

Uniform Additivity in Classical and Quantum Information

Andrew Cross,¹ Ke Li,^{1,2} and Graeme Smith¹

¹*IBM TJ Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598, USA*

²*Center for Theoretical Physics, Massachusetts*

Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

(Dated: March 4, 2024)

Information theory establishes the fundamental limits on data transmission, storage, and processing [1]. Quantum information theory unites information theoretic ideas with an accurate quantum-mechanical description of reality to give a more accurate and complete theory with new and more powerful possibilities for information processing. The goal of both classical and quantum information theory is to quantify the optimal rates of interconversion of different resources. These rates are usually characterized in terms of entropies. However, nonadditivity of many entropic formulas often makes finding answers to information theoretic questions intractable [2–9]. In a few auspicious cases, such as the classical capacity of a classical channel, the capacity region of a multiple access channel and the entanglement assisted capacity of a quantum channel, additivity allows a full characterization of optimal rates. Here we present a new mathematical property of entropic formulas, uniform additivity, that is both easily evaluated and rich enough to capture all known quantum additive formulas. We give a complete characterization of uniformly additive functions using the linear programming approach to entropy inequalities. In addition to all known quantum formulas, we find a new and intriguing additive quantity: the completely coherent information. We also uncover a remarkable coincidence—the classical and quantum uniformly additive functions are identical; the tractable answers in classical and quantum information theory are formally equivalent. Our techniques pave the way for a deeper understanding of the tractability of information theory, from classical multi-user problems like broadcast channels to the evaluation of quantum channel capacities.

Entropies tell us how much information is stored in a system. As a result, the answers to

information theoretic questions are usually found in terms of entropies evaluated on systems arising in optimal protocols. For example, the communication capacity of a classical channel \mathcal{N} that maps random variable X to Y is given by the maximization $C(\mathcal{N}) = \max_X I(X; Y)$, where the mutual information $I(X; Y) = H(X) + H(Y) - H(XY)$ is a linear combination of entropies [23]. Similarly, the cost of transmitting a quantum state ρ_A on system A is its von Neumann entropy $H(A) = -\text{tr } \rho_A \log \rho_A$. A noisy quantum communication channel $\mathcal{N} : A \rightarrow B$ can be mathematically extended to a unitary interaction $U : A \rightarrow BE$ of the input with an independent and inaccessible environment. Such a channel can be applied to a state ϕ_{VA} to create a state ρ_{VBE} . More generally, V may have many subsystems, and we may use $\phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A}$ to create $\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n BE}$. We can use such a state to generate an *entropic formula*: $f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}}) = \max_{\phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A}} f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A})$ with $f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A}) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_n BE)} \alpha_s H(\rho_s)$, where $\mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_n BE)$ ranges over all collections of subsystems from $V_1 \dots V_n BE$, and $H(\rho_s)$ is the entropy of collection s . We call the $V_1 \dots V_n$ systems auxiliary variables. Most operationally relevant quantities in quantum information can be expressed as a regularization of such a formula:

$$f_\alpha^\infty(\mathcal{N}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} f_\alpha(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}$ is the n -fold parallel use of channel \mathcal{N} . The auxiliary variables in an entropic formula are usually related operationally to the structure of optimal protocols; for example, the optimal distribution X that maximizes $C(\mathcal{N}) = \max_X I(X; Y)$ to give the classical capacity defines a distribution of capacity-achieving error correcting codes.

The infinite-dimensional optimization of Eq.(1), which is called a multi-letter formula, is usually intractable. In some rare cases additivity allows a substantial simplification. An entropic formula $f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}})$ is *additive* if $f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}) = f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}}) + f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{M}})$ for all channels \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} . When f_α is additive, we have $f_\alpha^\infty(U_{\mathcal{N}}) = f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}})$, which is called a single-letter formula. There are single-letter formulas for the classical capacity of a classical channel [10], the entanglement-assisted capacity of a quantum channel [11], and the quantum capacity of a quantum channel with access to a special zero-capacity assistance channel[12]. A single-letter formula often leads to a tractable means of evaluating a quantity.

Many relevant entropic formulas are nonadditive, especially in the quantum setting[2, 3, 5, 7, 8]. Optimal performance is thus captured only by a *multi-letter* formula, which is intractable to evaluate. As a result, many fundamental questions in quantum information




FIG. 1: Using a quantum channel to generate a quantum state. A noisy quantum channel from input A to output B can always be thought of as a unitary interaction of the input with some inaccessible environment E . We can generate a quantum state from this interaction by creating $\phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A}$ and acting on A with U_N , leading to the state $\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B E} = I \otimes U_N \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A} I \otimes U_N^\dagger$.

theory remain open—the classical and quantum capacities of most channels are unknown, and even deciding if a quantum channel has nonzero quantum capacity seems insurmountable [9].

Entropy inequalities express relationships between entropies of different collections of subsystems that are satisfied for all states. Subadditivity of entropy, for example, tells us that $H(A) + H(B) - H(AB) \geq 0$, or equivalently $I(A; B) \geq 0$. Its generalization, strong subadditivity[13], tells us that conditional mutual information is also positive: $I(A; B|C) = H(AC) + H(BC) - H(ABC) - H(C) \geq 0$. The set of $(2^n - 1)$ -dimensional entropy vectors $\mathbf{v} = (H(X_1), \dots, H(X_n), \dots, H(X_1 \dots X_n))$ that can be realized by classical probability distributions on $X_1 \dots X_n$ form a cone, whose study in terms of linear programming was formalized in [14]. The larger cone of realizable quantum entropies was studied in [15]. Entropy inequalities are the key to proving additivity when it exists.

If f_α is an additive formula with one auxiliary variable [24], for any pair of channels \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} and any state $\phi_{V A_1 A_2}$, there must be a pair of states $\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V} A_1}$ and $\hat{\phi}_{\hat{V} A_2}$ such that

$$f_\alpha(U_N \otimes U_M, \phi_{V A_1 A_2}) \leq f_\alpha(U_N, \tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V} A_1}) + f_\alpha(U_M, \hat{\phi}_{\hat{V} A_2}). \quad (2)$$

We call such a mapping $\phi_{V A_1 A_2} \rightarrow (\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V} A_1}, \hat{\phi}_{\hat{V} A_2})$ a decoupling. In principle, the appropriate

decoupling may depend in an arbitrary way on the channels \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} and the state $\phi_{VA_1A_2}$. In practice, useful decouplings are invariably what we call *standard* decouplings, which have a very simple form and are described in Fig. 2. Once we have fixed a decoupling and f_α , we can use entropy inequalities to determine if Eq. (2) is satisfied. When f_α does satisfy Eq. (2) with $(\tilde{\phi}, \hat{\phi})$ defined by a standard decoupling D , we say f_α is uniformly subadditive with respect to D . Since we also have $f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, \tilde{\phi} \otimes \hat{\phi}) = f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \tilde{\phi}) + f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{M}}, \hat{\phi})$, subadditivity implies that

$$f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}) = f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}}) + f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{M}}) \quad (3)$$

and we call f_α uniformly additive with respect to D . All known proofs of quantum additivity proceed by choosing a standard decoupling and proving Eq. (2) via entropy inequalities [11, 12, 16].

We have found all entropic formulas f_α that are uniformly additive with respect to standard decouplings. We do this by enumerating all standard decouplings, and using the linear programming formulation of entropy inequalities to determine which f_α are uniformly subadditive for each decoupling. Our approach captures all previously known examples of additive formulas and more. This method opens a line of attack on a variety of questions, from classical multiuser information theory to finding new classes of channels with additive capacities, and clarifies when and where to expect quantum synergies like superactivation [4].

Formulas with no auxiliary variables are particularly simple: $f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \phi_A) = \alpha_B H(B) + \alpha_E H(E) + \alpha_{BE} H(BE)$. Here we have only one standard decoupling to consider: $\phi_{A_1A_2} \rightarrow (\phi_{A_1}, \phi_{A_2})$. The conditions for uniform additivity in this case are

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_B + \alpha_{BE} &\geq 0 \\ \alpha_E + \alpha_{BE} &\geq 0 \\ \alpha_B + \alpha_E + \alpha_{BE} &\geq 0 \\ \alpha_{BE} &\geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

These inequalities define a cone of α s, which we refer to as a uniform additivity cone. Eq. (4) describes this cone in terms of its facets, but a cone can equally well be described in terms




FIG. 2: Decoupling is the process of mapping one state that can be acted on by two channels into two separate states, each of which can be acted on by a single channel use. It maps a state $\phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A_1 A_2}$ to two states, $\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V}_1 \dots \tilde{V}_n A_1}$ and $\hat{\phi}_{\hat{V}_1 \dots \hat{V}_n A_2}$. Here A_1 and A_2 are the input spaces to \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} , so that $U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}$ can be applied to $\phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A_1 A_2}$ to make $\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B_1 E_1 B_2 E_2}$, while $U_{\mathcal{N}}$ acts on $\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V}_1 \dots \tilde{V}_n A_1}$ to make $\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{V}_1 \dots \tilde{V}_n B_1 E_1}$ and $U_{\mathcal{M}}$ acts on $\hat{\phi}_{\hat{V}_1 \dots \hat{V}_n A_2}$ to make $\hat{\rho}_{\hat{V}_1 \dots \hat{V}_n B_2 E_2}$. For a *standard* decoupling, the states $\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V}_1 \dots \tilde{V}_n A_1}$ and $\hat{\phi}_{\hat{V}_1 \dots \hat{V}_n A_2}$ are constructed from $\phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A_1 A_2}$ as follows. To obtain $\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V}_1 \dots \tilde{V}_n A_1}$, we first apply $U_{\mathcal{M}}$ to make $\phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A_1 B_2 E_2}$. Given $\phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A_1 B_2 E_2}$, we define \tilde{V}_i to contain V_i . B_2 and E_2 are each either assigned to one of the \tilde{V}_i (or perhaps traced out) to generate $\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V}_1 \dots \tilde{V}_n A_1}$. We define $\hat{\phi}_{\hat{V}_1 \dots \hat{V}_n A_2}$ similarly.

of extremal rays: letting

$$\begin{aligned}
 \alpha_0 &= (1, 0, 0) \equiv H(B) \\
 \alpha_1 &= (0, 1, 0) \equiv H(E) \\
 \alpha_2 &= (0, -1, 1) \equiv H(B|E) \\
 \alpha_3 &= (-1, 0, 1) \equiv H(E|B),
 \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

α satisfies Eq. (4) exactly when $\alpha = \sum_i \lambda_i \alpha_i$ with $\lambda_i \geq 0$.

Formulas with one auxiliary variable require us to consider multiple decouplings, capturing the choice of \tilde{V} and \hat{V} in the decoupling map $D : \phi_{V A_1 A_2} \rightarrow (\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V} A_1}, \hat{\phi}_{\hat{V} A_2})$. A standard decoupling always has $\tilde{V} = \tilde{M}_2 V$ with \tilde{M}_2 chosen from $\{\emptyset, B_2, E_2, B_2 E_2\}$ and $\hat{V} = \hat{M}_1 V$ with \hat{M}_1 chosen from $\{\emptyset, B_1, E_1, B_1 E_1\}$. We can parametrize these by (a, b) , with a and b running from 0 to 3. We take advantage of two simplifications that can be made without loss of generality. First, given f_α , $\alpha = (\alpha^\emptyset, \alpha^V)$ with $\alpha^\emptyset = (\alpha_B, \alpha_E, \alpha_{BE})$ and $\alpha^V = (\alpha_V, \alpha_{BV}, \alpha_{EV}, \alpha_{BEV})$, we can define $f_{\alpha^\emptyset}^\emptyset$ and $f_{\alpha^V}^V$ such that f_α is uniformly additive with respect to decoupling (a, b) if and only if $f_{\alpha^\emptyset}^\emptyset$ is uniformly additive with respect to the decoupling $\phi_{A_1 A_2} \rightarrow (\phi_{A_1}, \phi_{A_2})$ and $f_{\alpha^V}^V$ is uniformly additive with respect to (a, b) . Second,




FIG. 3: Quantum Entropy Cone for two systems. The entropies of a bipartite quantum state ρ_{BE} form a vector $(H(B), H(E), H(BE))$. The vectors of entropies that can be realized by a quantum state lie in a cone. For two systems, the faces of this cone are implied by strong subadditivity. This is also true for $n = 3$ systems, but for $n \geq 4$ we do not know whether the quantum entropy cone lies strictly inside the cone implied by strong subadditivity.

these formulas have two useful symmetries that reduce the number of decouplings we must consider: 1) for any additive formula, we get a similar additive formula by exchanging B and E and 2) $f_{\alpha^V}^V$ with $\alpha^V = (\alpha_V, \alpha_{BV}, \alpha_{EV}, \alpha_{BEV})$ is equivalent via purification of the quantum state to $f_{\tilde{\alpha}^V}^V$ with $\tilde{\alpha}^V = (\alpha_{BEV}, \alpha_{EV}, \alpha_{BV}, \alpha_V)$. This leaves only 5 inequivalent decouplings to be considered.

