

Uncertainty principle and quantum Fisher information. II.

Paolo Gibilisco^{a)}

*Dipartimento SEFEMEQ, Facoltà di Economia, Università di Roma "Tor Vergata,"
Via Columbia 2, 00133 Rome, Italy*

Daniele Imparato^{b)}

*Dipartimento di Matematica, Politecnico di Torino, Corso Duca degli Abruzzi 24,
10129 Turin, Italy*

Tommaso Isola^{c)}

*Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Roma "Tor Vergata," Via della Ricerca
Scientifica, 00133 Rome, Italy*

(Received 16 April 2007; accepted 30 April 2007; published online 30 July 2007)

Heisenberg and Schrödinger uncertainty principles give lower bounds for the product of variances $\text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B)$ if the observables A, B are not compatible, namely, if the commutator $[A, B]$ is not zero. In this paper, we prove an uncertainty principle in Schrödinger form where the bound for the product of variances $\text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B)$ depends on the area spanned by the commutators $i[\rho, A]$ and $i[\rho, B]$ with respect to an arbitrary quantum version of the Fisher information.

© 2007 American Institute of Physics. [DOI: [10.1063/1.2748210](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.2748210)]

I. INTRODUCTION

Let X, Y be random variables on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \rho)$ and consider the covariance $\text{Cov}_\rho(X, Y) := E_\rho(XY) - E_\rho(X)E_\rho(Y)$ and the variance $\text{Var}_\rho(X) := \text{Cov}_\rho(X, X)$. The best one can get from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality is the following inequality:

$$\text{Var}_\rho(X)\text{Var}_\rho(Y) - |\text{Cov}_\rho(X, Y)|^2 \geq 0. \quad (1.1)$$

The uncertainty principle is one of the most striking consequences of noncommutativity in quantum mechanics and is a key point in which quantum probability differs from classical probability. We shall limit our discussion to the matrix case. If ρ is a state (i.e., density matrix), A, B observables (i.e., self-adjoint matrices), set $\text{Cov}_\rho(A, B) := \text{Tr}(\rho AB) - \text{Tr}(\rho A)\text{Tr}(\rho B)$. Define also the symmetrized covariance as $\text{Cov}_\rho^s(A, B) := \frac{1}{2}[\text{Cov}_\rho(A, B) + \text{Cov}_\rho(B, A)]$ and the variance as $\text{Var}(A) := \text{Cov}_\rho(A, A) = \text{Cov}_\rho^s(A, A)$. Again from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, one gets the following inequality:

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) - |\text{Cov}_\rho^s(A, B)|^2 \geq \frac{1}{4}|\text{Tr}(\rho[A, B])|^2, \quad (1.2)$$

which is known as the Schrödinger uncertainty principle. By omitting the covariance part, one gets the Heisenberg uncertainty principle (see Refs. 12 and 27). Inequality (1.2) states that the condition $[A, B] \neq 0$ (i.e., A, B are not compatible) gives a limitation to the simultaneous "smallness" of both $\text{Var}_\rho(A)$ and $\text{Var}_\rho(B)$, and this has very important consequences in quantum mechanics.

^{a)}Electronic mail: gibilisco@volterra.uniroma2.it. URL: <http://www.economia.uniroma2.it/sefemeq/professori/gibilisco>

^{b)}Electronic mail: daniele.imparato@polito.it

^{c)}Electronic mail: isola@mat.uniroma2.it. URL: <http://www.mat.uniroma2.it/~isola>

However, noncommutativity can enter also from another side. One may naturally ask if there are similar bounds for the product $\text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B)$ due to the fact that the observables A, B do not commute with the state ρ . Indeed this is the case, and our main result will provide such a bound in terms of an “area” spanned by the commutators $i[\rho, A]$ and $i[\rho, B]$.

To state our result we have to introduce the notion of quantum Fisher information. Let us denote by \mathcal{F}_{op} the class of normalized symmetric operator monotone functions on $(0, +\infty)$. It is by now a classical result of Petz that to each function $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$, one can associate a Riemannian metric $\langle A, B \rangle_{\rho, f}$ on the state manifold that is monotone and therefore a quantum version of the Fisher information (see Refs. 2 and 23). For example, the functions,

$$f_\beta(x) := \beta(1-\beta) \frac{(x-1)^2}{(x^\beta-1)(x^{1-\beta}-1)}, \quad x > 0, \quad \beta \in (0, 1/2],$$

are associated with a quantum Fisher information that is related to the well known Wigner-Yanase-Dyson (WYD) skew information. Indeed, for the WYD information of parameter β , one has

$$-\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}([\rho^\beta, A][\rho^{1-\beta}, A]) = \frac{\beta(1-\beta)}{2} \langle i[\rho, A], i[\rho, A] \rangle_{\rho, f_\beta}.$$

We denote by $\text{Area}_\rho^f(u, v)$ the area spanned by the tangent vectors u, v with respect to the Riemannian monotone metric associated with f (at the point ρ). For $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$, let us define $f(0) := \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} f(x)$; f is said regular if $f(0) > 0$ (see Ref. 9). The subset of regular elements of \mathcal{F}_{op} is denoted by $\mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}^r$.

The goal of the present paper is to prove the following inequality:

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) - |\text{Cov}_\rho^s(A, B)|^2 \geq \frac{1}{4} (f(0) \text{Area}_\rho^f(i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B]))^2, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}^r. \quad (1.3)$$

Note that inequality (1.3) holds trivially in the nonregular case. Our result has been inspired by particular cases of the above theorem that have been proved recently. Luo and Zhang¹⁹ conjectured inequality (1.3) for the Wigner-Yanase metric, namely, for the function $f_{1/2}$. This conjecture was proved shortly after by Luo and Zhang.²¹ The case of WYD metric [namely, the metric associated with f_β for $\beta \in (0, 1/2]$] was proved independently by Kosaki¹³ and by Yanagi *et al.*²⁸ In the paper of Gibilisco and Isola,⁶ they emphasized the geometric aspects of the question and they succeeded to formulate Eq. (1.3) for a general quantum Fisher information.

It is worth to emphasize the dynamical meaning of inequality (1.3). Indeed, each positive (self-adjoint) operator H determines a time evolution of a state ρ according to the formula $\rho_H(t) := e^{-iHt} \rho e^{iHt}$. If $[\rho, H] = 0$, then there is no evolution. Therefore, we may say that the bound given by Eq. (1.3) appears for those pairs of observables that are “dynamically incompatible,” that is, for pairs H, K such that the associated evolutions $\rho_H(t), \rho_K(t)$ are different and nontrivial (this is equivalent to the linear independence of $[\rho, H]$ and $[\rho, K]$).

As a by-product of the work needed to prove our main result, we derive also other two inequalities interesting *per se*. Indeed, a crucial ingredient in the proof of Eq. (1.3) is the following formula:

$$\tilde{f}(x) := \frac{1}{2} \left[(x+1) - (x-1) \frac{f(0)}{f(x)} \right],$$

that associates to any element $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$ another element $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$. Let $A_0 := A - \text{Tr}(\rho A)I$ and denote by L_ρ, R_ρ , respectively, the left and right multiplication by ρ . Let m_f be the mean associated with f (see Sec. VI below) and define

$$\mathcal{C}_\rho^f(A_0) := \text{Tr}(m_f(L_\rho, R_\rho)(A_0)A_0), \quad I_\rho^f(A) := \text{Var}_\rho(A) - \mathcal{C}_\rho^f(A_0).$$

Hansen introduced $I_\rho^f(A)$ in the paper⁹ with a different approach. We shall call it “metric adjusted skew information” or “ f information” to stress the dependence on the function f . One may consider $I_\rho^f(A)$ as a generalization of the WYD information. Let $f_{\text{RLD}}(x) = 2x/(x+1)$; we prove the following inequality:

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) \geq [I_\rho^f(A) + \mathcal{C}_\rho^{f_{\text{RLD}}}(A_0)][I_\rho^f(B) + \mathcal{C}_\rho^{f_{\text{RLD}}}(B_0)], \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}. \quad (1.4)$$

Moreover, we also prove that if $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$,

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) \geq \mathcal{C}_\rho^f(A_0)\mathcal{C}_\rho^f(B_0) + \frac{1}{4}|\text{Tr}(\rho[A, B])|^2 \Leftrightarrow f(x) \leq \sqrt{x}. \quad (1.5)$$

Inequality (1.4) is a refinement of an inequality proved by Luo, for the Wigner-Yanase metric, and by Hansen, in the general case (see Refs. 18 and 9). Inequality (1.5) for the function \sqrt{x} is due to Park and, independently, to Luo (see Refs. 22 and 16). Here we simply prove the optimality of their bound in \mathcal{F}_{op} .

The plan of the paper is as follows.

Sections II–IV contain preliminary notions. In Sec. II we recall the standard Heisenberg and Schrödinger uncertainty principles. In Sec. III we give the fundamental definitions and theorems for number and operator means. In Sec. IV we review the classification theorem for the quantum Fisher informations.

Sections V–VIII contain the core of the paper. In Sec. V we show that to any operator monotone function $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$, one may associate another element $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$ by formula (5.1); we study the properties of the mean $m_{\tilde{f}}$ and of an associated function $H_{\tilde{f}}$, discussing, in particular, how they behave as functions of f . In Sec. VI we prove the main result, namely, inequality (1.3). Furthermore, we study the right side of the above inequality as a function of f and relate it to quantum evolution of states, as said before. In Sec. VII we introduce the f correlation (a kind of generalized WYD correlation) and the f information and discuss their relation with the quantum Fisher information associated with $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$. In this way, we are able to show how inequality (1.3) generalizes the previously known results. Moreover, we prove that by choosing the SLD (Symmetric Logarithmic Derivative or Bures-Uhlmann) metric, the lower bound given in Eq. (1.3) is optimal and strictly greater than the previously known optimal bound (given by the Wigner-Yanase metric). In Sec. VIII we prove a necessary and sufficient condition to get the equality in Eq. (1.3).

In Sec. IX we prove inequality (1.4). In Sec. X we produce counterexamples to prove the logical independence of the uncertainty principles studied in this paper, that is, inequalities (1.3) and (1.4), from the standard Heisenberg-Schrödinger uncertainty principles. In Sec. XI we discuss what happens for not faithful and pure states, also at the light of the notion of radial extension for quantum Fisher information. In Sec. XII we show the optimality of an improvement of the Heisenberg uncertainty principle recently proposed by Park and Luo, namely, we prove inequality (1.5).

