colleges and Universities.

[1] John Preskill, “Quantum Computing in the NISQ era and beyond,” *Quantum* **2**, 79 (2018).

[2] Frank Arute et al., “Quantum supremacy using a pro-

- grammable superconducting processor,” *Nature* **574**, 505–510 (2019).
- [3] Michael A Nielsen and Isaac L Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- [4] Charles H. Bennett, Herbert J. Bernstein, Sandu Popescu, and Benjamin Schumacher, “Concentrating partial entanglement by local operations,” *Phys. Rev. A* **53**, 2046–2052 (1996).
- [5] Charles H. Bennett, Gilles Brassard, Sandu Popescu, Benjamin Schumacher, John A. Smolin, and William K. Wootters, “Purification of noisy entanglement and faithful teleportation via noisy channels,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 722–725 (1996).
- [6] Charles H. Bennett, David P. DiVincenzo, John A. Smolin, and William K. Wootters, “Mixed-state entanglement and quantum error correction,” *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 3824–3851 (1996).
- [7] Sergey Bravyi and Alexei Kitaev, “Universal quantum computation with ideal clifford gates and noisy ancillas,” *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 022316 (2005).
- [8] Ryszard Horodecki, Paweł Horodecki, Michał Horodecki, and Karol Horodecki, “Quantum entanglement,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865–942 (2009).
- [9] Alexander Streltsov, Gerardo Adesso, and Martin B. Plenio, “Colloquium: Quantum coherence as a resource,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89**, 041003 (2017).
- [10] Victor Veitch, S A Hamed Mousavian, Daniel Gottesman, and Joseph Emerson, “The resource theory of stabilizer quantum computation,” *New J. Phys.* **16**, 013009 (2014).
- [11] Eric Chitambar and Gilad Gour, “Quantum resource theories,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **91**, 025001 (2019).
- [12] Kun Fang and Zi-Wen Liu, “No-go theorems for quantum resource purification,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 060405 (2020).
- [13] Zi-Wen Liu, Kaifeng Bu, and Ryuji Takagi, “One-shot operational quantum resource theory,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 020401 (2019).
- [14] Fernando G. S. L. Brandão and Gilad Gour, “Reversible framework for quantum resource theories,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 070503 (2015).
- [15] Zi-Wen Liu, Xueyuan Hu, and Seth Lloyd, “Resource destroying maps,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 060502 (2017).
- [16] Andrés F. Ducuara and Paul Skrzypczyk, “Operational interpretation of weight-based resource quantifiers in convex quantum resource theories of states,” arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1909.10486 (2019), arXiv:1909.10486 [quant-ph].
- [17] Roope Uola, Tom Bullock, Tristan Kraft, Juha-Pekka Pellonpää, and Nicolas Brunner, “All quantum resources provide an advantage in exclusion tasks,” arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1909.10484 (2019), arXiv:1909.10484 [quant-ph].
- [18] Terry Rudolph and Robert W Spekkens, “Quantum state targeting,” *Physical Review A* **70**, 052306 (2004).
- [19] Bartosz Regula, Kun Fang, Xin Wang, and Gerardo Adesso, “One-shot coherence distillation,” *Physical review letters* **121**, 010401 (2018).