Figure 5 describes the functions $f_{\alpha^V}^V$ that are uniformly additive with respect to the 5 inequivalent decouplings. They are positive linear combinations[25] of the extreme rays in the corresponding row of the table. The uniformly additive functions with respect to decoupling (a, b) are the sum of any $f_{\alpha^\varnothing}^\varnothing$ satisfying Eq. (4) and such an $f_{\alpha^V}^V$ found from Figure 5.

We find many familiar additive quantities in this way. For example, maximum output entropy ($\max_{\phi_A} H(B)$) satisfies Eq. (4). The quantity $-H(B|V)$ was shown to be additive in [16], and later referred to as reverse coherent information[17]. Since $H(B)$ satisfies Eq. (4) and $-H(B|V)$ is uniformly additive with respect to multiple decouplings, so is their sum




FIG. 4: Additivity cone. Fixing a decoupling gives an entropy inequality that implies additivity. We check whether this inequality is satisfied by using known additivity inequalities, as expressed by the quantum entropy cone described in Figure 3. We find a cone of coefficients defining the entropy formulas that are uniformly additive with respect to the fixed decoupling. The cone above is the additive cone for zero-auxiliary variable formulas.

$H(B) - H(B|V) = I(B; V)$, whose maximization gives the entanglement assisted capacity.

One extreme ray of the $(1, 2)$ decoupling's additive cone is particularly intriguing: $I^{cc}(\mathcal{N}) = \max_{\phi_{V_A}} [H(VB) - H(VE)]$. We call this quantity the completely coherent information, since its relationship to the coherent information $I^{\text{coh}}(\mathcal{N}) = \max_A [H(B) - H(E)]$ is similar to the relationship between completely positive and positive maps. The version of this quantity evaluated on states was shown in [18] to be a lower bound on the communication cost of exchanging the B and E systems, but it was not realized that it is additive. We also show that I^{cc} is also an *upper* bound for the jointly achievable quantum communication rate from A to either B or E . We have not found a clear operational interpretation of this quantity.

We now consider formulas with multiple auxiliary variables. For concreteness, suppose we have some formula depending on two auxiliary variables V_1 and V_2 . A standard decoupling is a mapping from a state $\phi_{V_1 V_2 A_1 A_2}$ to two states $\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V}_1 \tilde{V}_2 A_1}$ and $\hat{\phi}_{\hat{V}_1 \hat{V}_2 A_2}$ that we get by choosing to incorporate (or not) B_2 and E_2 into one of \tilde{V}_1 and \tilde{V}_2 (and similarly for B_1, E_1 in \hat{V}_1 and \hat{V}_2). Since \tilde{V}_1 and \tilde{V}_2 should be non-overlapping, it is necessary to impose some consistency on the decouplings (a_1, b_1) and (a_2, b_2) . These also give rise to a third decoupling, which we

case	(a,b)	\hat{M}_1	\tilde{M}_2	equivalents	Additive Cone	Extreme Rays
1.	(3,3)	$B_1 E_1$	$B_2 E_2$	(0,0)	$\alpha_V + \alpha_{BV} + \alpha_{EV} \geq 0$ $\alpha_V + \alpha_{BV} \geq 0$ $\alpha_V + \alpha_{EV} \geq 0$ $\alpha_V \geq 0$	$-H(E BV)$ $-H(E V)$ $-H(B EV)$ $-H(B V)$
2.	(3,2)	$B_1 E_1$	E_2	$(2,3), (3,1)$ $(1,3), (1,0), (0,1)$ $(2,0), (0,2)$	$\alpha_{BV} \leq 0$ $\alpha_V + \alpha_{BV} \geq 0$	$-H(BE V)$ $\pm H(B EV)$ $-H(B V)$
3.	(3,0)	$B_1 E_1$	\emptyset	(0,3)	$\alpha_{EV} \leq 0$ $\alpha_{BV} \leq 0$	$H(E BV)$ $-H(E V)$ $\pm H(BE V)$
4.	(1,1)	B_1	B_2	(2,2)	$\alpha_{EV} = 0$ $\alpha_V \geq 0$ $\alpha_{BEV} \geq 0$	$-H(B V)$ $H(E BV)$
5.	(1,2)	B_1	E_2	(2,1)	$\alpha_{BEV} \geq 0$ $\alpha_V \geq 0$	$\pm[H(EV) - H(BV)]$ $H(E BV)$ $-H(E V)$

FIG. 5: Functions $f_{\alpha^V}^V$ that are uniformly subadditive with respect to the 5 inequivalent standard decouplings. Fixing a decoupling D , a single-auxiliary variable f_α is uniformly subadditive with respect to D exactly when it can be written as a sum of $f_{\alpha^\emptyset}^\emptyset$ satisfying Eq.4 and $f_{\alpha^V}^V$ that is a positive linear combination of the extreme rays in the row corresponding to D . Multiple auxiliary variables are all found similarly.

call (a^*, b^*) , that tells us which systems get included in the joint systems $\tilde{V}_1 \tilde{V}_2$ and $\hat{V}_1 \hat{V}_2$.

In this case it is possible to separate the variables much as we did in the single-variable case. Indeed, any f_α with $\alpha = (\alpha^\emptyset, \alpha^{V_1}, \alpha^{V_2}, \alpha^{V_1 V_2})$ [26] is uniformly additive with respect to decoupling $\{(a_1, b_1), (a_2, b_2)\}$ exactly when $f_{\alpha^\emptyset}^\emptyset$, $f_{\alpha^{V_1}}^{V_1}$, $f_{\alpha^{V_2}}^{V_2}$, and $f_{\alpha^{V_1 V_2}}^{V_1 V_2}$ are uniformly additive with respect to their respective decouplings. The same is true for more auxiliary variables. For any number of auxiliary variables, all f_α uniformly additive with respect to standard decouplings can be constructed from Figure 5 and Eq. (4).

Surprisingly, carrying out the same analysis as above for classical states and channels

yields *exactly* the same set of uniformly additive functions. This is in spite of the fact that the classical and quantum entropy cones do not coincide. This coincidence of uniformly additive functions may explain a well-known phenomenon: Formulas that solve classical information theory problems often tend to have corresponding quantum formulas that solve an appropriately coherified version of the problem [27]. In these cases, the classical and quantum problems have a solution for the same reason: the existence of an appropriately additive formula whose additivity proofs are formally equivalent. It would be very nice to formalize this apparent correspondence.

We are currently exploring the application of our techniques to finding special classes of channels that have additive capacities. We have identified a new criterion for the additivity of coherent information: informational degradability. We say a channel is informationally degradable if for any input state ϕ_{VA} we have $I(V; B) \geq I(V; E)$. This class includes degradable channels. We suspect informational degradability is the *only* single-letter entropic constraint on a channel that implies this additivity. We have also found a set of entropic constraints that imply a state is of the c-q form, which should be useful for studying classical and private capacities of quantum channels.

We have identified the limits of the techniques used in all known instances of quantum additivity. There *are* some classical formulas that are additive but not uniformly additive (e.g., minimum output entropy of a classical channel). Proving additivity in these cases requires knowledge of the optimizing state (in the case of minimum output entropy of a quantum channel, the optimal state is a pure state, which for classical channels is also a product state.). One potential path to new quantum additive formulas beyond what we have found is to better understand the optimizing state in an entropic formula. At this point we know of no examples where this can be done, but they may well exist.

I. METHODS

We now argue that Eq (4) captures all uniformly additive formulas with no auxiliary variables. To begin, for a zero auxiliary variable f_α , we define

$$\Delta^\varnothing(\alpha, U_N \otimes U_M, \phi_{A_1 A_2}) = f_\alpha(U_N, \phi_{A_1}) + f_\alpha(U_M, \phi_{A_2}) - f_\alpha(U_N \otimes U_M, \phi_{A_1 A_2}) \quad (6)$$

$$= \alpha_B I(B_1; B_2) + \alpha_E I(E_1; E_2) + \alpha_{BE} I(B_1 E_1; B_2 E_2), \quad (7)$$

so that f_α is uniformly additive with respect to the standard decoupling exactly when $\forall \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}, \phi_{A_1 A_2}$ we have $\Delta^\varnothing(\alpha, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{A_1 A_2}) \geq 0$. We make use of the alternate characterization of Eq.(4) in terms of extremal rays, Eq. (5). It is easy to verify that the α s associated with each of the extremal rays $H(B)$, $H(E)$, $H(E|B)$, and $H(B|E)$ lead to positive Δ^\varnothing s. For example, $H(B)$ corresponds to $(\alpha_B, \alpha_E, \alpha_{BE}) = (1, 0, 0)$ and $\Delta^\varnothing(\alpha, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, \rho_{A_1 A_2}) = I(B_1; B_2) \geq 0$, while $H(B|E)$ corresponds to $(\alpha_B, \alpha_E, \alpha_{BE}) = (0, -1, 1)$ and gives $\Delta^\varnothing(\alpha, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, \rho_{A_1 A_2}) = I(B_1 E_1; B_2 E_2) - I(E_1; E_2)$, which is also positive for all $\rho_{A_1 A_2}$. $H(E)$ and $H(E|B)$ follow mutatis mutandis. Eq. (4) is thus a sufficient condition for uniform additivity. To see that it is also a necessary condition, we find states (in fact, classical distributions) p^0, p^1, p^2, p^3 and channels \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} such that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta^\varnothing(\alpha, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, p^0) &= \alpha_B + \alpha_{BE} \\ \Delta^\varnothing(\alpha, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, p^1) &= \alpha_E + \alpha_{BE} \\ \Delta^\varnothing(\alpha, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, p^2) &= \alpha_B + \alpha_E + \alpha_{BE} \\ \Delta^\varnothing(\alpha, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, p^3) &= \alpha_{BE}.\end{aligned}$$

This shows that for any α that doesn't satisfy Eq. (4) there are states and channels such that $\Delta^\varnothing(\alpha, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, p) < 0$. Thus, Eq. (4) are both necessary and sufficient for uniform additivity.

Uniform additivity with one auxiliary variable requires us to consider 5 inequivalent decouplings. Fixing a decoupling (a, b) that maps $\phi_{V A_1 A_2} \rightarrow (\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V} A_1}, \hat{\phi}_{\hat{V} A_2})$ define

$$\Delta^{(a,b)}(\alpha, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{V A_1 A_2}) = f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V} A_1}) + f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{M}}, \hat{\phi}_{\hat{V} A_2}) - f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{V A_1 A_2}) \quad (8)$$

so that f_α is uniformly additive with respect to (a, b) exactly when for all $U_{\mathcal{N}}, U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{V A_1 A_2}$ we have $\Delta_{(a,b)}(\alpha, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{V A_1 A_2}) \geq 0$. Finding the uniformly subadditive f_α is greatly simplified through the separation of variables: letting $\alpha = (\alpha^\varnothing, \alpha^V)$ with $\alpha^\varnothing = (\alpha_B, \alpha_E, \alpha_{BE})$ and $\alpha^V = (\alpha_V, \alpha_{BV}, \alpha_{EV}, \alpha_{BEV})$ and defining

$$\Delta^\varnothing(\alpha^\varnothing, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{A_1 A_2}) = f_{\alpha^\varnothing}(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \phi_{A_1}) + f_{\alpha^\varnothing}(U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{A_2}) - f_{\alpha^\varnothing}(U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{A_1 A_2}) \quad (9)$$

$$\Delta^{V,(a,b)}(\alpha^V, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{V A_1 A_2}) = f_{(0,\alpha^V)}(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V} A_1}) + f_{(0,\alpha^V)}(U_{\mathcal{M}}, \hat{\phi}_{\hat{V} A_2}) - f_{(0,\alpha^V)}(U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{V A_1 A_2}) \quad (10)$$

we have

$$\Delta^{(a,b)}(\alpha, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{VA_1A_2}) = \Delta^{\varnothing}(\alpha^{\varnothing}, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{A_1A_2}) + \Delta^{V,(a,b)}(\alpha^V, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{VA_1A_2}). \quad (11)$$

Furthermore, $\Delta^{(a,b)}(\alpha, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{VA_1A_2}) \geq 0$ for all $U_{\mathcal{N}}, U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{VA_1A_2}$ exactly when $\Delta^{\varnothing}(\alpha^{\varnothing}, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{A_1A_2}) \geq 0$ for all $U_{\mathcal{N}}, U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{VA_1A_2}$ and $\Delta^{V,(a,b)}(\alpha^V, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{VA_1A_2}) \geq 0$ for all $U_{\mathcal{N}}, U_{\mathcal{M}}$, and $\phi_{VA_1A_2}$. We have already characterized when $\Delta^{\varnothing}(\alpha, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{VA_1A_2}) \geq 0$ in the previous paragraph, and we can determine the α^V such that $\Delta^{V,(a,b)}(\alpha^V, U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}, \phi_{VA_1A_2}) \geq 0$ for all $U_{\mathcal{N}}, U_{\mathcal{M}}$, and $\phi_{VA_1A_2}$ in a similar way (either by direct computation or linear programming).

II. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

KL acknowledges NSF grants CCF-1110941 and CCF-1111382 and GS acknowledges NSF grant CCF-1110941.

-
- [1] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory* (Wiley & Sons, 1991).
 - [2] D. DiVincenzo, P. W. Shor, and J. A. Smolin, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 830 (1998), arXiv:quant-ph/9706061.
 - [3] G. Smith and J. A. Smolin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 030501 (2007).
 - [4] G. Smith and J. Yard, Science **321**, 1812 (2008), arXiv:0807.4935.
 - [5] M. Hastings, Nat. Phys. **5**, 255 (2009), arXiv:0809.3972.
 - [6] K. Li, A. Winter, X. Zou, and G. Guo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 120501 (2009), arXiv:0903.4308.
 - [7] G. Smith and J. A. Smolin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 120503 (2009), arXiv:0904.4050.
 - [8] T. S. Cubitt, J. Chen, and A. W. Harrow, Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on **57**, 8114 (2011).
 - [9] T. Cubitt, D. Elkouss, W. Matthews, M. Ozols, D. Pérez-García, and S. Strelchuk, Nature communications **6** (2015).
 - [10] C. E. Shannon, Bell Syst. Tech. J. **27**, 379 (1948).
 - [11] C. H. Bennett, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **48**, 2637 (2002).

- [12] G. Smith, J. Smolin, and A. Winter, IEEE Trans. Info. Theory **54**, 4208 (2008), arXiv:quant-ph/0607039.
- [13] E. H. Lieb and M.-B. Ruskai, J. Math. Phys. **14**, 1938 (1973).
- [14] R. W. Yeung, Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on **43**, 1924 (1997).
- [15] N. Pippenger, Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on **49**, 773 (2003).
- [16] I. Devetak, M. Junge, C. King, and M. B. Ruskai, Communications in mathematical physics **266**, 37 (2006).
- [17] R. García-Patrón, S. Pirandola, S. Lloyd, and J. H. Shapiro, Physical review letters **102**, 210501 (2009).
- [18] J. Oppenheim and A. Winter, arXiv preprint quant-ph/0511082 (2005).
- [19] P. Hayden, R. Jozsa, D. Petz, and A. Winter, Communications in mathematical physics **246**, 359 (2004).
- [20] D. Petz, Communications in mathematical physics **105**, 123 (1986).
- [21] D. Petz, The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics **39**, 97 (1988).
- [22] I. Devetak and P. W. Shor, Comm. Math. Phys. **256**, 287 (2005), arXiv:quant-ph/0311131.
- [23] The entropy of a random variable X is $H(X) = -\sum_x p_x \log p_x$
- [24] We focus on 1 auxiliary variable for simplicity. Multiple variables can be handled similarly.
- [25] i.e., linear combinations with positive coefficients
- [26] Here $\alpha^\varnothing = (\alpha_B, \alpha_E \alpha_{BE})$, $\alpha^{V_1} = (\alpha_{V_1}, \alpha_{BV_1}, \alpha_{EV_1} \alpha_{BEV_1})$, $\alpha^{V_2} = (\alpha_{V_2}, \alpha_{BV_2}, \alpha_{EV_2} \alpha_{BEV_2})$ and $\alpha^{V_1 V_2} = (\alpha_{V_1 V_2}, \alpha_{BV_1 V_2}, \alpha_{EV_1 V_2} \alpha_{BEV_1 V_2})$.
- [27] Examples of this include 1) the correspondence between classical capacity of a classical channel and the entanglement assisted capacity of a quantum channel, 2) the connection between Slepian-Wolf and state merging, and 3) the correspondence between Csiszar-Korner solution to the broadcast channel with confidential messages and the recent analysis of the quantum one-time pad.

Appendix A: Notation and Background

For any collection of systems $X_1 \dots X_n$, let $\mathcal{P}(X_1 \dots X_n)$ be the power set of this collection

$$\mathcal{P}(X_1 \dots X_n) = \{X_1^{u_1} \dots X_n^{u_n} | (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in \{0, 1\}^n\}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

We study channels $U_{\mathcal{N}} : A \rightarrow BE$ and are interested in formulas $f_{\alpha}(U_{\mathcal{N}})$ that are maximizations of linear combinations of entropies involving auxiliary variables $V_1 \dots V_n$

$$f_{\alpha}(U_{\mathcal{N}}) = \max_{\phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A}} f_{\alpha}(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A}), \quad (\text{A2})$$

where the linear entropic quantity $f_{\alpha}(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A})$ is given by

$$f_{\alpha}(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A}) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_n BE)} \alpha_s H(s, \rho_{V_1 \dots V_n BE}) \quad (\text{A3})$$

where $\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n BE} = (I \otimes U_{\mathcal{N}})\phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A}(I \otimes U_{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger})$ is the channel output state and $H(s, \rho_{V_1 \dots V_n BE})$ is the entropy of the reduced state corresponding to systems s .

Appendix B: General Considerations

We are interested in understanding when

$$f_{\alpha}(U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}) = f_{\alpha}(U_{\mathcal{N}}) + f_{\alpha}(U_{\mathcal{M}}). \quad (\text{B1})$$

In order to do this, we study mappings from a state $\phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A_1 A_2}$ that can be acted on by $U_{\mathcal{N}} \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}$ to two states: $\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V}_1 \dots \tilde{V}_n A_1}$, which can be acted on by \mathcal{N} and $\hat{\phi}_{\hat{V}_1 \dots \hat{V}_n A_2}$ which can be acted on by \mathcal{M} . We call such a mapping, $\mathcal{D} : \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A_1 A_2} \rightarrow (\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V}_1 \dots \tilde{V}_n A_1}, \hat{\phi}_{\hat{V}_1 \dots \hat{V}_n A_2})$ a *decoupling*.

There are two important types of decouplings that we consider: standard decouplings, and consistent decouplings. Both types of decouplings construct $\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V}_1 \dots \tilde{V}_n A_1}$ from relabelling the systems of $I \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}\phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A_1 A_2}I \otimes U_{\mathcal{M}}^{\dagger}$ and construct $\hat{\phi}_{\hat{V}_1 \dots \hat{V}_n A_2}$ by relabelling the systems of $I \otimes U_{\mathcal{N}}\phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A_1 A_2}I \otimes U_{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger}$. For a *standard decoupling*, we have $\tilde{V}_i = \tilde{M}_2 V_i$ and $\hat{V}_i = \hat{M}_1 V_i$ with $\tilde{M}_2 \in \mathcal{P}(B_2 E_2)$ and $\hat{M}_1 \in \mathcal{P}(B_1 E_1)$. For a *consistent decoupling*, we require less: $\tilde{V}_i \in \mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_n B_2 E_2)$ with $\tilde{V}_i \cap \tilde{V}_j = \emptyset$ and $\hat{V}_i \in \mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_n B_1 E_1)$ with $\hat{V}_i \cap \hat{V}_j = \emptyset$.

We say that $f_{\alpha}(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A})$ is *uniformly* subadditive with respect to decoupling \mathcal{D} if for all $\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2$, and $\phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A_1 A_2}$ we have

$$f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}_1} \otimes U_{\mathcal{N}_2}, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A_1 A_2}) \leq f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}_1}, \tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V}_1 \dots \tilde{V}_n A_1}) + f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}_2}, \hat{\phi}_{\hat{V}_1 \dots \hat{V}_n A_2}). \quad (\text{B2})$$

The following quantity will be useful:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta(f_\alpha, U_{\mathcal{N}_1}, U_{\mathcal{N}_2}, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A_1 A_2}, \tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V}_1 \dots \tilde{V}_n A_1}, \hat{\phi}_{\hat{V}_1 \dots \hat{V}_n A_2}) \\ &= f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}_1}, \tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V}_1 \dots \tilde{V}_n A_1}) + f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}_2}, \hat{\phi}_{\hat{V}_1 \dots \hat{V}_n A_2}) - f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}_1} \otimes U_{\mathcal{N}_2}, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A_1 A_2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B3})$$

Defined in this way, Δ is linear in f_α , so if we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(f_{\alpha_1}, U_{\mathcal{N}_1}, U_{\mathcal{N}_2}, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A_1 A_2}, \tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V}_1 \dots \tilde{V}_n A_1}, \hat{\phi}_{\hat{V}_1 \dots \hat{V}_n A_2}) &\geq 0 \\ \Delta(f_{\alpha_2}, U_{\mathcal{N}_1}, U_{\mathcal{N}_2}, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A_1 A_2}, \tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V}_1 \dots \tilde{V}_n A_1}, \hat{\phi}_{\hat{V}_1 \dots \hat{V}_n A_2}) &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

then for $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0$ we also have

$$\Delta(\lambda_1 f_{\alpha_1} + \lambda_2 f_{\alpha_2}, U_{\mathcal{N}_1}, U_{\mathcal{N}_2}, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A_1 A_2}, \tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V}_1 \dots \tilde{V}_n A_1}, \hat{\phi}_{\hat{V}_1 \dots \hat{V}_n A_2}) \geq 0. \quad (\text{B4})$$

For the standard or consistent decouplings, the Δ function defined in Eq. (B3) depends only on the decoupling \mathcal{D} , the entropy formula f_α and the state

$$\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B_1 E_1 B_2 E_2} = (I \otimes U_{\mathcal{N}_1} \otimes U_{\mathcal{N}_2}) \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A_1 A_2} (I \otimes U_{\mathcal{N}_1}^\dagger \otimes U_{\mathcal{N}_2}^\dagger). \quad (\text{B5})$$

So we abbreviate it as $\Delta^\mathcal{D}(\alpha, \rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B_1 E_1 B_2 E_2})$. It is easy to see that any state $\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B_1 E_1 B_2 E_2}$ can be written the form of Eq. (B5), with appropriate $U_{\mathcal{N}_1}$, $U_{\mathcal{N}_2}$ and $\phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A_1 A_2}$. Thus $f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A})$ is uniformly subadditive with respect to the decoupling \mathcal{D} if and only if

$$\forall \rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B_1 E_1 B_2 E_2}, \quad \Delta^\mathcal{D}(\alpha, \rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B_1 E_1 B_2 E_2}) \geq 0.$$

Appendix C: non-infinite functions that are uniformly subadditive

We will restrict our attention to entropic formulas f_α that are not always infinite: there is at least one $U_{\mathcal{N}}$ such that $f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}}) < \infty$. This requirement leads to a particularly nice structure on the α 's of a uniformly additive function.

Lemma C.1. *Let $f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A})$ satisfy*

$$f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}}) = \max_{\phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A}} f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A}) < \infty$$

for some $U_{\mathcal{N}}$ and

$$\min_{\rho} \Delta^{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha, \rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B_1 E_1 B_2 E_2}) \geq 0,$$

for a standard decoupling \mathcal{D} . In words, f_{α} is bounded and uniformly subadditive with respect to the standard decoupling \mathcal{D} . Then for all non-empty $t \in \mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_n)$,

$$\eta_t := \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}(BE)} \alpha_{s,t} = 0.$$

Proof. For a channel \mathcal{N} such that $f_{\alpha}(U_{\mathcal{N}}) < \infty$, considering a state of the form $\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n}^{\otimes k} \otimes \rho_A$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & f_{\alpha}(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \rho_{V_1 \dots V_n}^{\otimes k} \otimes \rho_A) \\ &= f_{\alpha}(U_{\mathcal{N}}, |0\rangle\langle 0|_{V_1} \otimes \dots \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_{V_n} \otimes \rho_A) + k \sum_{t \in \mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_n)} \eta_t H(t, \rho_{V_1 \dots V_n}). \end{aligned}$$

So we must have

$$\sum_{t \in \mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_n)} \eta_t H(t, \rho_{V_1 \dots V_n}) \leq 0, \quad (\text{C1})$$

because otherwise, the quantity $f_{\alpha}(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \rho_{V_1 \dots V_n}^{\otimes k} \otimes \rho_A)$ would go to ∞ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Now, in order for f_{α} to be uniformly subadditive with respect to the standard decoupling \mathcal{D} , we need

$$\Delta^{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha, \rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B_1 E_1 B_2 E_2}) \geq 0$$

for all $\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B_1 E_1 B_2 E_2}$. This implies

$$\Delta^{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha, \rho_{V_1 \dots V_n} \otimes |0000\rangle\langle 0000|_{B_1 E_1 B_2 E_2}) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_n)} \eta_t H(t, \rho_{V_1 \dots V_n}) \geq 0, \quad (\text{C2})$$

where we have used the fact that $H(s_1 \tilde{X}) + H(s_2 \hat{X}) - H(s_1 s_2 X) = H(X)$ for this state and any subset X of systems $V_1 \dots V_n$. Eq. (C1) and Eq. (C2) together imply that

$$\sum_{t \in \mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_n)} \eta_t H(t, \rho_{V_1 \dots V_n}) = 0 \quad (\text{C3})$$

for all $\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n}$. This implies that each $\eta_t = 0$, by uniqueness results from the classical literature (Theorem 1 of [14]). \square

We let

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\alpha \mid \exists U_{\mathcal{N}}, f_{\alpha}(U_{\mathcal{N}}) < +\infty\} \quad (\text{C4})$$

be the set of non-infinite entropy formulas .