II. HEISENBERG AND SCHRÖDINGER UNCERTAINTY PRINCIPLES

Let $M_n := M_n(\mathbb{C})$ [$M_{n,sa} := M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$] be the set of all $n \times n$ complex matrices (all $n \times n$ self-adjoint matrices). We shall denote general matrices by X, Y, \dots , while letters A, B, \dots will be used for self-adjoint matrices. The Hilbert-Schmidt scalar product is denoted by $\langle A, B \rangle = \text{Tr}(A^*B)$. The adjoint of a matrix X is denoted by X^\dagger , while the adjoint of a superoperator $T: (M_n, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle) \rightarrow (M_n, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ is denoted by T^* . Let \mathcal{D}_n be the set of strictly positive elements of M_n and $\mathcal{D}_n^1 \subset \mathcal{D}_n$ be the set of strictly positive density matrices, namely,

$$\mathcal{D}_n^1 = \{\rho \in M_n | \text{Tr } \rho = 1, \rho > 0\}.$$

From now on, we shall treat the case of faithful states, namely, $\rho > 0$. We shall consider the general case $\rho \geq 0$ at the end of the paper, in Sec. XI, where we shall also discuss in detail what happens for pure states.

Definition 2.1: Suppose that $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_n^1$ is fixed. Define $X_0 := X - \text{Tr}(\rho X)I$.

Definition 2.2: For $A, B \in M_{n,sa}$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_n^1$ define covariance and variance as

$$\text{Cov}_\rho(A, B) := \text{Tr}(\rho AB) - \text{Tr}(\rho A)\text{Tr}(\rho B) = \text{Tr}(\rho A_0 B_0),$$

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A) := \text{Tr}(\rho A^2) - \text{Tr}(\rho A)^2 = \text{Tr}(\rho A_0^2).$$

Proposition 2.1:

$$2 \text{Re}\{\text{Cov}_\rho(A, B)\} = \text{Cov}_\rho(A, B) + \text{Cov}_\rho(B, A) = \text{Tr}(\rho\{A_0, B_0\}),$$

$$2i \text{Im}\{\text{Cov}_\rho(A, B)\} = \text{Cov}_\rho(A, B) - \text{Cov}_\rho(B, A) = \text{Tr}(\rho[A, B]),$$

where, for any $X, Y \in M_n$, $[X, Y] := XY - YX$, $\{X, Y\} := XY + YX$.

We define the symmetrized covariance as $\text{Cov}_\rho^s(A, B) := \frac{1}{2}[\text{Cov}_\rho(A, B) + \text{Cov}_\rho(B, A)] = \text{Re}\{\text{Cov}_\rho(A, B)\}$. The Cauchy-Schwartz inequality implies

$$|\text{Cov}_\rho(A, B)|^2 \leq \text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B).$$

From this, one gets the Schrödinger and Heisenberg uncertainty principles which are stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1: (See Ref. 27) For $A, B \in M_{n,sa}$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_n^1$, one has

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) - |\text{Cov}_\rho^s(A, B)|^2 \geq \frac{1}{4}|\text{Tr}(\rho[A, B])|^2$$

that implies

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) \geq \frac{1}{4}|\text{Tr}(\rho[A, B])|^2.$$

III. MEANS FOR POSITIVE NUMBERS AND MATRICES

For this section we refer to the exposition contained in Ref. 26.

Definition 3.1: Let $\mathbb{R}^+ := (0, +\infty)$. A mean for pairs of positive numbers is a function $m: \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

- (i) $m(x, x) = x$,
- (ii) $m(x, y) = m(y, x)$,
- (iii) $x < y \Rightarrow x < m(x, y) < y$,
- (iv) $x < x', y < y' \Rightarrow m(x, y) < m(x', y')$,
- (v) m is continuous, and
- (vi) for $t > 0$, one has $m(tx, ty) = t \cdot m(x, y)$.

We denote by \mathcal{M}_{nu} the set of means.

Definition 3.2: \mathcal{F}_{nu} is the class of functions $f: \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

- (i) $f(1) = 1$,
- (ii) $tf(t^{-1}) = f(t)$,
- (iii) $t \in (0, 1) \Rightarrow f(t) \in (0, 1)$,
- (iv) $t \in (1, \infty) \Rightarrow f(t) \in (1, \infty)$,

- (v) f is continuous, and
- (vi) f is monotone increasing.

Proposition 3.1: There is bijection between \mathcal{M}_{nu} and \mathcal{F}_{nu} given by the formulas

$$m_f(x,y) := yf(xy^{-1}), \quad f_m(t) := m(1,t).$$

Remark 3.1:

$$f \leq g \Leftrightarrow m_f \leq m_g.$$

Here below we report the Kubo-Ando theory of matrix means (see Ref. 14) as exposed in Ref. 26. In the sequel, for any pairs of matrices A, B , we shall write $A < B$ whenever $B - A$ is positive semidefinite.

Definition 3.3: Recall that $\mathcal{D}_n := \{A \in M_n(\mathbb{C}) \mid A > 0\}$. A mean for pairs of positive matrices is a function $m(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathcal{D}_n \times \mathcal{D}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_n$ such that conditions (i)–(v) of Definition 3.1 hold (with the matrix partial order defined above) and the *transformer inequality*,

$$Cm(A,B)C^* \leq m(CAC^*, CBC^*), \quad \forall C,$$

replaces (vi). We denote by \mathcal{M}_{op} the set of matrix means.

Example 3.1: The arithmetic, geometric, and harmonic (matrix) means are given, respectively, by

$$A \nabla B := \frac{1}{2}(A + B),$$

$$A \# B := A^{1/2}(A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2})^{1/2}A^{1/2},$$

$$A!B := 2(A^{-1} + B^{-1})^{-1}.$$

Let us recall that a function $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said *operator monotone* if, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, any $A, B \in M_n$ such that $0 \leq A \leq B$, the inequalities $0 \leq f(A) \leq f(B)$ hold. An operator monotone function is said *symmetric* if $f(x) = xf(x^{-1})$ and *normalized* if $f(1) = 1$.

Definition 3.4: \mathcal{F}_{op} is the class of operator monotone functions $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that conditions (i)–(v) of Definition 3.2 hold (with the matrix partial order defined above).

Note that the above definition is redundant (see, for example, Ref. 1); however, it emphasizes well the similarity with the number case. Indeed, one has the following result.

Proposition 3.2: \mathcal{F}_{op} is the class of functions $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

- (i') $f(1) = 1$,
- (ii') $tf(t^{-1}) = f(t)$, and
- (iii') f is operator monotone increasing.

Equivalently, $f \in \mathcal{F}_{op}$ if and only if f is a normalized, symmetric, operator monotone function.

The fundamental result, due to Kubo and Ando, is the following.

Theorem 3.1: There is bijection between \mathcal{M}_{op} and \mathcal{F}_{op} given by the formula

$$m_f(A,B) := A^{1/2}f(A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2})A^{1/2}.$$

When A and B commute, we have that

$$m_f(A,B) := A \cdot f(BA^{-1}).$$

Theorem 3.2: Among matrix means, arithmetic is the largest while harmonic is the smallest.

Proof: See Theorem 4.5 in Ref. 14. □

Corollary 3.1: For any $f \in \mathcal{F}_{op}$ and for any $x, y > 0$, one has

$$\frac{2x}{1+x} \leq f(x) \leq \frac{1+x}{2},$$

$$\frac{2xy}{x+y} \leq m_f(x,y) \leq \frac{x+y}{2}.$$

IV. QUANTUM FISHER INFORMATIONS

In what follows, given a differential manifold \mathcal{N} , we denote by $T_\rho\mathcal{N}$ the tangent space to \mathcal{N} at the point $\rho \in \mathcal{N}$. In the commutative case a Markov morphism is a stochastic map $T: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$. Let

$$\mathcal{P}_n := \{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^n | \rho_i > 0\}, \quad \mathcal{P}_n^1 := \{\rho \in \mathcal{P}_n | \sum \rho_i = 1\}.$$

The natural representation for the tangent space is given by

$$T_\rho\mathcal{P}_n^1 = \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^n | \sum_i v_i = 0 \right\}.$$

In this case a monotone metric is defined as a family of Riemannian metrics $g = \{g^n\}$ on $\{\mathcal{P}_n^1\}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$g_{T(\rho)}^m(TX, TX) \leq g_\rho^n(X, X)$$

holds for every Markov morphism $T: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, for every $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_n^1$ and for every $X \in T_\rho\mathcal{P}_n^1$.

The Fisher information is the Riemannian metric on \mathcal{P}_n^1 defined as

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{\rho, F} := \sum_i \frac{u_i v_i}{\rho_i}, \quad u, v \in T_\rho\mathcal{P}_n^1.$$

Theorem 4.1: (See Ref. 2) *There exists a unique monotone metric on \mathcal{P}_n^1 (up to scalars) given by the Fisher information.*

In the noncommutative case, a Markov morphism is a completely positive and trace preserving operator $T: M_n \rightarrow M_m$. Recall that there exists a natural identification of $T_\rho\mathcal{D}_n^1$ with the space of self-adjoint traceless matrices, namely, for any $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_n^1$,

$$T_\rho\mathcal{D}_n^1 = \{A \in M_{n,sa} | \text{Tr}(A) = 0\}.$$

In perfect analogy with the commutative case, a monotone metric in the noncommutative case is a family of Riemannian metrics $g = \{g^n\}$ on $\{\mathcal{D}_n^1\}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$g_{T(\rho)}^m(TX, TX) \leq g_\rho^n(X, X)$$

holds for every Markov morphism $T: M_n \rightarrow M_m$, for every $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_n^1$, and for every $X \in T_\rho\mathcal{D}_n^1$. Monotone metrics are usually normalized in such a way that $[A, \rho] = 0$ implies $g_{f,\rho}(A, A) = \text{Tr}(\rho^{-1}A^2)$.

To a normalized symmetric operator monotone function $f \in F_{\text{op}}$, one associates the so-called Chentsov-Morozowa (CM) function

$$c_f(x, y) := \frac{1}{yf(xy^{-1})} = m_f(x, y)^{-1} \quad \text{for } x, y > 0.$$

Define $L_\rho(A) := \rho A$, and $R_\rho(A) := A\rho$; observe that they are self-adjoint operators on $M_{n,sa}$. Since L_ρ and R_ρ commute we may define $c_f(L_\rho, R_\rho) = m_f(L_\rho, R_\rho)^{-1}$. Since m_f is a matrix mean one gets the following result.

Proposition 4.1: (See Ref. 23) *$m_f(L_\rho, R_\rho)$ and $c_f(L_\rho, R_\rho)$ are positive and therefore self-adjoint. Now we can state the fundamental theorems about noncommutative monotone metrics.*

Theorem 4.2: (See Ref. 23) *There exists a bijective correspondence between monotone met-*

rics on \mathcal{D}_n^1 and normalized symmetric operator monotone functions $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$. This correspondence is given by the formula

$$\langle A, B \rangle_{\rho, f} := \text{Tr}(A c_f(L_\rho, R_\rho)(B)) = \text{Tr}(A m_f(L_\rho, R_\rho)^{-1}(B)).$$

We set $\|A\|_{\rho, f}^2 := \langle A, A \rangle_{\rho, f}$. Because of the above theorems, we shall use the terms “monotone metrics” and “quantum Fisher informations” (QFI) with the same meaning.

For a symmetric operator monotone function, define $f(0) := \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} f(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} [f(x)/x]$. Of course, $f(0) \geq 0$. The condition $f(0) \neq 0$ is relevant because it is a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of the so-called radial extension of a monotone metric to pure states (see Refs. 25 and 24 or Sec. XI). Following Ref. 9 we say that a function $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$ is *regular* if and only if $f(0) \neq 0$. The corresponding operator mean, CM function, associated QFI, etc., are said regular too. The class of regular (nonregular) functions $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}^r$ ($\mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}^n$).