- [20] Patrick Hayden, Sepehr Nezami, Sandu Popescu, and Grant Salton, “Error correction of quantum reference frame information,” (2017), arXiv:1709.04471 [quant-ph].
- [21] Philippe Faist, Sepehr Nezami, Victor V. Albert, Grant Salton, Fernando Pastawski, Patrick Hayden, and John Preskill, “Continuous symmetries and approximate quantum error correction,” (2019), arXiv:1902.07714 [quant-ph].
- [22] Mischa P. Woods and Álvaro M. Alhambra, “Continuous groups of transversal gates for quantum error correcting codes from finite clock reference frames,” *Quantum* **4**, 245 (2020).
- [23] Aleksander Kubica and Rafal Demkowicz-Dobrzanski, “Using quantum metrological bounds in quantum error correction: A simple proof of the approximate eastin-knill theorem,” (2020), arXiv:2004.11893 [quant-ph].
- [24] Sisi Zhou, Zi-Wen Liu, and Liang Jiang, “New perspectives on covariant quantum error correction,” arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2005.11918 (2020), arXiv:2005.11918 [quant-ph].
- [25] Yuxiang Yang, Yin Mo, Joseph M. Renes, Giulio Chiribella, and Mischa P. Woods, “Covariant Quantum Error Correcting Codes via Reference Frames,” arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2007.09154 (2020), arXiv:2007.09154 [quant-ph].
- [26] Zi-Wen Liu and Andreas Winter, “Resource theories of quantum channels and the universal role of resource erasure,” arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1904.04201 (2019), arXiv:1904.04201 [quant-ph].
- [27] Gilad Gour and Carlo Maria Scandolo, “The entanglement of a bipartite channel,” arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.02552 (2019).
- [28] Mark M. Wilde, *Quantum Information Theory* (Cambridge University Press, 2013).
- [29] Alexei Gilchrist, Nathan K Langford, and Michael A Nielsen, “Distance measures to compare real and ideal quantum processes,” *Physical Review A* **71**, 062310 (2005).
- [30] A Yu Kitaev, “Quantum computations: algorithms and error correction,” *Russian Mathematical Surveys* **52**, 1191–1249 (1997).
- [31] Christopher M. Dawson and Michael A. Nielsen, “The solovay-kitaev algorithm,” *Quantum Info. Comput.* **6**, 81–95 (2006).
- [32] Debbie W Leung, Michael A Nielsen, Isaac L Chuang, and Yoshihisa Yamamoto, “Approximate quantum error correction can lead to better codes,” *Physical Review A* **56**, 2567 (1997).
- [33] Marco Tomamichel, Mario Berta, and Joseph M Renes, “Quantum coding with finite resources,” *Nature communications* **7**, 1–8 (2016).
- [34] Xin Wang, Kun Fang, and Runyao Duan, “Semidefinite programming converse bounds for quantum communication,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **65**, 2583–2592 (2018).
- [35] Mark D Bowdrey, Daniel KL Oi, Anthony J Short, Konrad Banaszek, and Jonathan A Jones, “Fidelity of single qubit maps,” *Physics Letters A* **294**, 258–260 (2002).
- [36] JM Chow, Jay M Gambetta, Lars Tornberg, Jens Koch, Lev S Bishop, Andrew A Houck, BR Johnson, L Frunzio, Steven M Girvin, and Robert J Schoelkopf, “Randomized benchmarking and process tomography for gate errors in a solid-state qubit,” *Physical review letters* **102**, 090502 (2009).
- [37] Steven T Flammia and Yi-Kai Liu, “Direct fidelity estimation from few pauli measurements,” *Physical review letters* **106**, 230501 (2011).
- [38] Dawei Lu, Hang Li, Denis-Alexandre Trottier, Jun Li, Aharon Brodutch, Anthony P Krismanich, Ahmad Ghavami, Gary I Dmitrienko, Guilu Long, Jonathan