Appendix D: Quantum Entropy Inequalities

All known inequalities that constrain entropy allocations in multipartite quantum states can be derived from *strong subadditivity* [13], given by

$$I(A; B|C) := H(AC) + H(BC) - H(ABC) - H(C) \geq 0. \quad (D1)$$

Here A , B , and C are arbitrary systems. Pippenger distinguished an independent set of basic inequalities on n systems from which all other known inequalities arise as positive linear combinations [15]. These are (1) nonnegativity of entropy $H(A) \geq 0$, (2) strong subadditivity as stated above, (3) weak monotonicity $H(C|A) + H(C|B) \geq 0$, (4) subadditivity $I(A; B) := H(A) + H(B) - H(AB) \geq 0$ and (5) Araki-Lieb inequality $H(AB) + H(A) - H(B) \geq 0$.

Appendix E: No Auxiliary Variables

There is only one standard decoupling, $\tilde{\phi}_{A_1} = \text{tr}_{A_2}(\phi_{A_1 A_2})$ and $\hat{\phi}_{A_2} = \text{tr}_{A_1}(\phi_{A_1 A_2})$, when there are no auxiliary variables. We now characterize the cone of uniformly additive linear entropic quantities. By the Minkowski-Weyl theorem, every polyhedron P has a half-space or *H-representation* $P = \{x : Ax \leq b\}$ for some real matrix A and vector b , and a vertex or *V-representation* $P = \text{conv}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n) + \text{nonneg}(r_1, r_2, \dots, r_s)$ where $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n, r_1, r_2, \dots, r_s$ are real vectors, conv denotes the convex hull, and nonneg denotes non-negative linear combinations.

Sufficient conditions: The quantity

$$f_\alpha(U_N, \phi_A) = \lambda_1 H(B) + \lambda_2 H(E) + \lambda_3 H(B|E) + \lambda_4 H(E|B) \quad (E1)$$

is uniformly subadditive for all $\lambda_i \geq 0$. To see this, note first that Eq. (D1) implies that $H(B_1 B_2) \leq H(B_1) + H(B_2)$ and $H(B_1 B_2 | E_1 E_2) \leq H(B_1 | E_1) + H(B_2 | E_2)$. The other terms $H(E)$ and $H(E|B)$ are handled similarly. We can then use Eq. (B4) to show f_α is uniformly subadditive for $\lambda_i \geq 0$. This characterization of the uniform additivity cone is a V-representation where the quantities $H(B)$, $H(E)$, $H(B|E)$, and $H(E|B)$ are a set of extreme rays and the cone contains the origin.

Necessary conditions: First we express f_α in a slightly different way

$$\begin{aligned} f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \phi_A) &= \lambda_1 H(B) + \lambda_2 H(E) + \lambda_3 H(B|E) + \lambda_4 H(E|B) \\ &= (\lambda_1 - \lambda_4) H(B) + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3) H(E) + (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4) H(BE), \end{aligned}$$

so that we have

$$f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \phi_A) = \alpha_B H(B) + \alpha_E H(E) + \alpha_{BE} H(BE)$$

with $\alpha_B = \lambda_1 - \lambda_4$, $\alpha_E = \lambda_2 - \lambda_3$, and $\alpha_{BE} = \lambda_3 + \lambda_4$. The requirement that $\lambda_i \geq 0$ translates to the conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_B + \alpha_{BE} &\geq 0 \\ \alpha_E + \alpha_{BE} &\geq 0 \\ \alpha_B + \alpha_E + \alpha_{BE} &\geq 0 \\ \alpha_{BE} &\geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{E2}$$

This characterization of the uniform additivity cone is an H-representation where each inequality corresponds to a face of the cone.

Now we show that these are necessary for uniform subadditivity. To see this, compute

$$\Delta(f_\alpha, p) = \alpha_B I(B_1; B_2) + \alpha_E I(E_1; E_2) + \alpha_{BE} I(B_1 E_1; B_2 E_2) \tag{E3}$$

where p denotes a classical distribution on $B_1 B_2 E_1 E_2$ corresponding to the channel output state. We will show that Eq. (E2) are necessary by exhibiting distributions p that lead to a negative value of $\Delta(f_\alpha, p)$ when any of the inequalities is violated.

First, suppose $\alpha_B + \alpha_{BE} < 0$. Then, by choosing classical probability distribution p such that $E_1 = E_2 = 0$ and $B_1 = B_2 = R_1$, with R_1 a uniform random bit, we find $\Delta(f_\alpha, p) = \alpha_B + \alpha_{BE} < 0$. We can show $\alpha_E + \alpha_{BE} \geq 0$ is necessary for uniform subadditivity in a similar way. Now, supposing $\alpha_B + \alpha_E + \alpha_{BE} < 0$, we let $B_1 = B_2 = E_1 = E_2 = R_1$ with R_1 a random uniform bit and find $\Delta(f_\alpha, p) = \alpha_B + \alpha_E + \alpha_{BE} < 0$. Finally, if $\alpha_{BE} < 0$, we can let $B_1 = R_1$, $B_2 = R_2$, $E_1 = R_1 \oplus R_3$, $E_2 = R_2 \oplus R_3$ with R_i independent random uniform bits. In this case we find $\Delta(f_\alpha, p) = \alpha_{BE} < 0$.

case	(a,b)	\hat{M}_1	\tilde{M}_2	equivalents
1.	(3,3)	$B_1 E_1$	$B_2 E_2$	none
2.	(3,1)	$B_1 E_1$	B_2	(1,3), (3,2), (2,3)
3.	(3,0)	$B_1 E_1$	\emptyset	(0,3)
4.	(1,1)	B_1	B_2	(2,2)
5.	(1,2)	B_1	E_2	(2,1)
6.	(1,0)	B_1	\emptyset	(2,0), (0,1), (0,2)
7.	(0,0)	\emptyset	\emptyset	none

TABLE I: The inequivalent standard decouplings for one auxiliary variable.

Appendix F: One Auxiliary Variable

For one auxiliary variable V , there are several choices of standard decouplings taking a state $\phi_{VA_1A_2}$ to states $\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{V}A_1}$ and $\hat{\phi}_{\hat{V}A_2}$. We define standard decouplings to have $\tilde{V} = \tilde{M}_2 V$ and $\hat{V} = \hat{M}_1 V$ where \hat{M}_1 is a collection of output systems from \mathcal{N}_1 and \tilde{M}_2 is a collection of output systems from \mathcal{N}_2 . Associate integer labels to each collection according to $0, 1, 2, 3 \leftrightarrow \emptyset, B, E, BE$. The standard decouplings are given by an ordered pair of integers (a, b) where a gives \hat{M}_1 and b gives \tilde{M}_2 . Table I lists the inequivalent standard decouplings.

For one auxiliary variable,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta^{(a,b)}(f_\alpha, \rho) = & \alpha_B I(B_1; B_2) + \alpha_E I(E_1; E_2) + \alpha_{BE} I(B_1 E_1; B_2 E_2) \\
& + \alpha_V (H(\tilde{V}) + H(\hat{V}) - H(V)) \\
& + \alpha_{BV} (H(B_1 \tilde{V}) + H(B_2 \hat{V}) - H(B_1 B_2 V)) \\
& + \alpha_{EV} (H(E_1 \tilde{V}) + H(E_2 \hat{V}) - H(E_1 E_2 V)) \\
& + \alpha_{BEV} (H(B_1 E_1 \tilde{V}) + H(B_2 E_2 \hat{V}) - H(B_1 B_2 E_1 E_2 V))
\end{aligned}$$

can be rewritten as

$$\Delta^{(a,b)}(\alpha, \rho) = \Delta^\emptyset(\alpha^\emptyset, \rho) + \Delta^{V,(a,b)}(\alpha^V, \rho) \quad (\text{F1})$$

where we have replaced f_α by the simpler notation α and

$$\Delta^\varnothing(\alpha^\varnothing, \rho) = \alpha_B I(B_1; B_2) + \alpha_E I(E_1; E_2) + \alpha_{BE} I(B_1 E_1; B_2 E_2) \quad (\text{F2})$$

$$\Delta^{V,(a,b)}(\alpha^V, \rho) = \left(\sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}(BE)} \alpha_{sV} \right) H(\hat{M}_1 \tilde{M}_2 V) + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}(BE)} \alpha_{sV} E_{sV}. \quad (\text{F3})$$

In these expressions ρ is the state at the channel outputs on which we evaluate the entropic quantities. The (a, b) index labels the different decouplings we may choose, $\alpha^\varnothing = (\alpha_B, \alpha_E, \alpha_{BE})$, $\alpha^V = (\alpha_V, \alpha_{BV}, \alpha_{EV}, \alpha_{BEV})$, and $\alpha = (\alpha^\varnothing, \alpha^V)$. The first expression Δ^\varnothing is the same as Eq. (E3) in the zero auxiliary case. For each s , the term corresponding to α_{sV} in the second expression has the entropic multiple

$$E_{sV} = H(s_1 \tilde{M}_2 V) + H(\hat{M}_1 s_2 V) - H(s_1 s_2 V) - H(\hat{M}_1 \tilde{M}_2 V). \quad (\text{F4})$$

If $s = \varnothing$, then Eq. (F4) takes the value $I(\hat{M}_1; \tilde{M}_2 | V)$. If $s = BE$, it takes the value $I(\hat{M}_1^c; \tilde{M}_2^c | \hat{M}_1 \tilde{M}_2 V)$ where superscript c denotes the complement in $\{B_j, E_j\}$. The expression is more complicated for other values of s . If $s = B$, it evaluates to expressions given in Table II, and if $s = E$ it evaluates to expressions in Table III.

We now show that the variables α^\varnothing and α^V can be separated and then prove that Figure 5 in the main text characterizes the uniformly additive formulas obtained using standard decouplings.