As proved by Lesniewski and Ruskai, each QFI is the Hessian of a suitable relative entropy (see Ref. 15).

V. THE FUNCTION \tilde{f} AND THE PROPERTIES OF THE ASSOCIATED MEAN

In Ref. 9 the following result has been proved.

Proposition 5.1: (Proposition 3.4 in Ref. 9)

If $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$ is regular, define the representing function as

$$d_f(x, y) := \frac{(x+y)}{f(0)} - (x-y)^2 c_f(x, y), \quad x, y > 0.$$

Then, the function d_f is positive and operator concave.

Definition 5.1: For $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$ and $x > 0$, set

$$\tilde{f}(x) := \frac{1}{2} \left[(x+1) - (x-1)^2 \frac{f(0)}{f(x)} \right]. \quad (5.1)$$

Proposition 5.2:

$$f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}} \Rightarrow \tilde{f} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}.$$

Proof: Easy calculations show that \tilde{f} is normalized and symmetric. To prove that f is operator monotone note that

- (a) if f is not regular then $\tilde{f}(x) = \frac{1}{2}(1+x)$ and the conclusion follows;
- (b) if f is regular then $\tilde{f}(x) = [f(0)/2]d(x, 1)$. Since d is positive and operator concave so is \tilde{f} . We get the conclusion because operator concavity is equivalent to operator monotonicity (see Ref. 10). \square

Remark 5.1: Note that f regular $\Rightarrow \tilde{f}$ not regular.

Following the terminology of Sec. III, we associate to \tilde{f} both a number and an operator mean by the formulas

$$m_{\tilde{f}}(x, y) := y \tilde{f}(xy^{-1}),$$

$$m_{\tilde{f}}(A, B) := A^{1/2} \tilde{f}(A^{-1/2} B A^{-1/2}) A^{1/2}.$$

Remark 5.2: Observe that $m_{\tilde{f}}(x, y) = [(x+y)/2] - [f(0)/2][(x-y)^2/xyf(x/y)]$.

From Corollary 3.1 one obtains this result.

Corollary 5.1: For any $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$ and for any $x, y > 0$, one has

TABLE I. We have, for some QFI the name, the function f , the mean m_f , the value of f at 0, the function \tilde{f} , and the mean $m_{\tilde{f}}$.

QFI	f	m_f	$f(0)$	\tilde{f}	$m_{\tilde{f}}$
RLD	$2x/(x+1)$	$2/(1/x+1/y)$	0	$(1+x)/2$	$(x+y)/2$
WYD(β) $\beta \in (-1, 0)$	$\beta(1-\beta)(x-1)^2 / (x^\beta-1)(x^{1-\beta}-1)$	$\beta(1-\beta)(x-y)^2 / (x^\beta-y^\beta)(x^{1-\beta}-y^{1-\beta})$	0	$(1+x)/2$	$(x+y)/2$
BKM	$(x-1)/\log x$	$(x-y)/(\log x-\log y)$	0	$(1+x)/2$	$(x+y)/2$
WYD(β) $\beta \in (0, 1/2)$	$\beta(1-\beta)(x-1)^2 / (x^\beta-1)(x^{1-\beta}-1)$	$\beta(1-\beta)(x-y)^2 / (x^\beta-y^\beta)(x^{1-\beta}-y^{1-\beta})$	$\beta(1-\beta)$	$(x^\beta+x^{1-\beta})/2$	$(x^\beta y^{1-\beta}+x^{1-\beta} y^\beta)/2$
WY	$((1+\sqrt{x})/2)^2$	$((\sqrt{x}+\sqrt{y})/2)^2$	1/4	\sqrt{x}	\sqrt{xy}
SLD	$(1+x)/2$	$(x+y)/2$	1/2	$2x/(x+1)$	$2/(1/x+1/y)$

$$\frac{2x}{1+x} \leq \tilde{f}(x) \leq \frac{1+x}{2},$$

$$\frac{2xy}{x+y} \leq m_{\tilde{f}}(x,y) \leq \frac{x+y}{2}.$$

Moreover we have the following result, whose proof is elementary.

Proposition 5.3: For every $x > 0$ and $f, g \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$,

$$\tilde{f}(x) \leq \tilde{g}(x) \Leftrightarrow \frac{f(0)}{f(x)} \geq \frac{g(0)}{g(x)}.$$

We synthesize some results in Table I.

Example 5.1: Let $x > 0$ and $\beta \in (0, 1/2)$. If we set

$$f_{\text{SLD}}(x) := \frac{1+x}{2}, \quad f_{\text{WY}}(x) := \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{x}}{2}\right)^2, \quad f_{\beta}(x) := \beta(1-\beta) \frac{(x-1)^2}{(x^\beta-1)(x^{1-\beta}-1)}, \quad f_{\text{RLD}}(x) := \frac{2x}{1+x},$$

one has (see Table I)

$$\tilde{f}_{\text{SLD}}(x) = \frac{2x}{1+x}, \quad \tilde{f}_{\text{WY}}(x) = \sqrt{x}, \quad \tilde{f}_{\beta}(x) := \frac{x^\beta + x^{1-\beta}}{2}, \quad \tilde{f}_{\text{RLD}}(x) := \frac{1+x}{2}.$$

Note that if $x > 0$ is fixed, the function $\beta \in (0, 1/2) \mapsto x^\beta + x^{1-\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is decreasing. This implies

$$\tilde{f}_{\text{SLD}} \leq \tilde{f}_{\text{WY}} \leq \tilde{f}_{\beta} \leq \tilde{f}_{\text{RLD}},$$

and therefore

$$m_{\tilde{f}_{\text{SLD}}} \leq m_{\tilde{f}_{\text{WY}}} \leq m_{\tilde{f}_{\beta}} \leq m_{\tilde{f}_{\text{RLD}}},$$

that is, a refined arithmetic-geometric-harmonic inequality,

$$\frac{2xy}{x+y} \leq \sqrt{xy} \leq \frac{1}{2}(x^\beta y^{1-\beta} + x^{1-\beta} y^\beta) \leq \frac{1+x}{2}, \quad x, y > 0, \quad \beta \in (0, 1/2).$$

Remark 5.3: The metrics associated with the functions f_{β} are equivalent to the metrics induced by noncommutative α divergences, where $\beta = (1-\alpha)/2$ (see Ref. 11). They are very important in information geometry and are related to the WYD information (see, for example, Refs. 3,4,5 and 7). Defining $\ell_{\gamma}(x) := ((1+x^{\gamma})/2)^{1/\gamma}$ for $\gamma \in [1/2, 1]$, one has $\ell_{\gamma} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$. The two parametric families f_{β}, ℓ_{γ} give us a continuum of operator monotone functions from the smallest

function $2x/(x+1)$ to the largest function $(1+x)/2$. Further examples of this kind of “bridges” can be found in. Refs. 8 and 9. Note that also $g_0(x) := \sqrt{x}$ is an element of \mathcal{F}_{op} .

In the sequel we need to study the following function.

Definition 5.2: For any $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$, set

$$H_f(x, y, w, z) := [(x+y) - m_{\tilde{f}}(x, y)]m_{\tilde{f}}(w, z) + [(w+z) - m_{\tilde{f}}(w, z)]m_{\tilde{f}}(x, y), \quad x, y, w, z > 0.$$

Proposition 5.4: For any $f, g \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f} &\leq \tilde{g} \\ \Downarrow \\ H_f(x, y, w, z) &\leq H_g(x, y, w, z), \quad \forall x, y, w, z > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof: Since

$$(x+y) - m_{\tilde{f}}(x, y) = (x+y) - \frac{x+y}{2} + \frac{(x-y)^2}{2y} \frac{f(0)}{f(x/y)} = \frac{x+y}{2} + \frac{(x-y)^2}{2y} \frac{f(0)}{f(x/y)},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_f(x, y, w, z) &:= [(x+y) - m_{\tilde{f}}(x, y)]m_{\tilde{f}}(w, z) + [(w+z) - m_{\tilde{f}}(w, z)]m_{\tilde{f}}(x, y) \\ &= \left(\frac{x+y}{2} + \frac{(x-y)^2}{2y} \frac{f(0)}{f(x/y)} \right) \left(\frac{w+z}{2} - \frac{(w-z)^2}{2z} \frac{f(0)}{f(w/z)} \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{w+z}{2} + \frac{(w-z)^2}{2z} \frac{f(0)}{f(w/z)} \right) \left(\frac{x+y}{2} - \frac{(x-y)^2}{2y} \frac{f(0)}{f(x/y)} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[(x+y)(w+z) - \left(\frac{(x-y)^2}{y} \frac{(w-z)^2}{z} \right) \left(\frac{f(0)}{f(x/y)} \frac{f(0)}{f(w/z)} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

Since, from Proposition 5.3,

$$\tilde{f} \leq \tilde{g} \Rightarrow \frac{f(0)}{f(t)} \geq \frac{g(0)}{g(t)} > 0, \quad \forall t > 0,$$

we obtain

$$H_f(x, y, w, z) \leq H_g(x, y, w, z), \quad \forall x, y, w, z > 0$$

by elementary computations. □

Note that for f nonregular, one has

$$H_f(x, y, w, z) = \frac{1}{2}(x+y)(w+z).$$

On the other hand, for the function $f_{\text{SLD}} = \frac{1}{2}(1+x)$, one has from Eq. (5.2),

$$H_{\text{SLD}}(x, y, w, z) = \frac{1}{2} \left[(x+y)(w+z) - \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{(x-y)^2(w-z)^2}{[(x+y)/2][(w+z)/2]} \right) \right] = 2 \frac{xy(w^2+z^2) + wz(x^2+y^2)}{(x+y)(w+z)}.$$

Therefore, we have the following bounds.

Corollary 5.2: For any $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$,

$$0 < 2 \left[\frac{xy(w^2+z^2) + wz(x^2+y^2)}{(x+y)(w+z)} \right] \leq H_f(x, y, w, z) \leq \frac{1}{2}(x+y)(w+z), \quad \forall x, y, w, z > 0.$$

Remark 5.4: Note that for every $x > 0$,

$$\frac{f_{\text{SLD}}(0)}{f_{\text{SLD}}(x)} = \frac{1/2}{(1+x)/2} = \frac{1}{1+x} > \frac{1}{1+x+2\sqrt{x}} = \frac{1}{(1+\sqrt{x})^2} = \frac{1/4}{(1+\sqrt{x})^2/4} = \frac{f_{\text{WY}}(0)}{f_{\text{WY}}(x)},$$

so that for every $x, y, w, z > 0$,

$$H_{\text{SLD}}(x, y, w, z) < H_{\text{WY}}(x, y, w, z).$$

VI. THE MAIN RESULT

Proposition 6.1: Given $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$, let $\Delta := m_{\bar{f}}(L_{\rho}, R_{\rho})$. Recall that $B_0 := B - \text{Tr}(\rho B)$. One has

- (i) $\text{Tr}(B_0 \Delta(I)) = 0$,
- (ii) $\text{Tr}(I \Delta(B_0)) = 0$, and
- (iii) $\text{Tr}(\Delta(I)) = 1$.