- Baugh, *et al.*, “Experimental estimation of average fidelity of a clifford gate on a 7-qubit quantum processor,” *Physical review letters* **114**, 140505 (2015).
- [39] Pawel Horodecki, Michal Horodecki, and Ryszard Horodecki, “General teleportation channel, singlet fraction and quasi-distillation,” *arXiv e-prints*, quant-ph/9807091 (1998), [arXiv:quant-ph/9807091 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [40] M. Hayashi, “Discrimination of two channels by adaptive methods and its application to quantum system,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **55**, 3807–3820 (2009).
- [41] Aram W. Harrow, Avinatan Hassidim, Debbie W. Leung, and John Watrous, “Adaptive versus nonadaptive strategies for quantum channel discrimination,” *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 032339 (2010).
- [42] Xin Wang and Mark M Wilde, “Resource theory of asymmetric distinguishability for quantum channels,” *Physical Review Research* **1**, 033169 (2019).
- [43] Kun Fang, Omar Fawzi, Renato Renner, and David Sutter, “Chain rule for the quantum relative entropy,” *Physical Review Letters* **124**, 100501 (2020).
- [44] Mark M. Wilde, Mario Berta, Christoph Hirche, and Eneet Kaur, “Amortized channel divergence for asymptotic quantum channel discrimination,” *Letters in Mathematical Physics* **110**, 2277–2336 (2020).
- [45] Rafal Demkowicz-Dobrzański and Lorenzo Maccone, “Using entanglement against noise in quantum metrology,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 250801 (2014).
- [46] Haidong Yuan and Chi-Hang Fred Fung, “Fidelity and fisher information on quantum channels,” *New Journal of Physics* **19**, 113039 (2017).
- [47] Sisi Zhou and Liang Jiang, “Asymptotic theory of quantum channel estimation,” *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2003.10559 (2020), [arXiv:2003.10559 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [48] Vishal Katariya and Mark M. Wilde, “Geometric distinguishability measures limit quantum channel estimation and discrimination,” *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2004.10708 (2020), [arXiv:2004.10708 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [49] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, “Quantum circuit architecture,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 060401 (2008).
- [50] Giulio Chiribella, Giacomo Mauro D’Ariano, and Paolo Perinotti, “Theoretical framework for quantum networks,” *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 022339 (2009).
- [51] Tom Cooney, Milán Mosonyi, and Mark M. Wilde, “Strong converse exponents for a quantum channel discrimination problem and quantum-feedback-assisted communication,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **344**, 797–829 (2016).
- [52] Xin Wang and Mark M. Wilde, “Resource theory of asymmetric distinguishability for quantum channels,” *Phys. Rev. Research* **1**, 033169 (2019).
- [53] Daniel Gottesman, *Stabilizer codes and quantum error correction*, Ph.D. thesis, California Institute of Technology (1997).
- [54] Kun Fang, Xin Wang, Marco Tomamichel, and Mario Berta, “Quantum channel simulation and the channel’s smooth max-information,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **66**, 2129–2140 (2019).
- [55] Ryuji Takagi, Kun Wang, and Masahito Hayashi, “Application of the resource theory of channels to communication scenarios,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 120502 (2020).
- [56] Xin Wang, Kun Fang, and Marco Tomamichel, “On converse bounds for classical communication over quantum channels,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **65**, 4609–4619 (2019).
- [57] Mario Berta and Mark M Wilde, “Amortization does not enhance the max-rains information of a quantum channel,” *New Journal of Physics* **20**, 053044 (2018).
- [58] Kun Fang and Hamza Fawzi, “Geometric relative entropy divergence and its applications in quantum channel capacities,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05758* (2019).
- [59] Hamza Fawzi and Omar Fawzi, “Defining quantum divergences via convex optimization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.12576* (2020).
- [60] Eric M Rains, “A semidefinite program for distillable entanglement,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **47**, 2921–2933 (2001).
- [61] Daniel Gottesman and Isaac L. Chuang, “Demonstrating the viability of universal quantum computation using teleportation and single-qubit operations,” *Nature* **402**, 390–393 (1999).
- [62] Brett Giles and Peter Selinger, “Exact synthesis of multiqubit clifford+t circuits,” *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 032332 (2013).
- [63] Vadym Kliuchnikov, Dmitri Maslov, and Michele Mosca, “Asymptotically optimal approximation of single qubit unitaries by clifford and t circuits using a constant number of ancillary qubits,” *Physical review letters* **110**, 190502 (2013).
- [64] David Gosset, Vadym Kliuchnikov, Michele Mosca, and Vincent Russo, “An algorithm for the T-count,” *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:1308.4134 (2013), [arXiv:1308.4134 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [65] Peter Selinger, “Efficient clifford+t approximation of single-qubit operators,” *Quantum Info. Comput.* **15**, 159–180 (2015).
- [66] Vadym Kliuchnikov and Jon Yard, “A framework for exact synthesis,” *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:1504.04350 (2015), [arXiv:1504.04350 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [67] Ryan Babbush, Craig Gidney, Dominic W Berry, Nathan Wiebe, Jarrod McClean, Alexandru Paler, Austin Fowler, and Hartmut Neven, “Encoding electronic spectra in quantum circuits with linear t complexity,” *Physical Review X* **8**, 041015 (2018).
- [68] Guang Hao Low, Vadym Kliuchnikov, and Luke Schaeffer, “Trading t-gates for dirty qubits in state preparation and unitary synthesis,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.00954* (2018).
- [69] Mark Howard and Earl Campbell, “Application of a resource theory for magic states to fault-tolerant quantum computing,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 090501 (2017).
- [70] Sergey Bravyi, Dan Browne, Padraic Calpin, Earl Campbell, David Gosset, and Mark Howard, “Simulation of quantum circuits by low-rank stabilizer decompositions,” *Quantum* **3**, 181 (2019).
- [71] T Xia, M Lichtman, K Maller, AW Carr, MJ Piotrowicz, L Isenhower, and M Saffman, “Randomized benchmarking of single-qubit gates in a 2d array of neutral-atom qubits,” *Physical review letters* **114**, 100503 (2015).
- [72] Xin Wang, Mark M Wilde, and Yuan Su, “Quantifying the magic of quantum channels,” *New Journal of Physics* **21**, 103002 (2019).
- [73] Aram W. Harrow, Benjamin Recht, and Isaac L. Chuang, “Efficient discrete approximations of quantum gates,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **43**, 4445–4451 (2002), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1495899>.
- [74] Bartosz Regula and Ryuji Takagi, “Fundamental limita-

tions on quantum channel manipulation,” Appearing on arXiv concurrently.