1. Separation of Variables

We would now like to show that the V -type terms and the \varnothing -type terms can be separated. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi^\varnothing &= \{\alpha^\varnothing \mid \forall \rho, \Delta^\varnothing(\alpha^\varnothing, \rho) \geq 0\} \cap \mathcal{F} \\ \Pi^{V,(a,b)} &= \{\alpha^V \mid \forall \rho, \Delta^{V,(a,b)}(\alpha^V, \rho) \geq 0\} \cap \mathcal{F} \\ \Pi^{(a,b)} &= \{\alpha \mid \forall \rho, \Delta^\varnothing(\alpha^\varnothing, \rho) + \Delta^{V,(a,b)}(\alpha^V, \rho) \geq 0\} \cap \mathcal{F}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F5})$$

Lemma F.1 (separation of variables). *Let Π^\varnothing , $\Pi^{V,(a,b)}$, and $\Pi^{(a,b)}$ be as above. Then*

$$\Pi^{(a,b)} = \{(\alpha^\varnothing, \alpha^V) \mid \alpha^\varnothing \in \Pi^\varnothing \text{ and } \alpha^V \in \Pi^{V,(a,b)}\}.$$

Proof. It is clear that $\Pi^{(a,b)} \supset \Pi^\varnothing + \Pi^{V,(a,b)}$, since if $\Delta^\varnothing(\alpha^\varnothing, \rho) \geq 0$ and $\Delta^{V,(a,b)}(\alpha^V, \rho) \geq 0$ then $\Delta^{(a,b)}(\alpha, \rho) \geq 0$. We would also like to show that any $\alpha \in \Pi^{(a,b)}$ can be decomposed as $\alpha = (\alpha^\varnothing, \alpha^V)$ with $\alpha^\varnothing \in \Pi^\varnothing$ and $\alpha^V \in \Pi^{V,(a,b)}$. To this end, let $\alpha = (\alpha^\varnothing, \alpha^V) \in \Pi^{(a,b)}$. To begin with, Lemma C.1 tells us that $\alpha_V + \alpha_{BV} + \alpha_{EV} + \alpha_{BEV} = 0$. This lets us rewrite Eq. (F3) as

$$\Delta^{V,(a,b)}(\alpha^V, p) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}(BE)} \alpha_{sV} E_{sV}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} E_{sV} &= H(s_1 \tilde{M}_2 V) + H(\hat{M}_1 s_2 V) - H(s_1 s_2 V) - H(\hat{M}_1 \tilde{M}_2 V) \\ &= H(s_1 \tilde{M}_2 | V) + H(\hat{M}_1 s_2 | V) - H(s_1 s_2 | V) - H(\hat{M}_1 \tilde{M}_2 | V). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F6})$$

Now, suppose that $\alpha^\varnothing \notin \Pi^\varnothing$. In that case, as shown in Section E, there is a *classical* probability distribution p_1 on $B_1 B_2 E_1 E_2$ such that $\Delta^\varnothing(\alpha^\varnothing, p_1) < 0$. However, we can now extend p_1 to V by letting $V = (B_1, B_2, E_1, E_2)$ be a perfectly correlated copy of $B_1 B_2 E_1 E_2$. From Eq.(F6) we see that $E_{sV}(p_1)$ is a sum of entropies of subsets of $B_1 B_2 E_1 E_2$ conditioned on V , so $E_{sV}(p_1) = 0$ and therefore $\Delta^{V,(a,b)}(\alpha, p_1) = 0$. But this means that

$$\Delta(\alpha, p_1) = \Delta^\varnothing(\alpha^\varnothing, p_1) + \Delta^{V,(a,b)}(\alpha^V, p_1) = \Delta^\varnothing(\alpha^\varnothing, p_1) < 0,$$

so we must have $\alpha \notin \Pi^{(a,b)}$ after all.

Now, suppose $\alpha = (\alpha^\varnothing, \alpha^V) \in \Pi^{(a,b)}$, but $\alpha^V \notin \Pi^{V,(a,b)}$. This means that there is some $\rho_{B_1 E_1 B_2 E_2 V}$ such that $\Delta^{V,(a,b)}(\alpha^V, \rho) < 0$. We use this ρ to define a new state,

$$\sigma_{B_1 B_2 E_1 E_2 V'} = \frac{1}{d_B^4 d_E^4} \sum_{i,j} \sum_{k,l} (P_i \otimes P_j \otimes P_k \otimes P_l \otimes I_V) \rho(P_i^\dagger \otimes P_j^\dagger \otimes P_k^\dagger \otimes P_l^\dagger \otimes I_V) \otimes |i, j, k, l\rangle\langle i, j, k, l|_{V_1},$$

where $i, j = 1 \dots d_B^2$, $k, l = 1 \dots d_E^2$, P_i and P_j label the Pauli matrices on B , P_k and P_l label the Pauli matrices on E , and $V' = V V_1$. This state is constructed so that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^\varnothing(\alpha^\varnothing, \sigma) &= 0 \\ \Delta^{V,(a,b)}(\alpha^V, \sigma) &= \Delta^{V,(a,b)}(\alpha^V, \rho). \end{aligned}$$

As a result, we also find that

$$\Delta^{(a,b)}(\alpha, \sigma) = \Delta^\varnothing(\alpha^\varnothing, \sigma) + \Delta^{V,(a,b)}(\alpha^V, \sigma) = \Delta^{V,(a,b)}(\alpha^V, \rho) < 0,$$

so that we have $\alpha \notin \Pi^{(a,b)}$ in this case too. \square

\hat{M}_1	\tilde{M}_2	expression
\emptyset	\emptyset	$I(B_1; B_2 V)$
B_1	\emptyset	0
E_1	\emptyset	$H(B_2 E_1V) - H(B_2 B_1V) = I(B_1; B_2 V) - I(E_1; B_2 V)$
B_1E_1	\emptyset	$-I(E_1; B_2 B_1V)$
\emptyset	B_2	0
B_1	B_2	0
E_1	B_2	0
B_1E_1	B_2	0
\emptyset	E_2	$H(B_1 E_2V) - H(B_1 B_2V) = I(B_1; B_2 V) - I(B_1; E_2 V)$
B_1	E_2	0
E_1	E_2	$H(B_1E_2V) + H(E_1B_2V) - H(B_1B_2V) - H(E_1E_2V)$
B_1E_1	E_2	$I(E_1; E_2 B_1V) - I(E_1; B_2 B_1V)$
\emptyset	B_2E_2	$-I(B_1; E_2 B_2V)$
B_1	B_2E_2	0
E_1	B_2E_2	$I(E_2; E_1 B_2V) - I(E_2; B_1 B_2V)$
B_1E_1	B_2E_2	$I(E_1; E_2 B_1B_2V)$

TABLE II: The entropic quantity E_{sV} in Eq. (F4) evaluates to these expressions when $s = B$.

For each standard decoupling, we want to identify parameters α such that $\Delta^{(a,b)} \geq 0$ for all states on systems $B_1B_2E_1E_2V$. We use Lemma F.1, and our earlier characterization of the α^\emptyset satisfying $\Delta^\emptyset \geq 0$, to separate variables and focus solely on $\Delta^{V,(a,b)}$. Recall also that $\alpha_V + \alpha_{BV} + \alpha_{EV} + \alpha_{BEV} = 0$ for all standard decouplings. In what follows, let R_1 , R_2 , and R_3 denote independent uniform 0-1 random variables.

2. Case 1: (3,3) decoupling

Here we have $\hat{M}_1 = B_1E_1$ and $\tilde{M}_2 = B_2E_2$. We want to compute $\Delta^{V,(3,3)} = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}(BE)} \alpha_{sV} E_{sV}$. For $s = \emptyset$ and $s = BE$ we have $E_V = I(B_1E_1; B_2E_2|V)$ and $E_{BEV} = 0$. Consulting Table II and III, we find $E_{BV} = I(E_1; E_2|B_1B_2V)$ and $E_{EV} = I(B_1; B_2|E_1E_2V)$

\hat{M}_1	\tilde{M}_2	expression
\emptyset	\emptyset	$I(E_1; E_2 V)$
E_1	\emptyset	0
B_1	\emptyset	$H(E_2 B_1V) - H(E_2 E_1V) = I(E_1; E_2 V) - I(B_1; E_2 V)$
E_1B_1	\emptyset	$-I(B_1; E_2 E_1V)$
\emptyset	E_2	0
E_1	E_2	0
B_1	E_2	0
E_1B_1	E_2	0
\emptyset	B_2	$H(E_1 B_2V) - H(E_1 E_2V) = I(E_1; E_2 V) - I(E_1; B_2 V)$
E_1	B_2	0
B_1	B_2	$H(E_1B_2V) + H(B_1E_2V) - H(E_1E_2V) - H(B_1B_2V)$
E_1B_1	B_2	$I(B_1; B_2 E_1V) - I(B_1; E_2 E_1V)$
\emptyset	E_2B_2	$-I(E_1; B_2 E_2V)$
E_1	E_2B_2	0
B_1	E_2B_2	$I(B_2; B_1 E_2V) - I(B_2; E_1 E_2V)$
E_1B_1	E_2B_2	$I(B_1; B_2 E_1E_2V)$

TABLE III: The entropic quantity E_{sV} in Eq. (F4) evaluates to these expressions when $s = E$.

so that

$$\Delta^{V,(3,3)} = \alpha_V I(B_1E_1; B_2E_2|V) + \alpha_{BV} I(E_1; E_2|B_1B_2V) + \alpha_{EV} I(B_1; B_2|E_1E_2V). \quad (\text{F7})$$

We now need necessary and sufficient conditions on α for $\Delta^{V,(3,3)} \geq 0$.

Necessary conditions: The conditions

$$\alpha_V + \alpha_{BV} + \alpha_{EV} \geq 0 \quad (\text{F8})$$

$$\alpha_V + \alpha_{BV} \geq 0 \quad (\text{F9})$$

$$\alpha_V + \alpha_{EV} \geq 0 \quad (\text{F10})$$

$$\alpha_V \geq 0 \quad (\text{F11})$$

are necessary for positivity of $\Delta^{V,(3,3)}$. To see the necessity of Eq. (F8), choose $B_1 = R_1$, $B_2 = R_2$, $E_1 = R_1 \oplus R_3$, $E_2 = R_2 \oplus R_3$ and $V = 0$. This give us a distribution with

$I(B_1E_1; B_2E_2|V) = 1$, $I(B_1; B_2|E_1E_2V) = 1$, and $I(E_1; E_2|B_1B_2V) = 1$, and so we find Eq. (F8). Eq. (F9) can be seen by choosing $B_1 = R_1$, $B_2 = R_1 \oplus R_2$, $E_1 = 0$, $E_2 = R_2$, and $V = 0$ which results in $I(B_1E_1; B_2E_2|V) = 1$, $I(B_1; B_2|E_1E_2V) = 1$, and $I(E_1; E_2|B_1B_2V) = 0$. Eq. (F10) can be seen in a similar fashion. Finally, to see Eq. (F11), let $B_1 = R_1$, $B_2 = 0$, $E_1 = 0$, $E_2 = R_1$, and $V = 0$.

Sufficient conditions: We will now show that the necessary conditions for positivity of $\Delta^{V,(3,3)}$ are also sufficient. There are four cases to consider. Suppose first that $\alpha_V, \alpha_{BV}, \alpha_{EV} \geq 0$. The positivity of conditional mutual information, and thus the relevant E_{sV} 's, makes $\Delta^{V,(3,3)} \geq 0$ immediately. Suppose next that $\alpha_{BV} \geq 0$ and $\alpha_{EV} < 0$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{V,(3,3)} &= \alpha_V I(B_1E_1; B_2E_2|V) + \alpha_{BV} I(E_1; E_2|B_1B_2V) + \alpha_{EV} I(B_1; B_2|E_1E_2V) \\ &= (\alpha_V + \alpha_{EV}) I(B_1E_1; B_2E_2|V) + \alpha_{BV} I(E_1; E_2|B_1B_2V) + |\alpha_{EV}| [I(B_1E_1; B_2E_2|V) - I(B_1; B_2|E_1E_2V)] \\ &= (\alpha_V + \alpha_{EV}) I(B_1E_1; B_2E_2|V) + \alpha_{BV} I(E_1; E_2|B_1B_2V) + |\alpha_{EV}| [I(E_1; B_2|E_2V) + I(B_1E_1; B_2|V)] \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where we have used

$$I(B_1; B_2|E_1E_2V) = I(B_1E_1; B_2E_2|V) - I(E_1; B_2|E_2V) - I(B_1E_1; B_2|V)$$

and the positivity of conditional mutual information. The case $\alpha_{BV} < 0$ and $\alpha_{EV} \geq 0$ follows the same argument as the second case. Finally suppose that $\alpha_{BV} < 0$ and $\alpha_{EV} < 0$. In this case we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{V,(3,3)} &= \alpha_V I(B_1E_1; B_2E_2|V) + \alpha_{BV} I(E_1; E_2|B_1B_2V) + \alpha_{EV} I(B_1; B_2|E_1E_2V) \\ &= (\alpha_V + \alpha_{BV} + \alpha_{EV}) I(B_1E_1; B_2E_2|V) + |\alpha_{BV}| [I(B_1E_1; B_2E_2|V) - I(E_1; E_2|B_1B_2V)] \\ &\quad + |\alpha_{EV}| [I(B_1E_1; B_2E_2|V) - I(B_1; B_2|E_1E_2V)] \\ &= (\alpha_V + \alpha_{BV} + \alpha_{EV}) I(B_1E_1; B_2E_2|V) + |\alpha_{BV}| [I(B_1; E_2|B_2V) + I(B_1E_1; E_2|V)] \\ &\quad + |\alpha_{EV}| [I(E_1; B_2|E_2V) + I(B_1E_1; B_2|V)] \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

3. Case 2: (3,1) decoupling

Here we have $\hat{M}_1 = B_1E_1$ and $\tilde{M}_2 = B_2$. For $s = \emptyset$ and $s = BE$ we have $E_V = I(B_1E_1; B_2|V)$ and $E_{BEV} = 0$, respectively, while for $s = B$ and $s = E$, we find $E_{BV} = 0$ and $E_{EV} = I(B_1; B_2|E_1V) - I(B_1; E_2|E_1V)$ from Table II and III. This gives us

$$\Delta^{V,(3,1)} = \alpha_V I(B_1E_1; B_2|V) + \alpha_{EV} [I(B_1; B_2|E_1V) - I(B_1; E_2|E_1V)]. \quad (\text{F12})$$

Necessary conditions: We wish to show that in order to have $\Delta^{V,(3,1)} \geq 0$ for all distributions, we need

$$\alpha_{EV} \leq 0 \quad (\text{F13})$$

$$\alpha_V + \alpha_{EV} \geq 0. \quad (\text{F14})$$

To see that Eq. (F13) is true, choose $B_1 = E_2 = R_1$, and $E_1 = B_2 = V = 0$ to get $\Delta^{V,(3,1)} = -\alpha_{EV}$, so that $\alpha_{EV} \leq 0$. To see that Eq. (F14) is necessary, choose $E_2 = E_1 = V = 0$ and $B_1 = B_2 = R_1$. Then $\Delta^{V,(3,1)} = \alpha_V + \alpha_{EV}$ which means we need $\alpha_V + \alpha_{EV} \geq 0$.