Proof.

- (i) Since $(L_{\rho} - R_{\rho})(I) = 0$ and $\text{Tr}(\rho B_0) = \text{Tr}(\rho B) - \text{Tr}(\rho B) = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle B_0, m_{\bar{f}}(L_{\rho}, R_{\rho})(I) \rangle &= \text{Tr}(B_0 m_{\bar{f}}(L_{\rho}, R_{\rho})(I)) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(B_0 (L_{\rho} + R_{\rho})(I)) - \frac{1}{2} f(0) \text{Tr}(B_0 c_f(L_{\rho}, R_{\rho})) \\ &\quad \times (L_{\rho} - R_{\rho})^2(I) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(B_0 \rho + \rho B_0) = \text{Tr}(\rho B_0) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

- (ii) It is a simple consequence of (i) and of Proposition 4.1. Indeed,

$$\langle I, m_{\bar{f}}(L_{\rho}, R_{\rho})(B_0) \rangle = \langle m_{\bar{f}}(L_{\rho}, R_{\rho})(I), B_0 \rangle = 0.$$

- (iii)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\Delta(I)) &= \text{Tr}(m_{\bar{f}}(L_{\rho}, R_{\rho})(I)) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}((L_{\rho} + R_{\rho})(I)) - \frac{1}{2} f(0) \text{Tr}(c_f(L_{\rho}, R_{\rho})(L_{\rho} - R_{\rho})^2(I)) = \text{Tr}(\rho) \\ &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Proposition 6.2:

$$f(0) \langle i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B] \rangle_{\rho, f} = \text{Tr}(\rho AB) + \text{Tr}(\rho BA) - 2 \text{Tr}(A \Delta(B)).$$

Proof: Let us introduce the shorthand notation

$$\hat{c}_f(x, y) := (x - y)^2 c_f(x, y),$$

so that by definition

$$f(0) \hat{c}_f(x, y) = (x + y) - 2m_{\bar{f}}(x, y).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(0) \langle i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B] \rangle_{\rho, f} &= f(0) \text{Tr}((i[\rho, A]) c_f(L_{\rho}, R_{\rho})(i[\rho, B])) \\ &= f(0) \langle (i[\rho, A]), c_f(L_{\rho}, R_{\rho})(i[\rho, B]) \rangle \\ &= f(0) \langle i(L_{\rho} - R_{\rho})(A), c_f(L_{\rho}, R_{\rho}) \circ (i(L_{\rho} - R_{\rho}))(B) \rangle \\ &= f(0) \langle A, (i(L_{\rho} - R_{\rho}))^* \circ c_f(L_{\rho}, R_{\rho}) \circ (i(L_{\rho} - R_{\rho}))(B) \rangle \\ &= f(0) \langle A, -i(L_{\rho} - R_{\rho}) \circ c_f(L_{\rho}, R_{\rho}) \circ (i(L_{\rho} - R_{\rho}))(B) \rangle \\ &= f(0) \langle A, \hat{c}_f(L_{\rho}, R_{\rho})(B) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= f(0)\text{Tr}(A\hat{c}_f(L_\rho, R_\rho)(B)) \\
&= \text{Tr}(A(f(0)\hat{c}_f(L_\rho, R_\rho))(B)) \\
&= \text{Tr}(A(L_\rho + R_\rho - 2m\tilde{f}(L_\rho, R_\rho))(B)) \\
&= \text{Tr}(\rho AB) + \text{Tr}(\rho BA) - 2 \text{Tr}(Am\tilde{f}(L_\rho, R_\rho)(B)).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 6.3:

$$f(0)\langle i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B] \rangle_{\rho, f} = 2(\text{Re}\{\text{Cov}_\rho(A, B)\} - \text{Tr}(\Delta(A_0)B_0)).$$

Proof: We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
f(0)\langle i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B] \rangle_{\rho, f} &= \text{Tr}(\rho AB) + \text{Tr}(\rho BA) - 2 \text{Tr}(A\Delta(B)) \\
&= \text{Cov}_\rho(A, B) + \text{Cov}_\rho(B, A) + 2 \text{Tr}(\rho A)\text{Tr}(\rho B) - 2 \text{Tr}(A\Delta(B)) \\
&= 2 \text{Re}\{\text{Cov}_\rho(A, B)\} + 2(\text{Tr}(\rho A)\text{Tr}(\rho B) - \text{Tr}(A\Delta(B))).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, because of Proposition 6.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Tr}(\rho A)\text{Tr}(\rho B) - \text{Tr}(\Delta(A)B) &= \text{Tr}(\rho A)\text{Tr}(\rho B) - \text{Tr}(\Delta(A_0 + \text{Tr}(\rho A)I)(B_0 + \text{Tr}(\rho B)I)) \\
&= \text{Tr}(\rho A)\text{Tr}(\rho B) - [\text{Tr}(\Delta(A_0)B_0) + \text{Tr}(\rho A)\text{Tr}(\Delta(I)B_0) \\
&\quad + \text{Tr}(\Delta(A_0)I)\text{Tr}(\rho B) + \text{Tr}(\rho A)\text{Tr}(\rho B)\text{Tr}(\Delta(I)I)] \\
&= \text{Tr}(\rho A)\text{Tr}(\rho B) - \text{Tr}(\Delta(A_0)B_0) - \text{Tr}(\rho A)\text{Tr}(\rho B) \\
&= - \text{Tr}(\Delta(A_0)B_0).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Therefore, the conclusion follows.

We recall some consequences of the spectral theorem we need in the sequel. Let ρ be a state, λ_i its eigenvalues, and E_i the associated eigenprojectors. The spectral decompositions of L_ρ and R_ρ are the following:

$$L_\rho = \sum_i \lambda_i L_{E_i}, \quad R_\rho = \sum_i \lambda_i R_{E_i}.$$

Therefore, from the spectral theorem for commuting self-adjoint operators, we get the following result.

Corollary 6.1: Let ρ be a state, λ_i its eigenvalues, and E_i the projectors of the associated eigenspaces. If $s: [0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function, then

$$s(L_\rho, R_\rho) = \sum_{i,j} s(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) L_{E_i} R_{E_j}.$$

Let V be a finite dimensional real vector space with a scalar product $g(\cdot, \cdot)$. We define, for $v, w \in V$,

$$\text{Area}^g(v, w) := \sqrt{g(v, v)g(w, w) - |g(v, w)|^2}.$$

In the Euclidean plane, $\text{Area}^g(v, w)$ is the area of the parallelogram spanned by v and w . If we are dealing with a ρ point-dependent Riemannian metric, we write Area_ρ^g . If $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$, we denote by Area_ρ^f the area functional associated with the monotone metric $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\rho, f}$.

We are now ready for the main results.

Theorem 6.1: For any $f, g \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$,

(i)

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) - |\text{Cov}_\rho^s(A,B)|^2 \geq \left(\frac{f(0)}{2} \text{Area}_\rho^f(i[\rho,A], i[\rho,B]) \right)^2.$$

(ii)

$$\tilde{g} \geq \tilde{f} \Rightarrow \frac{g(0)}{2} \text{Area}_\rho^g(i[\rho,A], i[\rho,B]) \leq \frac{f(0)}{2} \text{Area}_\rho^f(i[\rho,A], i[\rho,B]).$$

Proof: Fix $A, B \in M_{n,sa}$. Let us introduce, for the sake of brevity,

$$F(f) := (\text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) - |\text{Cov}_\rho^s(A,B)|^2) - \left(\frac{f(0)}{2} \text{Area}_\rho^f(i[\rho,A], i[\rho,B]) \right)^2.$$

Then, we have to show that $F(f) \geq 0$ and $\tilde{g} \geq \tilde{f} \Rightarrow F(g) \geq F(f)$.

Let $\{\varphi_i\}$ be a complete orthonormal base composed of eigenvectors of ρ and $\{\lambda_i\}$ the corresponding eigenvalues. Set $a_{ij} \equiv \langle A_0 \varphi_i | \varphi_j \rangle$ and $b_{ij} \equiv \langle B_0 \varphi_i | \varphi_j \rangle$. Note that $a_{ij} \neq A_{ij} :=$ the i, j entry of A .

Then we calculate

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A) = \text{Tr}(\rho A_0^2) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} (\lambda_i + \lambda_j) a_{ij} a_{ji},$$

$$\text{Var}_\rho(B) = \text{Tr}(\rho B_0^2) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} (\lambda_i + \lambda_j) b_{ij} b_{ji},$$

$$\text{Cov}_\rho^s(A,B) = \text{Re}\{\text{Cov}_\rho(A,B)\} = \text{Re}\{\text{Tr}(\rho A_0 B_0)\} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} (\lambda_i + \lambda_j) \text{Re}\{a_{ij} b_{ji}\},$$

$$\frac{f(0)}{2} \|i[\rho,A]\|_{\rho,f}^2 = \text{Var}_\rho(A) - \text{Tr}(A_0 m_{\tilde{f}}(L_\rho, R_\rho) A_0) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} (\lambda_i + \lambda_j) a_{ij} a_{ji} - \sum_{i,j} m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) a_{ij} a_{ji},$$

$$\frac{f(0)}{2} \|i[\rho,B]\|_{\rho,f}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} (\lambda_i + \lambda_j) b_{ij} b_{ji} - \sum_{i,j} m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) b_{ij} b_{ji},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f(0)}{2} \langle i[\rho,A], i[\rho,B] \rangle_{\rho,f} &= \text{Re}\{\text{Cov}_\rho(A,B)\} - \text{Re}\{\text{Tr}(m_{\tilde{f}}(L_\rho, R_\rho)(A_0)B_0)\} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} (\lambda_i + \lambda_j) \text{Re}\{a_{ij} b_{ji}\} \\ &\quad - \sum_{i,j} m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) \text{Re}\{a_{ij} b_{ji}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &:= \text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) - \frac{f(0)^2}{4} \|i[\rho,A]\|_{\rho,f}^2 \|i[\rho,B]\|_{\rho,f}^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j,k,l} \{(\lambda_i + \lambda_j) m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_k, \lambda_l) + (\lambda_k + \lambda_l) m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) - 2 m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_k, \lambda_l)\} a_{ij} a_{ji} b_{kl} b_{lk} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i,j,k,l} \{(\lambda_i + \lambda_j) m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_k, \lambda_l) + (\lambda_k + \lambda_l) m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) - 2 m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_k, \lambda_l)\} \{a_{ij} a_{ji} b_{kl} b_{lk} + a_{kl} a_{lk} b_{ij} b_{ji}\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\eta := |\text{Cov}_\rho^s(A, B)|^2 - \frac{f(0)^2}{4} |\langle i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B] \rangle_{\rho, f}|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j,k,l} \{(\lambda_i + \lambda_j)m_f(\lambda_k, \lambda_l) + (\lambda_k + \lambda_l)m_f(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) - 2m_f(\lambda_i, \lambda_j)m_f(\lambda_k, \lambda_l)\} \text{Re}\{a_{ij}b_{ji}\} \text{Re}\{a_{kl}b_{lk}\},$$

$$K_{i,j,k,l} := K_{i,j,k,l}(\rho, A, B) := |a_{ij}|^2|b_{kl}|^2 + |a_{kl}|^2|b_{ij}|^2 - 2 \text{Re}\{a_{ij}b_{ji}\} \text{Re}\{a_{kl}b_{lk}\}.$$

Since

$$|a_{ij}|^2|b_{kl}|^2 + |a_{kl}|^2|b_{ij}|^2 \geq 2|a_{ij}b_{ji}||a_{kl}b_{lk}| \geq 2|\text{Re}\{a_{ij}b_{ji}\} \text{Re}\{a_{kl}b_{lk}\}|,$$

we have that $K_{i,j,k,l} \geq 0$. Note that $K_{i,j,k,l}$ does not depend on f .