Sufficient conditions: Let $\alpha_{EV} \leq 0$ and $\alpha_V + \alpha_{EV} \geq 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{V,(3,1)} &= \alpha_V I(B_1 E_1; B_2 | V) + \alpha_{EV} [I(B_1; B_2 | E_1 V) - I(B_1; E_2 | E_1 V)] \\ &= (\alpha_V - |\alpha_{EV}|) I(B_1 E_1; B_2 | V) + |\alpha_{EV}| [I(B_1 E_1; B_2 | V) - I(B_1; B_2 | E_1 V)] + |\alpha_{EV}| I(B_1; E_2 | E_1 V) \\ &= (\alpha_V + \alpha_{EV}) I(B_1 E_1; B_2 | V) + |\alpha_{EV}| [I(E_1; B_2 | V)] + |\alpha_{EV}| I(B_1; E_2 | E_1 V) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

4. Case 3: (3,0) decoupling

Here we have $\hat{M}_1 = B_1 E_1$ and $\tilde{M}_2 = \emptyset$ which leads to $E_V = 0$, $E_{BEV} = 0$, $E_{BV} = -I(E_1; B_2 | B_1 V)$, and $E_{EV} = -I(B_1; E_2 | E_1 V)$. Therefore,

$$\Delta^{V,(3,0)} = -\alpha_{BV} I(E_1; B_2 | B_1 V) - \alpha_{EV} I(B_1; E_2 | E_1 V). \quad (\text{F15})$$

Necessary conditions: We will need to have

$$\alpha_{BV} \leq 0 \quad (\text{F16})$$

$$\alpha_{EV} \leq 0. \quad (\text{F17})$$

To see Eq. (F16), choose $E_1 = B_2 = R_1$ and $E_2 = B_1 = V = 0$ to get $\Delta^{V,(3,0)} = -\alpha_{BV} \geq 0$. Similarly, choosing $B_1 = E_2 = R_1$ and $E_1 = B_2 = V = 0$ gives $\Delta^{V,(3,0)} = -\alpha_{EV} \geq 0$ and Eq. (F17).

Sufficient conditions: Eq.(F15) is explicitly nonnegative when $\alpha_{BV} \leq 0$ and $\alpha_{EV} \leq 0$.

5. Case 4: (1,1) decoupling

Here we have $\hat{M}_1 = B_1$ and $\tilde{M}_2 = B_2$, which gives $E_V = I(B_1; B_2 | V)$, $E_{BEV} = I(E_1; E_2 | B_1 B_2 V)$, $E_{BV} = 0$, and $E_{EV} = H(E_1 B_2 V) + H(B_1 E_2 V) - H(B_1 B_2 V) - H(E_1 E_2 V)$.

Therefore

$$\Delta^{V,(1,1)} = \alpha_V I(B_1; B_2|V) + \alpha_{EV} [H(E_1 B_2 V) + H(B_1 E_2 V) - H(B_1 B_2 V) - H(E_1 E_2 V)] \quad (\text{F18})$$

$$+ \alpha_{BEV} I(E_1; E_2|B_1 B_2 V). \quad (\text{F19})$$

Necessary conditions: We need to have

$$\alpha_{EV} = 0 \quad (\text{F20})$$

$$\alpha_V \geq 0 \quad (\text{F21})$$

$$\alpha_{BEV} \geq 0. \quad (\text{F22})$$

Choosing $B_1 = E_2 = R_1$ and $E_1 = B_2 = V = 0$, we find $-\alpha_{EV} \geq 0$ so that $\alpha_{EV} \leq 0$. Choosing $B_1 = R_1$, $B_2 = R_2$, $E_1 = E_2 = R_1 \oplus R_2$, and $V = 0$, we find $\Delta^{V,(1,1)} = \alpha_{EV} \geq 0$, so that $\alpha_{EV} = 0$, showing Eq.(F20). Thus, we have

$$\Delta^{V,(1,1)} = \alpha_V I(B_1; B_2|V) + \alpha_{BEV} I(E_1; E_2|B_1 B_2 V),$$

from which we see Eq. (F21) and Eq. (F22).

Sufficient conditions: The sufficiency of $\alpha_V \geq 0$, $\alpha_{BEV} \geq 0$ and $\alpha_{EV} = 0$ is immediate from positivity of conditional mutual information.

6. Case 5: (1,2) decoupling

Here we have $\hat{M}_1 = B_1$ and $\tilde{M}_2 = E_2$, which gives $E_V = I(B_1; E_2|V)$, $E_{BEV} = I(E_1; B_2|B_1 E_2 V)$, $E_{BV} = 0$, and $E_{EV} = 0$. This leads to

$$\Delta^{V,(1,1)} = \alpha_V I(B_1; E_2|V) + \alpha_{BEV} I(E_1; B_2|B_1 E_2 V).$$

Necessary conditions: We need to have

$$\alpha_V \geq 0 \quad (\text{F23})$$

$$\alpha_{BEV} \geq 0. \quad (\text{F24})$$

Choosing $B_1 = E_2 = V = 0$, and $E_1 = B_2 = R_1$, we get Eq.(F24). Letting $B_1 = B_2 = E_1 = E_2 = R_1$ and $V = 0$ we get Eq.(F23).

Sufficient conditions: Sufficiency is immediate from positivity of conditional mutual information.

Appendix G: Multiple Auxiliary Variables

We now consider the general case with multiple auxiliary variables V_1, \dots, V_n . We will prove that we can separate the variables, similar to the one-variable case. As a result, under a standard decoupling, the cone of uniformly additive entropic formulas is decomposed into a sum of smaller cones, each of which involves one specific subset of the auxiliary variables. Furthermore, the characterizations of these smaller cones is identical with the ones for zero and one auxiliary variable, which we have given in the previous sections. This will finish the characterization of the additive cone under standard decouplings.

Let $\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B_1 E_1 B_2 E_2} = (I \otimes U_{\mathcal{N}_1} \otimes U_{\mathcal{N}_2}) \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A_1 A_2} (I \otimes U_{\mathcal{N}_1}^\dagger \otimes U_{\mathcal{N}_2}^\dagger)$ be a state generated by the channels \mathcal{N}_1 and \mathcal{N}_2 . We are considering entropic quantities evaluated on systems $V_1 \dots V_n B_1 E_1 B_2 E_2$. A standard decoupling is an assignment $\tilde{V}_i = N_2^i V_i$, $\hat{V}_i = N_1^i V_i$, where N_1^i is picked from $\mathcal{P}(B_1 E_1)$ and N_2^i is picked from $\mathcal{P}(B_2 E_2)$. We require the decoupling to be consistent: each of B_2 and E_2 appears in at most one N_2^i and each of B_1 and E_1 appears in at most one N_1^i , such that the new auxiliary variables have no overlaps. A consistent standard decoupling will be indexed by $(a_1, b_1) \dots (a_n, b_n)$.

Let $J \subseteq [n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ be a set of indices and V_J denote the collection of systems $V_1 \dots V_n$ indexed by J . Likewise let N_1^J and N_2^J denote collections of systems $\{N_1^i\}$ and $\{N_2^i\}$ respectively. Note that $V_\emptyset = \emptyset$, $N_1^\emptyset = \emptyset$ and $N_2^\emptyset = \emptyset$. For α being the coefficient vector of an entropy formula f_α , we let $\alpha^{V_J} = (\alpha_{V_J}, \alpha_{BV_J}, \alpha_{EV_J}, \alpha_{BEV_J})$. In Lemma C.1 we found that if f_α is bounded and uniformly additive with respect to a standard decoupling, then for all J it must hold that

$$\alpha_{V_J} + \alpha_{BV_J} + \alpha_{EV_J} + \alpha_{BEV_J} = 0. \quad (\text{G1})$$

So in the following we assume Eq.(G1). Thus, we can write

$$\Delta^{V_J, (a_J, b_J)}(\alpha^{V_J}, \rho) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}(BE)} \alpha_{sV_J} \left(H(s_1 N_2^J | V_J) + H(N_1^J s_2 | V_J) - H(s_1 s_2 | V_J) - H(N_1^J N_2^J | V_J) \right), \quad (\text{G2})$$

$$\Delta^{(a_1, b_1) \dots (a_n, b_n)}(\alpha, \rho) = \sum_J \Delta^{V_J, (a_J, b_J)}(\alpha^{V_J}, \rho), \quad (\text{G3})$$

where (a_J, b_J) tells us which systems from $\{B_1, E_1, B_2, E_2\}$ go with V_J and is induced from

$(a_1, b_1) \dots (a_n, b_n)$. We can now define the cones

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi^{V_J, (a_J, b_J)} &= \{\alpha^{V_J} \mid \forall \rho, \Delta^{V_J, (a_J, b_J)}(\alpha^{V_J}, \rho) \geq 0\} \cap \mathcal{F}, \\ \Pi^{(a_1, b_1) \dots (a_n, b_n)} &= \{\alpha \mid \forall \rho, \Delta^{(a_1, b_1) \dots (a_n, b_n)}(\alpha, \rho) \geq 0\} \cap \mathcal{F}.\end{aligned}$$

If $V_J = \emptyset$, the characterization of $\Pi^{V_J, (a_J, b_J)}$ has been given in Section E. Note that in this case $a_J = 0$ and $b_J = 0$ correspond to empty sets and they are meaningless. If $V_J \neq \emptyset$, we can regard V_J as a single auxiliary variable and find the explicit description of $\Pi^{V_J, (a_J, b_J)}$ in Section F. On the other hand, the cone $\Pi^{(a_1, b_1) \dots (a_n, b_n)}$ includes all the uniformly additive quantities f_α , under the decoupling $(a_1, b_1) \dots (a_n, b_n)$. Our main result in this section is the following Theorem G.1, which gives a simple characterization of $\Pi^{(a_1, b_1) \dots (a_n, b_n)}$, in terms of $\Pi^{V_J, (a_J, b_J)}$.

Theorem G.1. *Given α , we have*

$$\alpha \in \Pi^{(a_1, b_1) \dots (a_n, b_n)} \tag{G4}$$

if and only if

$$\forall J \subseteq [n], \quad \alpha^{V_J} \in \Pi^{V_J, (a_J, b_J)}. \tag{G5}$$

The proof of Theorem G.1 uses the following two lemmas.

Lemma G.2. *Let $\Pi^{V_J, (a_J, b_J)}$ be defined as above. Then, if $\alpha^{V_J} \notin \Pi^{V_J, (a_J, b_J)}$ there is a classical probability distribution p on $B_1 E_1 B_2 E_2 V_J$ such that $\Delta^{V_J, (a_J, b_J)}(\alpha^{V_J}, p) < 0$.*

Proof. This is shown in Section E and Section F. □

Lemma G.3. *Fix a probability distribution p on $V_1 \dots V_n B_1 E_1 B_2 E_2$ and a consistent standard decoupling $(a_1, b_1) \dots (a_n, b_n)$. Let $T \subseteq [n]$ be a fixed set and (a_T, b_T) be the induced standard decoupling associated with the set of variables V_T . Then we can construct a probability distribution p' on $V_1' \dots V_n' B_1' E_1' B_2' E_2'$ such that*

$$\Delta^{(a_1, b_1) \dots (a_n, b_n)}(\alpha, p') = \Delta^{V_T, (a_T, b_T)}(\alpha^{V_T}, p). \tag{G6}$$

Proof. If the systems B_1, B_2, E_1, E_2 do not have the same size, we extend them such that their sizes are the same. Denote $d = |B_1| = |B_2| = |E_1| = |E_2|$. We let $k = |T|$, the number of indices in T , and let $t_i, i = 1, \dots, k$, be the i th element of T . For each $f = 0, \dots, 3$ and $i =$

$1, \dots, k$, choose R_i^f to be an independent uniformly distributed variable on $\{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}$. Let $R^f = \sum_{i=1}^k R_i^f \pmod{d}$. To define p' , we let

$$B'_1 = R^0 + B_1 \pmod{d} \quad E'_1 = R^1 + E_1 \pmod{d} \quad (\text{G7})$$

$$B'_2 = R^2 + B_2 \pmod{d} \quad E'_2 = R^3 + E_2 \pmod{d}. \quad (\text{G8})$$

For $i = 1, \dots, k$, we let $V'_{t_i} = V_{t_i} R_i^0 R_i^1 R_i^2 R_i^3$, and for $r \notin T$ we choose $V'_r = B_1 E_1 B_2 E_2$.

For any $X \in \mathcal{P}(B_1 E_1)$ and $Y \in \mathcal{P}(B_2 E_2)$, we let X' and Y' be the corresponding collections of systems from $B'_1 E'_1$ and $B'_2 E'_2$, respectively (i.e., if $X = B_1 E_1$, then $X' = B'_1 E'_1$). Since V'_T includes V_T , as well as all the R_i^f variables from which we know R^0, R^1, R^2 and R^3 , we have

$$H(X'Y'|V'_T) = H(XY|V_T).$$

This, combined with Eq. (G2), gives

$$\Delta^{V_T, (a_T, b_T)}(\alpha^{V_T}, p') = \Delta^{V_T, (a_T, b_T)}(\alpha^{V_T}, p). \quad (\text{G9})$$

Next, we show that

$$\Delta^{V_J, (a_J, b_J)}(\alpha^{V_J}, p') = 0, \quad \text{for all } J \neq T. \quad (\text{G10})$$

For this, we consider two cases. If $T \subset J$, then B'_1, E'_1, B'_2, E'_2 are all known given V'_J , because V'_J includes $B_1 E_1 B_2 E_2 R^0 R^1 R^2 R^3$. As a result,

$$H(X'Y'|V'_J) = 0.$$

On the other hand, if $T \not\subseteq J$, There must exist i , such that none of $R_i^0, R_i^1, R_i^2, R_i^3$ is included in V'_J . Thus given V'_J , the variables R^0, R^1, R^2, R^3 are independent and uniformly distributed, and so are B'_1, E'_1, B'_2, E'_2 . As a result,

$$H(X'Y'|V'_J) = H(X') + H(Y').$$

In both cases, using Eq. (G2) we obtain Eq. (G10). At last, using Eq. (G3) we easily see that Eq. (G9) and Eq. (G10) together lead to Eq. (G6). \square

Proof of Theorem G.1. It is obvious that Eq. (G5) implies Eq. (G4). For the other direction, we suppose that Eq. (G5) is not true: there is a subset $T \subseteq [n]$, such that $\alpha^{V_T} \notin \Pi^{V_T, (a_T, b_T)}$. Then by Lemma G.2, there is a probability distribution p on $B_1 E_1 B_2 E_2 V_T$, satisfying

$$\Delta^{V_T, (a_T, b_T)}(\alpha^{V_T}, p) < 0.$$

Due to Lemma G.3, this further implies that we have probability distribution p' such that

$$\Delta^{(a_1, b_1) \dots (a_n, b_n)}(\alpha, p') < 0,$$

which indicates that $\alpha \notin \Pi^{(a_1, b_1) \dots (a_n, b_n)}$. \square

Appendix H: Non-standard Decouplings

The motivation of our consideration of standard decouplings comes from the experience in proving additivity of certain well-known quantities. However, a general treatment should consider all possible ways to generate the new auxiliary variables in the decoupling. In this section, we investigate the usefulness of non-standard decouplings. Interestingly, we find that all uniformly additive quantities $f_\alpha(U_N)$ derived from consistent decouplings that are non-standard (cf. definitions in Section B), can be obtained by using standard decouplings. This proves that standard decouplings are really typical.

Theorem H.1. *Let the linear entropy formula $f_\alpha(U_N, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A})$ be bounded and uniformly subadditive with respect to a non-standard, consistent decoupling. Then there is $f_\beta(U_N, \varphi_{V_1 \dots V_m A})$ defined on states with $m \leq n$ auxiliary variables, such that $f_\beta(U_N, \varphi_{V_1 \dots V_m A})$ is uniformly subadditive with respect to a standard decoupling and*

$$\max_{\phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A}} f_\alpha(U_N, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A}) = \max_{\varphi_{V_1 \dots V_m A}} f_\beta(U_N, \varphi_{V_1 \dots V_m A}).$$

Theorem H.1 guarantees that there is no need to find out the uniformly subadditive entropy formulas $f_\alpha(U_N, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A})$ under non-standard consistent decouplings. This is because our interest is in searching for uniformly additive quantities $f_\alpha(U_N) := \max_\phi f_\alpha(U_N, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A})$, other than in the entropy formulas themselves. For this purpose, Theorem H.1 shows that our consideration of standard decouplings suffices.

Before going to the proof, we specify some of the notations. Since the linear entropy formula $f_\alpha(U_N, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A})$ is defined with respect to the state $\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B E} = (I \otimes U_N) \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A} (I \otimes U_N^\dagger)$, we also denote $f_\alpha(U_N, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A})$ as

$$f_\alpha(\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B E}) := \sum_{t \in \mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_n)} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}(B E)} \alpha_{s, t} H(st)_\rho. \quad (\text{H1})$$

When non-standard decouplings are considered, we may encounter the situation that some of the auxiliary variables are empties. Let the state $\sigma_{V_1 \dots V_n B E}$ have empty auxiliary variables,

say, we suppose $V_n = \emptyset$. Then $f_\alpha(\sigma_{V_1 \dots V_n B E})$ is evaluated according to Eq. (H1) by letting $H(V_n)_\sigma = 0$ and $H(MV_n)_\sigma = H(M)_\sigma$ for any $M \in \mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_{n-1} B E)$. Such a state $\sigma_{V_1 \dots V_n B E}$ with $V_n = \emptyset$ is not artificial: we can identify it in a natural way with $\sigma_{V_1 \dots V_{n-1} B E} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_{V_n}$, that is, empty variables are actually each in a pure state and are hence isolated from the other ones.

Let $\mathcal{D} : \rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B_1 B_2 E_1 E_2} \rightarrow (\rho_{\tilde{V}_1 \dots \tilde{V}_n B_1 E_1}, \rho_{\hat{V}_1 \dots \hat{V}_n B_2 E_2})$ be the non-standard decoupling in the assumption of Theorem H.1. It is determined by a grouping and relabeling of the systems $V_1, \dots, V_n, B_2, E_2$ to form $\tilde{V}_1, \dots, \tilde{V}_n$, and another grouping and relabeling of the systems $V_1, \dots, V_n, B_1, E_1$ to form $\hat{V}_1, \dots, \hat{V}_n$. That is, $\tilde{V}_i \in \mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_n B_2 E_2)$ and $\hat{V}_i \in \mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_n B_1 E_1)$, and as a consistence condition we require $\tilde{V}_i \cap \tilde{V}_j = \hat{V}_i \cap \hat{V}_j = \emptyset$. We further write \tilde{V}_i and \hat{V}_i as the joint of the “V” part and the “BE” part: $\tilde{V}_i = V'_i N_2^i$ with $V'_i \in \mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_n)$ and $N_2^i \in \mathcal{P}(B_2 E_2)$, $\hat{V}_i = V''_i N_1^i$ with $V''_i \in \mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_n)$ and $N_1^i \in \mathcal{P}(B_1 E_1)$. In this section, the notations $\tilde{V}_i, \hat{V}_i, V'_i, V''_i, N_1^i, N_2^i$ with $i = 1, \dots, n$ are all reserved to denote the fixed sets of variables given by the decoupling \mathcal{D} , as described above.

Definition H.2. *Given the sets $T_1, \dots, T_n \in [n]$ such that $T_i \cap T_j = \emptyset$ for $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$, we define a relocation rule g of the variables W_1, \dots, W_n , via*

$$g(W_1, \dots, W_n) := (W_{T_1}, \dots, W_{T_n}),$$

where W_{T_i} is a collection of the systems W_j such that $j \in T_i$.

According to Definition H.2, we now define two relocation rules g_1 and g_2 , which are associated with the decoupling \mathcal{D} and satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(V_1, \dots, V_n) &= (V'_1, \dots, V'_n), \\ g_2(V_1, \dots, V_n) &= (V''_1, \dots, V''_n). \end{aligned}$$

That is, g_1 is given by the sets $T_i := \{j \mid 1 \leq j \leq n, V_j \in V'_i\}$ with $i = 1, \dots, n$, and g_2 is given by the sets $S_i := \{j \mid 1 \leq j \leq n, V_j \in V''_i\}$ with $i = 1, \dots, n$.

The following lemma will be very useful. Note that in Eqs. (H2) and (H3), V'_i and V''_i are actually collections of the variables V_1, \dots, V_n , formulated by the relocation rules g_1 and g_2 . So in later applications of Lemma H.3, we may also use g_1 and g_2 to specify the relations between the auxiliary variables.

Lemma H.3. *Under the same assumption of Theorem H.1 and using the notations described above, we have for any state $\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B E}$,*

$$f_\alpha(\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B E}) \leq f_\alpha(\rho_{V'_1 \dots V'_n B E}), \quad (\text{H2})$$

$$f_\alpha(\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B E}) \leq f_\alpha(\rho_{V''_1 \dots V''_n B E}). \quad (\text{H3})$$

Proof. At first, it has been shown in Lemma C.1 (Eq. (C1)) that $f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A})$ being bounded implies that

$$f_\alpha(\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n} \otimes |00\rangle\langle 00|_{BE}) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_n)} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}(BE)} \alpha_{s,t} H(t)_{\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n}} \leq 0 \quad (\text{H4})$$

for any state $\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n}$. Now since $f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A})$ is uniformly subadditive with respect to the decoupling \mathcal{D} , we have

$$\Delta(\alpha, \rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B_1 B_2 E_1 E_2}) = f_\alpha(\rho_{\tilde{V}_1 \dots \tilde{V}_n B_1 E_1}) + f_\alpha(\rho_{\hat{V}_1 \dots \hat{V}_n B_2 E_2}) - f_\alpha(\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B_1 B_2 E_1 E_2}) \geq 0 \quad (\text{H5})$$

for any state $\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B_1 B_2 E_1 E_2}$. Considering a state of the form $\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B_1 E_1} \otimes \rho_{B_2 E_2}$, we derive from Eq. (H5) that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\alpha, \rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B_1 E_1} \otimes \rho_{B_2 E_2}) &= \sum_{s,t} \alpha_{s,t} (H(s_1 \tilde{t}) + H(s_2 \hat{t}) - H(s_1 s_2 t)) \\ &= \sum_{s,t} \alpha_{s,t} (H(s_1 t') + H(\tilde{t}/t') + H(s_2) + H(\hat{t}) - H(s_2) - H(s_1 t)) \\ &= \sum_{s,t} \alpha_{s,t} (H(s_1 t') - H(s_1 t)) + \sum_{s,t} \alpha_{s,t} (H(\tilde{t}/t') + H(\hat{t})) \\ &\geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H6})$$

where the sums are over all subsets $s \in \mathcal{P}(BE)$ and $t \in \mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_n)$, and the notation \tilde{t}/t' indicates the collection of variables resulting from removing t' from \tilde{t} . Eq. (H4) gives

$$\sum_{s,t} \alpha_{s,t} H(\tilde{t}/t') \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{s,t} \alpha_{s,t} H(\hat{t}) \leq 0.$$

Combining this with Eq. (H6) we conclude that for any state $\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B_1 E_1}$,

$$\sum_{s,t} \alpha_{s,t} (H(s_1 t') - H(s_1 t)) \geq 0,$$

which proves Eq. (H2). Since Eq. (H3) can be proved in the same way we have finished the proof. \square

Now we are ready for the proof of Theorem H.1. We will not construct an explicit expression for $f_\beta(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \varphi_{V_1 \dots V_m A})$. Instead, we prove the existence.

Proof of Theorem H.1. We will use mathematical induction. Let us consider the following two cases.