Then

$$F(f) = \xi - \eta = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i,j,k,l} \{(\lambda_i + \lambda_j)m_f(\lambda_k, \lambda_l) + (\lambda_k + \lambda_l)m_f(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) - 2m_f(\lambda_i, \lambda_j)m_f(\lambda_k, \lambda_l)\} \times \{|a_{ij}|^2|b_{kl}|^2 + |a_{kl}|^2|b_{ij}|^2 - 2 \text{Re}\{a_{ij}b_{ji}\} \text{Re}\{a_{kl}b_{lk}\}\} = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i,j,k,l} H_f(\lambda_i, \lambda_j, \lambda_k, \lambda_l) K_{i,j,k,l}.$$

Because of Proposition 5.4 and Corollary 5.2, one has

$$\tilde{f} \leq \tilde{g} \Rightarrow 0 \leq H_f(\lambda_i, \lambda_j, \lambda_k, \lambda_l) \leq H_g(\lambda_i, \lambda_j, \lambda_k, \lambda_l),$$

and therefore

$$\tilde{f} \leq \tilde{g} \Rightarrow 0 \leq F(f) \leq F(g),$$

and we get the thesis. □

The standard Schrödinger uncertainty principle reads as

$$\text{Area}_\rho^{\text{Cov}^s}(A, B) \geq \frac{1}{2} |\text{Tr}(\rho[A, B])|,$$

while the main result of the present paper can be expressed as

$$\text{Area}_\rho^{\text{Cov}^s}(A, B) \geq \frac{f(0)}{2} \text{Area}_\rho^f(i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B]).$$

Corollary 3.2: For any $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$, $A, B \in M_{n,sa}$, one has

$$\frac{f_{\text{SLD}}(0)}{2} \text{Area}_\rho^{f_{\text{SLD}}}(i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B]) \geq \frac{f(0)}{2} \text{Area}_\rho^f(i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B]).$$

Proof: Immediate consequence of Corollary 3.1 □

Remark 6.1: Setting

$$N_\rho^f(A, B) := \text{Area}_\rho^{\text{Cov}^s}(A, B) - \frac{f(0)}{2} \text{Area}_\rho^f(i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B]) \geq 0,$$

we may strengthen the main result to

$$\text{Area}_\rho^{\text{Cov}^s}(A, B) \geq \frac{f(0)}{2} \text{Area}_\rho^f(i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B]) + N_\rho^{\text{SLD}}(A, B).$$

The above geometric considerations take a particularly interesting form when considering the dynamics of quantum states. Suppose that we have a positive (self-adjoint) operator H determining a quantum evolution. The state ρ evolves according to the formula

$$\rho_H(t) := e^{-itH} \rho e^{itH}.$$

We say that $\rho_H(t)$ is the time evolution of $\rho = \rho_H(0)$ determined by H . For the evolution $\rho_H(t)$, this is equivalent to satisfy the quantum analog of the Liouville theorem in classical statistical mechanics, namely, the Landau-von Neumann equation.

Definition 6.1: Let $\rho(t)$ be a curve in \mathcal{D}_n^1 and let $H \in M_{n,sa}$. We say that $\rho(t)$ satisfies the Landau-von Neumann equation with respect to H if

$$\dot{\rho}(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \rho(t) = i[\rho(t), H].$$

Satisfying the Landau-von Neumann equation is equivalent to $\rho(t) = \rho_H(t) = e^{-itH} \rho e^{itH}$.

From Theorem 6.1, we get the following inequality.

Proposition 6.4: Let $\rho > 0$ be a state and $H, K \in M_{n,sa}$. Suppose that $\rho = \rho_H(0) = \rho_K(0)$. Then, for any $f \in \mathcal{F}_{op}$, one has

$$\text{Area}_\rho^{\text{Cov}^f}(H, K) \geq \frac{f(0)}{2} \text{Area}_\rho^f(\dot{\rho}_H(0), \dot{\rho}_K(0)).$$

Therefore, as we said in the Introduction, the bound on the right side of our inequality appears when the evolutions $\rho_H(t), \rho_K(t)$ are different and not trivial.

VII. THE f -CORRELATION ASSOCIATED WITH QUANTUM FISHER INFORMATIONS

Mainly to confront our result with previous results, we introduce the notions of f correlation and f information.

Definition 7.1:

$$\mathcal{C}_\rho^f(A, B) = \mathcal{C}_\rho^f(B, A) := \text{Tr}(m_f(L_\rho, R_\rho)(A)B),$$

$$\mathcal{C}_\rho^f(A) := \mathcal{C}_\rho^f(A, A).$$

Definition 7.2: For $A, B \in M_{n,sa}$, $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_n^1$, and $f \in \mathcal{F}_{op}$, the *metric adjusted correlation* (or f correlation) and the *metric adjusted skew information* (or f information) are defined as

$$\text{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B) := \text{Tr}(\rho AB) - \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\rho^f(A, B) = \text{Tr}(\rho AB) - \text{Tr}(m_f(L_\rho, R_\rho)(A)B),$$

$$I_\rho^f(A) := \text{Corr}_\rho^f(A, A).$$

The definition of $\text{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B)$ appeared in Ref. 9 in a different form. For the f correlation there is an analog of Proposition 2.1 for covariance.

Lemma 7.1: For any $A, B \in M_{n,sa}$, $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_n^1$, and $f \in \mathcal{F}_{op}$, one has

$$2 \text{Re}\{\text{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B)\} = \text{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B) + \text{Corr}_\rho^f(B, A) = f(0) \langle i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B] \rangle_{\rho, f},$$

$$2i \text{Im}\{\text{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B)\} = \text{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B) - \text{Corr}_\rho^f(B, A) = \text{Tr}(\rho[A, B]).$$

Proof: We have that

$$\text{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B) - \text{Corr}_\rho^f(B, A) = \text{Tr}(\rho[A, B]),$$

which is purely imaginary.

This implies

$$\operatorname{Re}\{\operatorname{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B)\} = \operatorname{Re}\{\operatorname{Corr}_\rho^f(B, A)\},$$

so that

$$2 \operatorname{Re}\{\operatorname{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B)\} = \operatorname{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B) + \operatorname{Corr}_\rho^f(B, A),$$

$$2i \operatorname{Im}\{\operatorname{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B)\} = \operatorname{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B) - \operatorname{Corr}_\rho^f(B, A).$$

Since

$$\operatorname{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B) + \operatorname{Corr}_\rho^f(B, A) = \operatorname{Tr}(\rho AB) + \operatorname{Tr}(\rho BA) - 2 \operatorname{Tr}(A \Delta(B)),$$

the conclusion follows from Proposition 6.2. \square

Corollary 7.1:

$$I_\rho^f(A) = \operatorname{Corr}_\rho^f(A, A) = \frac{f(0)}{2} \langle i[\rho, A], i[\rho, A] \rangle_{\rho, f} = \frac{f(0)}{2} \|i[\rho, A]\|_{\rho, f}^2.$$

Remark 7.1: If

$$f_\beta(x) := \beta(1 - \beta) \frac{(x - 1)^2}{(x^\beta - 1)(x^{1-\beta} - 1)}, \quad \beta \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right],$$

then

$$I_\rho^{f_\beta}(A) = \frac{f_\beta(0)}{2} \operatorname{Tr}(i[\rho, A] c_{f_\beta}(L_\rho, R_\rho) i[\rho, A]) = -\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr}([\rho^\beta, A][\rho^{1-\beta}, A]),$$

so $I_\rho^{f_\beta}(A)$ coincides with the WYD skew information.

Let us reformulate the main result in terms of f correlation.

Proposition 7.1: For any $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$, one has

$$\left(\frac{f(0)}{2} \operatorname{Area}_\rho^f(i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B])\right)^2 = I_\rho^f(A) I_\rho^f(B) - |\operatorname{Re}\{\operatorname{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B)\}|^2.$$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{f(0)}{2} \operatorname{Area}_\rho^f(i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B])\right)^2 &= \frac{f(0)^2}{4} (\langle i[\rho, A], i[\rho, A] \rangle_{\rho, f} \langle i[\rho, B], i[\rho, B] \rangle_{\rho, f} - \langle i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B] \rangle_{\rho, f}^2) \\ &= \left(\frac{f(0)}{2} \|i[\rho, A]\|_{\rho, f}^2\right) \left(\frac{f(0)}{2} \|i[\rho, B]\|_{\rho, f}^2\right) - \left(\frac{f(0)}{2} \langle i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B] \rangle_{\rho, f}\right)^2 \\ &= I_\rho^f(A) I_\rho^f(B) \\ &\quad - |\operatorname{Re}\{\operatorname{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B)\}|^2. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Therefore, our main result states that

$$\operatorname{Var}_\rho(A) \operatorname{Var}_\rho(B) - |\operatorname{Re}\{\operatorname{Cov}_\rho(A, B)\}|^2 \geq I_\rho^f(A) I_\rho^f(B) - |\operatorname{Re}\{\operatorname{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B)\}|^2.$$

Recall that we introduced, for fixed ρ, A, B , the functional

$$\begin{aligned}
F(f) &= \text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) - |\text{Cov}_\rho^s(A,B)|^2 - \left(\frac{f(0)}{2} \text{Area}_\rho^f(i[\rho,A], i[\rho,B]) \right)^2 \\
&= \text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) - |\text{Re}\{\text{Cov}_\rho(A,B)\}|^2 - I_\rho^f(A)I_\rho^f(B) + |\text{Re}\{\text{Corr}_\rho^f(A,B)\}|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

As the main result, we proved that, for any $f, g \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$, $F(f) \geq 0$ and $\tilde{f} \leq \tilde{g} \Rightarrow F(f) \leq F(g)$.

Corollary 7.2: Suppose that ρ, A, B are fixed. Then the function of β given by

$$F(\beta) := F(f_\beta)$$

is decreasing on $(0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and $F(1/2) \geq 0$; therefore $F(\beta) \geq 0$.

Proof: Given $x > 0$, the function $\beta \mapsto \tilde{f}_\beta(x) = \frac{1}{2}(x^\beta + x^{1-\beta})$ is decreasing in $(0, \frac{1}{2}]$, so that

$$\beta_1 \leq \beta_2 \Rightarrow \tilde{f}_{\beta_1} \geq \tilde{f}_{\beta_2} \Rightarrow F(\beta_1) \geq F(\beta_2). \quad \square$$

Remark 7.2: The above corollary was the content of Theorem 5, the main result in Ref. 13, and of Proposition IV.1 in Ref. 28. Note that, because of Corollary 7.2 the optimal bound previously known was given by f_{WY} , namely, the bound of Wigner-Yanase metric (this was due to Kosaki in Ref. 13). Remark 5.4 implies that the bound given by the SLD area is strictly greater than that given by the WY area.

Proposition 7.2:

$$\text{Cov}_\rho(A,B) = \text{Corr}_\rho^f(A,B) + \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\rho^f(A_0, B_0),$$

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A) = I_\rho^f(A) + \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\rho^f(A_0).$$

Proof: The calculations of Proposition 6.3 imply that

$$\text{Corr}_\rho^f(A,B) - \text{Cov}_\rho(A,B) = \text{Tr}(\rho A)\text{Tr}(\rho B) - \text{Tr}(\Delta(A)B) = -\text{Tr}(m_{\tilde{\gamma}}(L_\rho, R_\rho)(A_0)B_0) = -\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\rho^f(A_0, B_0). \quad \square$$

Luo¹⁷ suggested that if one considers the variance as a measure of “uncertainty” of an observable A in the state ρ , then the above equality splits the variance in a “quantum” part ($I_\rho^f(A)$) plus a “classical” part ($\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\rho^f(A_0)$).

VIII. CONDITIONS FOR EQUALITY

In this section we give a necessary and sufficient condition to have equality in our main result.

Proposition 8.1: The inequality of Theorem 6.1 is an equality if and only if A_0 and B_0 are proportional.

Proof: If $A_0 = \lambda B_0$, with $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) - |\text{Re}\{\text{Cov}_\rho(A,B)\}|^2 &= \text{Tr}(\rho A_0^2)\text{Tr}(\rho B_0^2) - |\text{Re}\{\text{Tr}(\rho A_0 B_0)\}|^2 = \text{Tr}(\rho(\lambda B_0)^2)\text{Tr}(\rho B_0^2) \\
&\quad - |\text{Re}\{\text{Tr}(\rho \lambda B_0 B_0)\}|^2 = \lambda^2 \text{Tr}(\rho B_0^2)^2 - \lambda^2 |\text{Tr}(\rho B_0^2)|^2 = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

In this case the inequality is just the equality $0=0$.

Now we suppose that A_0, B_0 are not proportional and we prove that the inequality is strict. We use the same notations as in the proof of Theorem 6.1.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) - |\text{Re}\{\text{Cov}_\rho(A,B)\}|^2 - I_\rho^f(A)I_\rho^f(B) + |\text{Re}\{\text{Corr}_\rho^f(A,B)\}|^2 \\ &= \xi - \eta = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i,j,k,l} H_f(\lambda_i, \lambda_j, \lambda_k, \lambda_l) K_{i,j,k,l}(A,B) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$H_f(\lambda_i, \lambda_j, \lambda_k, \lambda_l) > 0, \quad K_{i,j,k,l}(A,B) \geq 0, \quad \forall i,j,k,l.$$

Therefore, the strict inequality is equivalent to $\xi - \eta > 0$, which is, in turn, equivalent to

$$K_{i,j,k,l}(A,B) > 0,$$

for some i, j, k, l .

From the fact that A_0, B_0 are not proportional, one can derive that also the matrices $\{a_{ij}\}, \{b_{ij}\}$ are not proportional and this implies (the other cases being trivial) that there exist (complex) $a_{ij}, b_{ij}, a_{kl}, b_{kl} \neq 0$ and (real) $\lambda, \mu \neq 0$ such that

$$a_{ij} = \lambda b_{ij}, \quad a_{kl} = \mu b_{kl}, \quad \lambda \neq \mu.$$

We get

$$\begin{aligned} K_{i,j,k,l}(A,B) &= |a_{ij}|^2 |b_{kl}|^2 + |a_{kl}|^2 |b_{ij}|^2 - 2 \text{Re}\{a_{ij} b_{ji}\} \text{Re}\{a_{kl} b_{lk}\} \\ &= |a_{ij}|^2 |b_{kl}|^2 + |\mu b_{kl}|^2 \left| \frac{a_{ij}}{\lambda} \right|^2 - 2 \text{Re}\left\{ a_{ij} \frac{\overline{a_{ij}}}{\lambda} \right\} \text{Re}\{\mu b_{kl} b_{lk}\} \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{\mu^2}{\lambda^2} \right) |a_{ij}|^2 |b_{kl}|^2 - 2 \frac{\mu}{\lambda} |a_{ij}|^2 |b_{kl}|^2 \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{\mu^2}{\lambda^2} - 2 \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \right) |a_{ij}|^2 |b_{kl}|^2 = \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \right)^2 |a_{ij}|^2 |b_{kl}|^2 > 0, \end{aligned}$$

because

$$\left(1 - \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \right) \neq 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\xi - \eta \neq 0,$$

and this ends the proof. \square

The particular case $f=f_\beta$ (where $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$) of the above proposition has been proved in Proposition 6 in Ref. 13.

IX. ANOTHER INEQUALITY

The study of the mean $m_{\bar{f}}$ allows us to get another inequality that can be seen as an uncertainty principle in Heisenberg form. Recall that

$$f_{\text{RLD}}(x) := \frac{2x}{x+1}.$$

Proposition 9.1:

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A) \geq I_\rho^f(A) + C_\rho^{f_{\text{RLD}}}(A_0), \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}.$$

Proof: We use the notations employed in the proof of Theorem 6.1. Since

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A) = \text{Tr}(\rho A_0^2) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} (\lambda_i + \lambda_j) a_{ij} a_{ji},$$

$$I_\rho^f(A) = \text{Var}_\rho(A) - \text{Tr}(A_0 m_{\tilde{f}}(L_\rho, R_\rho) A_0) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} (\lambda_i + \lambda_j) a_{ij} a_{ji} - \sum_{i,j} m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) a_{ij} a_{ji},$$

$$C_\rho^{f\text{RLD}}(A_0) = \sum_{i,j} m_{h_0}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) a_{ij} a_{ji},$$

using Corollary 5.1 we have

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A) - I_\rho^f(A) - C_\rho^{f\text{RLD}}(A_0) = \sum_{i,j} [m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) - m_{h_0}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j)] |a_{ij}|^2 \geq 0. \quad \square$$

From this we get the following inequality.

Theorem 9.1:

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A) \text{Var}_\rho(B) \geq [I_\rho^f(A) + C_\rho^{f\text{RLD}}(A_0)][I_\rho^f(B) + C_\rho^{f\text{RLD}}(B_0)], \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}. \quad (9.1)$$

Since $C_\rho^{f\text{RLD}}(A_0) \geq 0$, we obtain, as a corollary, two results due to Luo, for the case $f=f_{\text{WY}} = \frac{1}{4}(1 + \sqrt{x})^2$, and to Hansen, for the general case (see Refs. 18 and 9).

Proposition 9.2:

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A) \geq I_\rho^f(A), \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}.$$

Theorem 9.2:

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A) \text{Var}_\rho(B) \geq I_\rho^f(A) I_\rho^f(B) = \frac{f(0)^2}{4} \|i[\rho, A]\|_{\rho, f}^2 \|i[\rho, B]\|_{\rho, f}^2, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}.$$

Let us study how the bound $I_\rho^f(A) I_\rho^f(B)$ depends on f .

Proposition 9.3: For any $f, g \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$,

$$f \leq g \Rightarrow C_\rho^f(A_0) \leq C_\rho^g(A_0),$$

$$\tilde{f} \leq \tilde{g} \Rightarrow I_\rho^f(A) \geq I_\rho^g(A).$$

Proof: We still use notations of Theorem 6.1. Since $m_f \leq m_g$,

$$C_\rho^g(A_0) - C_\rho^f(A_0) = \sum_{i,j} m_g(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) a_{ij} a_{ji} - \sum_{i,j} m_f(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) a_{ij} a_{ji} = \sum_{i,j} [m_g(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) - m_f(\lambda_i, \lambda_j)] |a_{ij}|^2 \geq 0.$$

The second inequality is an immediate consequence of the first one. □

Corollary 9.1:

$$I_\rho^{\text{SLD}}(A) \geq I_\rho^f(A), \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}.$$

Proof: Immediate consequence of Corollary 5.1. □

Corollary 9.2:

$$\tilde{f} \leq \tilde{g} \Rightarrow I_\rho^f(A) I_\rho^f(B) \geq I_\rho^g(A) I_\rho^g(B).$$

We discuss, now, the equality in Theorem 9.2.

Proposition 9.4:

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A) \text{Var}_\rho(B) = I_\rho^f(A) I_\rho^f(B) \Leftrightarrow A_0 = B_0 = 0.$$

Proof: Because of Proposition 9.2, we have

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) = I_\rho^f(A)I_\rho^f(B) \Leftrightarrow \text{Var}_\rho(A) = I_\rho^f(A), \quad \text{Var}_\rho(B) = I_\rho^f(B).$$

Hence, we need to show $\text{Var}_\rho(A) = I_\rho^f(A) \Leftrightarrow A_0 = 0$. Indeed, using the same notations as in Theorem 6.1,

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A) = I_\rho^f(A) \Leftrightarrow \text{Tr}(A_0 m_{\bar{f}}(L_\rho, R_\rho) A_0) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \sum_{i,j} m_{\bar{f}}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) a_{ij} a_{ji} = 0 \Leftrightarrow a_{ij} = 0, \quad \forall i, j \Leftrightarrow A_0 = 0.$$

□

X. RELATION WITH THE STANDARD UNCERTAINTY PRINCIPLES

Some authors tried to prove the following inequalities:

$$\left(\frac{f(0)}{2} \text{Area}(i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B]) \right)^2 = I_\rho^f(A)I_\rho^f(B) - |\text{Re}(\text{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B))|^2 \geq \frac{1}{4} |\text{Tr}(\rho[A, B])|^2, \quad (10.1)$$

$$I_\rho^f(A)I_\rho^f(B) \geq \frac{1}{4} |\text{Tr}(\rho[A, B])|^2. \quad (10.2)$$

They wanted to obtain the standard Heisenberg-Schrödinger uncertainty principles as consequences of the uncertainty principles discussed in the present paper. Actually inequality (10.1) has been proved false for $f=f_\beta$, that is, for the WYD case (see pp. 632 and 642–644 in Ref. 13, p. 4404 in Ref. 28, and Ref. 20). However, the discussion of Secs. VI–IX shows that the upper bounds

$$G(f) = \frac{f(0)}{2} \text{Area}(i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B]), \quad N(f) := I_\rho^f(A)I_\rho^f(B)$$

can be larger than those of the WYD metric (we showed it for the SLD metric in Remark 5.4). It is, therefore, natural to ask if the above inequalities, that are false for the WYD metric, can be true for some different QFI (for example, for the SLD metric). The following theorem shows that this is not the case, even on 2×2 matrices.

Theorem 10.1: *There exist 2×2 self-adjoint matrices A and B and a density matrix ρ such that*

$$I_\rho^f(A)I_\rho^f(B) < \frac{1}{4} |\text{Tr}(\rho[A, B])|^2, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}.$$

Therefore, for these ρ, A, B , we also have

$$\left(\frac{f(0)}{2} \text{Area}(i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B]) \right)^2 = I_\rho^f(A)I_\rho^f(B) - |\text{Re}(\text{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B))|^2 < \frac{1}{4} |\text{Tr}(\rho[A, B])|^2, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}.$$

Proof: We use notations of Theorem 6.1: let $\{\varphi_i\}$ be a complete orthonormal base composed of eigenvectors of ρ and $\{\lambda_i\}$ the corresponding eigenvalues. Set $a_{ij} \equiv \langle A_0 \varphi_i | \varphi_j \rangle$ and $b_{ij} \equiv \langle B_0 \varphi_i | \varphi_j \rangle$. In what follows, $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > 0$, $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 1$, and

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ -i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

(in terms of Pauli matrices, $A = -\sigma_2$ and $B = \sigma_1$). Simple calculations show that $|a_{ii}| = |b_{ii}| = 0$, while $|a_{ij}| = |b_{ij}| = 1$ for any i, j such that $i \neq j$. Therefore,

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A) = \text{Tr}(\rho A_0) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} (\lambda_i + \lambda_j) a_{ij} a_{ji} = \frac{1}{2} ((\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) + (\lambda_2 + \lambda_1)) = 1,$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\rho^f(A_0) = \sum_{i,j} m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) a_{ij} a_{ji} = (m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_2, \lambda_1)) = 2m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2),$$

$$I_\rho^f(A) = \text{Var}_\rho(A) - \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\rho^f(A_0) = 1 - 2m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2).$$

By the same reasoning,

$$\text{Var}_\rho(B) = 1,$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\rho^f(B_0) = 2m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2),$$

$$I_\rho^f(B) = 1 - 2m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2).$$

Moreover, by direct calculation, one has

$$\frac{1}{4} |\text{Tr}(\rho[A, B])|^2 = (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2.$$

Now, recall that since $m_{\tilde{f}}$ is a mean (and because of Corollary 3.1), one has for any $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$,

$$\lambda_1 > m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) > \lambda_2 > 0,$$

$$1 - 2m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) - 2m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \geq 0.$$

Hence, the following inequalities are equivalent:

$$I_\rho^f(A) I_\rho^f(B) < \frac{1}{4} |\text{Tr}(\rho[A, B])|^2,$$

$$(1 - 2m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2))^2 < (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2,$$

$$(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) - 2m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) < \lambda_1 - \lambda_2,$$

$$2\lambda_2 < 2m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2),$$

$$\lambda_2 < m_{\tilde{f}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2),$$

and so we get the conclusion. □

Note that

$$\frac{1}{4} |\text{Tr}(\rho[A, B])|^2 \geq I_\rho^f(A) I_\rho^f(B)$$

is obviously false, in general: if one takes $A=B$, the left side is zero and the right side could be positive at the same time.

A similar argument applies to the inequality

$$\frac{1}{4}|\mathrm{Tr}(\rho[A,B])|^2 \geq I_\rho^f(A)I_\rho^f(B) - |\mathrm{Re}\{\mathrm{Corr}_\rho^f(A,B)\}|^2 = \left(\frac{f(0)}{2}\mathrm{Area}_f(i[\rho,A],i[\rho,B])\right)^2.$$

Indeed, one may choose ρ, A, B such that $[A, B]=0$ while $[\rho, A], [\rho, B]$ are not proportional, so that they span a positive area.

We may conclude that the Heisenberg and Schrödinger uncertainty principles,

$$\mathrm{Var}_\rho(A)\mathrm{Var}_\rho(B) \geq \frac{1}{4}|\mathrm{Tr}(\rho[A,B])|^2,$$

$$\mathrm{Area}_\rho^{\mathrm{Cov}^s}(A,B) \geq \frac{1}{2}|\mathrm{Tr}(\rho[A,B])|,$$

cannot be deduced from the uncertainty principles,

$$\mathrm{Var}_\rho(A)\mathrm{Var}_\rho(B) \geq I_\rho^f(A)I_\rho^f(B),$$

$$\mathrm{Area}_\rho^{\mathrm{Cov}^s}(A,B) \geq \frac{f(0)}{2}\mathrm{Area}_\rho^f(i[\rho,A],i[\rho,B]),$$

and vice versa.

The above described mistake appeared several times in the literature (see Theorem 2 in Ref. 18, Theorem 2 in Ref. 19, Theorem 1 in Ref. 21, and Note 1, Sec. 3.2 in Ref. 9). It can be helpful to explain its origin, again along the lines of Ref. 13 (see also Ref. 28).

We have seen that

$$\frac{1}{2i}\mathrm{Tr}(\rho[A,B]) = \frac{1}{2i}(\mathrm{Corr}_\rho^f(A,B) - \mathrm{Corr}_\rho^f(B,A)) = \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{Corr}_\rho^f(A,B)),$$

and therefore

$$\frac{1}{4}|\mathrm{Tr}(\rho[A,B])|^2 = |\mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{Corr}_\rho^f(A,B))|^2 \leq |\mathrm{Corr}_\rho^f(A,B)|^2.$$

If there were a Cauchy-Schwartz-type estimate,

$$|\mathrm{Corr}_\rho^f(A,B)|^2 \leq \mathrm{Corr}_\rho^f(A,A)\mathrm{Corr}_\rho^f(B,B), \quad (10.3)$$

using, for example, Theorem 9.2, one would get a refined Heisenberg uncertainty principle in the form

$$\mathrm{Var}_\rho(A)\mathrm{Var}_\rho(B) \geq I_\rho^f(A)I_\rho^f(B) \geq \frac{1}{4}|\mathrm{Tr}(\rho[A,B])|^2.$$

By Theorem 10.1 we know that this is impossible. The wrong point is the Cauchy-Schwartz estimate [Eq. (10.3)], which is false. This depends on the following facts. The sesquilinear form

$$\mathrm{Corr}_\rho^f(X,Y) := \mathrm{Tr}(\rho X^\dagger Y) - \mathrm{Tr}(X^\dagger m_{\vec{f}}(L_\rho, R_\rho)(Y))$$

on the complex space M_n is not positive (see p. 632 in Ref. 13). On the other hand, $\mathrm{Corr}_\rho^f(A,B)$ is not a real form on the real space $M_{n,sa}$: also in this case, one cannot prove the desired Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. The best one can have is a Cauchy-Schwartz estimate only for the (real) positive bilinear form $\mathrm{Re}\{\mathrm{Corr}_\rho^f(A,B)\}$ on $M_{n,sa}$ [see Ref. 13 (p. 643) and Ref. 20]. This would simply imply

$$\left(\frac{f(0)}{2} \text{Area}_\rho^f(i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B])\right)^2 = I_\rho^f(A)I_\rho^f(B) - |\text{Re}\{\text{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B)\}|^2 \geq 0.$$

XI. NOT FAITHFUL STATES AND PURE STATES

We discuss, now, the general case $\rho \geq 0$.

Proposition 11.1: The function $m_f: (0, \infty) \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ has a continuous extension to $[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)$.

Proof: If f is regular then, for example,

$$\lim_{(x,y) \rightarrow (0,y_0)} m_f(x,y) = \frac{y_0}{2} - \frac{f(0)y_0^2}{2y_0f(0)} = 0.$$

If f is not regular then $m_f(x,y) = (x+y)/2$ and we are done (see Ref. 9). □

The definition of f correlation still makes sense and the inequality of Theorem 6.1

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) - |\text{Re}\{\text{Cov}_\rho(A,B)\}|^2 \geq I_\rho^f(A)I_\rho^f(B) - |\text{Re}\{\text{Corr}_\rho^f(A,B)\}|^2,$$

holds by continuity for arbitrary (not necessarily faithful) states.

In what follows, we study the pure state case.

Corollary 11.1: If $s: [0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function and ρ is a pure state, then

$$s(L_\rho, R_\rho)(A) = \rho A \rho.$$

Proof: Consequence of Corollary 6.1 □

Lemma 11.1: If ρ is pure, then $\text{Tr}((\rho A \rho)(\rho B \rho)) = \text{Tr}(\rho A \rho)\text{Tr}(\rho B \rho)$.

Proof: Suppose for simplicity that $\rho = \text{diag}(1, 0, \dots, 0)$ (the general case follows easily from this). Then $\rho A \rho = \text{diag}(A_{11}, 0, \dots, 0)$ and the same holds for B . Therefore $(\rho A \rho)(\rho B \rho) = \text{diag}(A_{11}B_{11}, 0, \dots, 0)$. This implies

$$\text{Tr}((\rho A \rho)(\rho B \rho)) = A_{11}B_{11} = \text{Tr}(\rho A \rho)\text{Tr}(\rho B \rho). \quad \square$$

Lemma 11.2: If ρ is pure, then

$$\text{Tr}(m_f(L_\rho, R_\rho)(A)B) = \text{Tr}(\rho A)\text{Tr}(\rho B).$$

Proof: By Corollary 11.1, one has

$$m_f(L_\rho, R_\rho)(A) = \rho A \rho,$$

and therefore

$$\text{Tr}(m_f(L_\rho, R_\rho)(A)B) = \text{Tr}(\rho A \rho B) = \text{Tr}((\rho A \rho)(\rho B \rho)) = \text{Tr}(\rho A \rho)\text{Tr}(\rho B \rho) = \text{Tr}(\rho A)\text{Tr}(\rho B). \quad \square$$

Corollary 11.2: If ρ is pure, then

$$C_\rho^f(A_0, B_0) = \text{Tr}(m_f(L_\rho, R_\rho)(A_0)B_0) = \text{Tr}(\rho A_0)\text{Tr}(\rho B_0) = 0.$$

Proposition 11.2: If ρ is pure, then

$$\text{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B) = \text{Cov}_\rho(A, B), \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}.$$

Proof: Immediate from the above corollary and Proposition 7.2. □

The case $I_\rho^f(A) = \text{Var}_\rho(A)$ was proved by Hansen in Theorem 3.8 (p. 16) in Ref. 9.

Therefore, on pure states we have the equalities

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) - |\text{Re}\{\text{Cov}_\rho(A,B)\}|^2 = I_\rho^f(A)I_\rho^f(B) - |\text{Re}\{\text{Corr}_\rho^f(A,B)\}|^2,$$

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) = I_\rho^f(A)I_\rho^f(B).$$

This implies that if a sequence of faithful states D_n converges to the pure state ρ , then the limit

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{f(0)}{2} \text{Area}_{D_n}^f(i[D_n, A], i[D_n, B]) \right)^2 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} I_{D_n}^f(A)I_{D_n}^f(B) - |\text{Re}\{\text{Corr}_{D_n}^f(A, B)\}|^2 = I_\rho^f(A)I_\rho^f(B) \\ &\quad - |\text{Re}\{\text{Corr}_\rho^f(A, B)\}|^2 = \text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) - |\text{Re}\{\text{Cov}_\rho(A, B)\}|^2 \end{aligned}$$

does not depend on f .

This result has an interesting alternative explanation, using a theorem by Petz and Sudar that describes the possible extension of QFI to pure states (see Ref. 25). We devote the rest of the section to explain this phenomenon.

Let $M_n^0 = M_n^0(\mathbb{C})$ be the set of faithful states whose eigenvalues are all distinct. Recall that the pure states are identified with $\mathbb{C}P^{n-1}$, the complex projective space. On $\mathbb{C}P^{n-1}$ one has a natural metric, the Fubini-Study metric (denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\rho, \text{FS}}$). We denote by D the elements of M_n^0 and by ρ the elements of $\mathbb{C}P^{n-1}$. We can define a projection $\pi: M_n^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^{n-1}$ as follows: $\pi(D) \in \mathbb{C}P^{n-1}$ is the pure state associated with the one-dimensional eigenspace corresponding to the largest eigenvalue of $D \in M_n^0$. With this definition, $\pi: M_n^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^{n-1}$ is a smooth fiber bundle. The structure group is $U(1) \times U(n-1)$ [where $U(k)$ is the group of $k \times k$ unitary matrices]. The fiber space is $\pi^{-1}(e)$, where e is the ray generated by the vector $(1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Now, fix a monotone metric $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{D, f}$. We denote by $T_D\pi$ the differential of π at D and let H_D be the orthogonal complement of $\ker(T_D\pi)$ with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{D, f}$. Since $T_D\pi$ is surjective, the restriction of $T_D\pi$ gives a linear isomorphism between H_D and $T_{\pi(D)}\mathbb{C}P^{n-1}$. For any tangent vector $A \in T_{\pi(D)}\mathbb{C}P^{n-1}$, there is a unique ‘‘lift’’ $A_D \in H_D \subset T_D(M_n^0)$ such that $(T_D\pi)(A_D) = A$.

Definition 11.1: (Ref. 25) We say that the sequence $D_n \in M_n^0$ radially converges to $\rho \in \mathbb{C}P^{n-1}$ if $D_n \rightarrow \rho$ as density matrices in M^n and $\pi(D_n) = \rho, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Definition 11.2: (Ref. 25) A metric k on $\mathbb{C}P^{n-1}$ is a radial extension of a metric g on M_n^0 if for any sequence $D_n \in M_n^0$, radially convergent to a point $\rho \in \mathbb{C}P^{n-1}$, and for any tangent vectors $A, B \in T_\rho\mathbb{C}P^{n-1}$, one has

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} g(A_{D_n}, B_{D_n}) = k(A, B).$$

Theorem 11.1: (Ref. 25) A monotone metric admits a radial extension if and only if it is regular, namely, if and only if $f(0) \neq 0$. In this case the associated extension is just a multiple of the Fubini-Study metric according to the formula

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \langle A_{D_n}, B_{D_n} \rangle_{D_n, f} = \frac{1}{2f(0)} \langle A, B \rangle_{\rho, \text{FS}}.$$

Lemma 11.3: (Ref. 24) With the above definition,

$$\pi(D) = \rho \Rightarrow [D, A] = ([\rho, A])_D,$$

namely, the lift of commutator is the commutator of the lift.

This implies the following result.

Proposition 11.3: If $D_n \rightarrow \rho$ radially, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} f(0) \text{Area}_{D_n}^f(i[D_n, A], i[D_n, B]) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Area}_\rho^{\text{FS}}(i[\rho, A], i[\rho, B]).$$

Hence, we have obtained the limit behavior by a totally different argument.

XII. OPTIMALITY OF AN IMPROVEMENT FOR HEISENBERG UNCERTAINTY PRINCIPLE

The following result has been proved by Park in Ref. 22 and independently by Luo in Ref. 16.

Theorem 12.1: *If $g_0(x) = \sqrt{x}$, then*

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) \geq C_\rho^{g_0}(A_0)C_\rho^{g_0}(B_0) + \frac{1}{4}|\text{Tr}(\rho[A, B])|^2.$$

Note that the term $C_\rho^{g_0}(A_0)C_\rho^{g_0}(B_0)$ disappears for pure states. We prove that the above result is the best one can have considering functions $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$.

Theorem 12.2: *For any $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{op}}$, we have*

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) \geq C_\rho^f(A_0)C_\rho^f(B_0) + \frac{1}{4}|\text{Tr}(\rho[A, B])|^2 \Leftrightarrow f(x) \leq \sqrt{x}.$$

Proof: We have

$$f(x) \leq g(x) \Rightarrow m_f(x, y) \leq m_g(x, y) \Rightarrow C_\rho^f(A_0) \leq C_\rho^g(A_0),$$

and therefore if $f(x) \leq \sqrt{x}$ we are done.

If $f(x_0) > \sqrt{x_0}$ for a certain x_0 , we produce a counterexample. To this end, we do the same process we did in the proof of Theorem 10.1.

Consider again $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > 0$, $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 1$, and

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ -i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We have calculated

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A) = 1, \quad C_\rho^f(A_0) = 2m_f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2),$$

$$\text{Var}_\rho(B) = 1, \quad C_\rho^f(B_0) = 2m_f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2),$$

$$\text{Tr}(\rho[A, B]) = (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2.$$

In this case the inequality

$$\text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B) \geq C_\rho^f(A_0)C_\rho^f(B_0) + \frac{1}{4}|\text{Tr}(\rho[A, B])|^2$$

reads as

$$1 \cdot 1 \geq 2m_f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)2m_f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2,$$

that is,

$$1 \geq 4(m_f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2))^2 + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2$$

or

$$1 \geq 4\left(\lambda_2 f\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}\right)\right)^2 + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2.$$

For $g_0(x) = \sqrt{x}$, we have

$$4\left(\lambda_2 g_0\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}\right)\right)^2 + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2 = 1.$$

Therefore, if for some $x_0 \neq 1$ we have $f(x_0) > \sqrt{x_0}$, then for $\lambda_1/\lambda_2 = x_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} C_\rho^f(A_0)C_\rho^f(B_0) + \frac{1}{4}|\text{Tr}(\rho[A, B])|^2 &= 4\left(\lambda_2 f\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}\right)\right)^2 + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2 > 4\left(\lambda_2 \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}}\right)^2 + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2 \\ &= 1 = \text{Var}_\rho(A)\text{Var}_\rho(B), \end{aligned}$$

that is, the inequality is false. □

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

It is a pleasure to thank Frank Hansen for sending us the preprint (Ref 9).

- ¹Bhatia, R., *Matrix Analysis* (Springer, New York, 1996).
- ²Čencov, N. N., in *Statistical Decision Rules and Optimal Inference*, edited by Leifman, L. J. (American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1982).
- ³Gibilisco, P. and Isola, T., “A characterization of Wigner-Yanase skew information among statistically monotone metrics,” *Infinite Dimen. Anal., Quantum Probab., Relat. Top.* **4**, 553–557 (2001).
- ⁴Gibilisco, P. and Isola, T., “On the characterization of paired monotone metrics,” *Ann. Inst. Stat. Math.* **56**, 369–381 (2004).
- ⁵Gibilisco, P. and Isola, T., “On the monotonicity of scalar curvature in classical and quantum information geometry,” *J. Math. Phys.* **46**, 023501–14 (2005).
- ⁶Gibilisco, P. and Isola, T., “Uncertainty principle and quantum Fisher information,” *Ann. Inst. Stat. Math.* **59**, 147–159 (2006).
- ⁷Gibilisco, P. and Isola, T., “Wigner-Yanase information on quantum state space: the geometric approach,” *J. Math. Phys.* **44**, 3752–3762 (2003).
- ⁸Hansen, F., “Characterizations of symmetric monotone metrics on the state space of quantum systems,” *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **6**, 597–605 (2006).
- ⁹Hansen, F., “Metric adjusted skew information,” e-print math-ph/0607049v3.
- ¹⁰Hansen, F. and Pedersen, G. K., “Jensen’s inequality for operators and Löwner’s theorem,” *Math. Ann.* **258**, 229–241 (1982).
- ¹¹Hasegawa, H. and Petz, D., *Quantum Communications and Measurement* (Plenum, New York, 1997), pp. 109–118.
- ¹²Heisenberg, W., “Über den anschaulichen inhalt der quantentheoretischen kinematik und mechanik,” *Z. Phys.* **43**, 172–198 (1927).
- ¹³Kosaki, H., “Matrix trace inequality related to uncertainty principle,” *Int. J. Math.* **16**, 629–645 (2005).
- ¹⁴Kubo, F. and Ando, T., “Means of positive linear operators,” *Math. Ann.* **246**, 205–224 (1979).
- ¹⁵Lesniewski, A. and Ruskai, M. B., “Monotone Riemannian metrics and relative entropy on noncommutative probability spaces,” *J. Math. Phys.* **40**, 5702–5724 (1999).
- ¹⁶Luo, S., “Heisenberg uncertainty relations for mixed states,” *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 042110 (2005).
- ¹⁷Luo, S., “Quantum versus classical uncertainty,” *Theor. Math. Phys.* **143**, 681–688 (2005).
- ¹⁸Luo, S., “Wigner-Yanase skew information and uncertainty relations,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 180403 (2003).
- ¹⁹Luo, S. and Zhang, Z., “An informational characterization of Schrödinger’s uncertainty relations,” *J. Stat. Phys.* **114**, 1557–1576 (2004).
- ²⁰Luo, S. and Zhang, Q., “Correction to On skew information,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **51**, 4432 (2005).
- ²¹Luo, S., and Zhang, Q., “On skew information,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **50**, 1778–1782 (2004).
- ²²Park, Y. M., “Improvement of uncertainty relations for mixed states,” *J. Math. Phys.* **46**, 042109 (2005).
- ²³Petz, D., “Monotone metrics on matrix spaces,” *Linear Algebr. Appl.* **244**, 81–96 (1996).
- ²⁴Petz, D. and Sudár, C., *Geometry in Present Days Sciences*, edited by Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E., and Vendel Jensen, E. B. (World Scientific, Singapore 1999).
- ²⁵Petz, D. and Sudár, C., “Geometry of quantum states,” *J. Math. Phys.* **37**, 2662–2673 (1996).
- ²⁶Petz, D. and Temesi, R., “Means of positive numbers and matrices,” *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* **27**, 712–720 (2005).
- ²⁷Schrödinger, E., “About Heisenberg uncertainty relation (original annotation by Angelow, A., and Batoni, M. C.),” *Bulg. J. Phys.* **26**, 193–203 (2000) [*Proc. Prussian Acad. Sci. Phys. Math. Sect.* **19**, 296–303 (1930)].
- ²⁸Yanagi, K., Furuichi, S., and Kuriyama, K., “A generalized skew information and uncertainty relation,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **51**, 4401–4404 (2005).