Case 1: $V_i' \neq \emptyset$ and $V_i'' \neq \emptyset$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. In this case, V_1', \dots, V_n' and V_1'', \dots, V_n'' are respectively permutations of V_1, \dots, V_n : there are permutations $\pi, \tau \in S_n$ such that $V_i' = V_{\pi(i)}$ and $V_i'' = V_{\tau(i)}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Denote the order of π and τ as a and b , respectively. That is

$$\pi^a = \tau^b = I,$$

where I is the identity of the symmetric group S_n . Now define

$$\left(\tilde{V}_1^{(a-1)}, \dots, \tilde{V}_n^{(a-1)} \right) := g_1^{a-1} \left(\tilde{V}_1, \dots, \tilde{V}_n \right), \quad (\text{H7})$$

$$\left(\hat{V}_1^{(b-1)}, \dots, \hat{V}_n^{(b-1)} \right) := g_2^{b-1} \left(\hat{V}_1, \dots, \hat{V}_n \right). \quad (\text{H8})$$

Then

$$\tilde{V}_i^{(a-1)} = \tilde{V}_{\pi^{a-1}(i)} = V_{\pi^{a-1}(i)}' N_2^{\pi^{a-1}(i)} = V_{\pi^a(i)} N_2^{\pi^a(i)} = V_i N_2^{\pi^a(i)}, \quad (\text{H9})$$

$$\hat{V}_i^{(b-1)} = \hat{V}_{\tau^{b-1}(i)} = V_{\tau^{b-1}(i)}'' N_1^{\tau^{b-1}(i)} = V_{\tau^b(i)} N_1^{\tau^b(i)} = V_i N_1^{\tau^b(i)}. \quad (\text{H10})$$

To proceed, for any state $\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B_1 B_2 E_1 E_2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_\alpha(\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B_1 B_2 E_1 E_2}) &\leq f_\alpha(\rho_{\tilde{V}_1 \dots \tilde{V}_n B_1 E_1}) + f_\alpha(\rho_{\hat{V}_1 \dots \hat{V}_n B_2 E_2}) \\ &\leq f_\alpha(\rho_{\tilde{V}_1^{(a-1)} \dots \tilde{V}_n^{(a-1)} B_1 E_1}) + f_\alpha(\rho_{\hat{V}_1^{(b-1)} \dots \hat{V}_n^{(b-1)} B_2 E_2}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H11})$$

where the first inequality is by assumption, and for the second inequality we have applied Lemma H.3 iteratively and used the notations defined in Eqs. (H7) and (H8). Eq. (H11) shows that $f_\alpha(\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B E})$ itself is uniformly subadditive with respect to a *standard* decoupling given by Eqs. (H9) and (H10).

Case 2: at least one of V_i' for $i = 1, \dots, n$ or one of V_i'' for $i = 1, \dots, n$ is \emptyset . Without loss of generality, we suppose $V_i' = \emptyset$ for some values of i , and further suppose that all the empty variables are in the end. So there is $k < n$, such that $V_1' \dots V_n' = V_1' \dots V_k' \emptyset \dots \emptyset$ (i.e., $V_i' = \emptyset$ for $i = k+1, \dots, n$). Note that it is possible that $k = 0$. Now Eq. (H2) of Lemma H.3 translates to

$$f_\alpha(\rho_{V_1 \dots V_n B E}) \leq f_\alpha(\rho_{V_1' \dots V_k' B E} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_{V_{k+1}'} \otimes \dots \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_{V_n'}). \quad (\text{H12})$$

Define a linear entropy formula $f_\gamma(\rho_{V_1 \dots V_k B E})$ on states with k auxiliary variables, as

$$f_\gamma(\rho_{V_1 \dots V_k B E}) := f_\alpha(\rho_{V_1 \dots V_k B E} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_{V_{k+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_{V_n}). \quad (\text{H13})$$

We now claim:

(A) It holds that

$$\max_{\phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A}} f_\alpha(U_{\mathcal{N}}(\phi_{V_1 \dots V_n A})) = \max_{\varphi_{V_1 \dots V_k A}} f_\gamma(U_{\mathcal{N}}(\varphi_{V_1 \dots V_k A})).$$

In particular, this equality implies that $f_\gamma(U_{\mathcal{N}}, \varphi_{V_1 \dots V_k A})$ is also bounded.

(B) $f_\gamma(\rho_{V_1 \dots V_k B E})$ is uniformly subadditive with respect to a *consistent* decoupling.

Claim (A) is easy to see. The “ \leq ” part follows from Eq. (H12), and the “ \geq ” part is obvious by the definition Eq. (H13). To verify claim (B), for any state $\rho_{V_1 \dots V_k B_1 B_2 E_1 E_2}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_\gamma(\rho_{V_1 \dots V_k B_1 B_2 E_1 E_2}) &= f_\alpha(\rho_{V_1 \dots V_k B_1 B_2 E_1 E_2} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_{V_{k+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_{V_n}) \\ &\leq f_\alpha(\rho_{\tilde{V}_1 \dots \tilde{V}_n B_1 E_1}) + f_\alpha(\rho_{\hat{V}_1 \dots \hat{V}_n B_2 E_2}) \\ &\leq f_\alpha(\rho_{\tilde{V}'_1 \dots \tilde{V}'_k B_1 E_1} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_{\tilde{V}'_{k+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_{\tilde{V}'_n}) + f_\alpha(\rho_{\hat{V}'_1 \dots \hat{V}'_k B_2 E_2} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_{\hat{V}'_{k+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_{\hat{V}'_n}) \\ &= f_\gamma(\rho_{\tilde{V}'_1 \dots \tilde{V}'_k B_1 E_1}) + f_\gamma(\rho_{\hat{V}'_1 \dots \hat{V}'_k B_2 E_2}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H14})$$

where we have defined $(\tilde{V}'_1, \dots, \tilde{V}'_n) := g_1(\tilde{V}_1, \dots, \tilde{V}_n)$ and $(\hat{V}'_1, \dots, \hat{V}'_n) := g_1(\hat{V}_1, \dots, \hat{V}_n)$, and since the second line, we have set $V_{k+1} = \dots = V_n = \emptyset$. In Eq. (H14), the first line is by definition (H13), the second line is by assumption that f_α is uniformly subadditive with respect to the decoupling \mathcal{D} , the third line is by Lemma H.3 (in the form of Eq. (H12)), and the last line is again by definition (H13). We can check that $\tilde{V}'_i \in \mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_k B_2 E_2)$ and $\hat{V}'_i \in \mathcal{P}(V_1 \dots V_k B_1 E_1)$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, and also $\tilde{V}'_i \cap \tilde{V}'_j = \emptyset$ and $\hat{V}'_i \cap \hat{V}'_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. Thus

$$\rho_{V_1 \dots V_k B_1 B_2 E_1 E_2} \rightarrow (\rho_{\tilde{V}'_1 \dots \tilde{V}'_k B_1 E_1}, \rho_{\hat{V}'_1 \dots \hat{V}'_k B_2 E_2}) \quad (\text{H15})$$

is a consistent decoupling and Eq. (H14) indeed verifies that $f_\gamma(\rho_{V_1 \dots V_k B E})$ is uniformly subadditive with respect to this decoupling.

At last, we argue that the above considerations of Case 1 and Case 2 suffice to conclude the proof, by applying the method of mathematical induction, of which the basis here is the fact that with zero auxiliary variable, the unique consistent decoupling $\rho_{B_1 B_2 E_1 E_2} \rightarrow$

$(\rho_{B_1 E_1}, \rho_{B_2 E_2})$ is standard. Note that the proofs for the two claims in Case 2 work as well when $k = 0$ and in this case the decoupling (H15) reduces to the standard decoupling $\rho_{B_1 B_2 E_1 E_2} \rightarrow (\rho_{B_1 E_1}, \rho_{B_2 E_2})$. \square

Appendix I: Entropic Criterion for C-Q Structure of Quantum State

Lemma I.1. *For a quantum state $\rho_{R_1 R_2 R_3 A}$, suppose the conditional entropies satisfy $H(R_i | R_j) = 0$ and $H(R_i | R_j R_k) = 0$ for all $i, j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Then the reduced state $\rho_{R_i A}$ is classical-quantum, e.g., $\rho_{R_1 A}$ can be written as*

$$\rho_{R_1 A} = \sum_x p_x |x\rangle\langle x|^{R_1} \otimes \rho_x^A, \quad (\text{I1})$$

with $\{|x\rangle\}$ a set of orthogonal states.

Proof. Since $I(R_1; R_2 | R_3) = H(R_1 | R_3) - H(R_1 | R_2 R_3) = 0$, by the result of [19], we know that the reduced state $\rho_{R_1 R_2}$ is separable. Thus we can write

$$\rho_{R_1 R_2} = \sum_{x=1}^M p_x \sigma_x^{R_1} \otimes \omega_x^{R_2},$$

and without loss of generality we assume $\sigma_{x_1} \neq \sigma_{x_2}$ and $\omega_{x_1} \neq \omega_{x_2}$ for all $1 \leq x_1 \neq x_2 \leq M$.

Let

$$\rho_{X R_1 R_2} = \sum_{x=1}^M p_x |x\rangle\langle x|^X \otimes \sigma_x^{R_1} \otimes \omega_x^{R_2}$$

be an extension of $\rho_{R_1 R_2}$, with $\{|x\rangle\}$ a set of orthogonal states. Then we have

$$0 = H(R_1 | R_2) \geq H(R_1 | R_2 X) = \sum_x p_x H(\sigma_x) \geq 0. \quad (\text{I2})$$

On the one hand, Eq. (I2) implies that σ_x is pure for all values of x . On the other hand, from Eq. (I2) we have

$$H(R_1 | R_2) = H(R_1 | R_2 X),$$

which implies that we can recover $\rho_{X R_1 R_2}$ from $\rho_{R_1 R_2}$ by a CPTP map acting on system R_2 only [20, 21]. This further implies that the set of states $\{\omega_x\}_x$ are mutually orthogonal. In similar ways, we can show that ω_x is pure for all values of x , and the set of states $\{\sigma_x\}_x$ are mutually orthogonal. These consequences all together give us that $\rho_{R_1 R_2}$ has the follow form:

$$\rho_{R_1 R_2} = \sum_{x=1}^M p_x |x\rangle\langle x|^{\otimes 2},$$

with $\{|x\rangle\}$ a set of orthogonal states. This obviously implies Eq. (I1), and we are done. \square

Appendix J: Informationally Degradable Channels Have Additive Coherent Information

We say that a quantum channel $\mathcal{N} : A \rightarrow B$ is informationally degradable, if

$$I(V; B) \geq I(V; E)$$

for any state $\rho_{VBE} = (I \otimes U_{\mathcal{N}})\phi_{VA}(I \otimes U_{\mathcal{N}}^\dagger)$, where $U_{\mathcal{N}} : A \rightarrow BE$ is the unitary interaction associated with the channel. This class of channels is a generalization of degradable channels [22], and we will show that they enjoy the same property of additivity for coherent information.

Proposition J.1. *Let quantum channels $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_n$ be informationally degradable. Then they have additive coherent information:*

$$I_c(\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{N}_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n I_c(\mathcal{N}_i). \quad (\text{J1})$$

Epecially, $Q(\mathcal{N}) = I_c(\mathcal{N})$ for any informationally degradable channel \mathcal{N} .

Proof. It suffices to show subadditivity. At first, we notice that due to the informational degradability, for any i it holds that

$$H(B_i V) - H(E_i V) \leq H(B_i) - H(E_i),$$

where the entropies are evaluated on any state $\rho_{VB_i E_i} := U_{\mathcal{N}_i} \phi_{VA_i} U_{\mathcal{N}_i}^\dagger$. Using this, we can actually show uniform subadditivity,

$$\begin{aligned} I_c(\phi_{A_1 \dots A_n}, \mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{N}_n) &= H(B_1 \dots B_n) - H(E_1 \dots E_n) \\ &= H(B_1 \dots B_n) - H(E_1 B_2 \dots B_n) \\ &\quad + H(E_1 B_2 \dots B_n) - H(E_1 E_2 B_3 \dots B_n) \\ &\quad + \dots \\ &\quad + H(E_1 \dots E_{n-1} B_n) - H(E_1 \dots E_n) \\ &\leq (H(B_1) - H(E_1)) + (H(B_2) - H(E_2)) + \dots + (H(B_n) - H(E_n)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n I_c(\phi_{A_i}, \mathcal{N}_i). \end{aligned}$$

\square

This implies Eq. (J1). The single-letter formula for quantum capacity follows as a consequence directly.

Remark: We do not know whether product of informationally degradable channels is still informationally degradable. This is why we prove additivity for multiple uses of channels, instead of proving this for any two channels. A interesting problem we leave for future study is to find informationally degradable channels that are not degradable in the sense of Ref. [22].

Appendix K: Completely coherent information and quantum sum rate

Given an isometry $U_{\mathcal{N}} : A \rightarrow BE$, we say that the rate pair (R_1, R_2) is an achievable joint quantum communication rate if for all $\epsilon > 0$ there is an n_0 such that for all $n \geq n_0$ there are isometries $U_{\mathcal{E}_n} : A_1 A_2 \rightarrow A^n F$ and decoders $U_{\mathcal{D}_1} : B^n \rightarrow A'_1 D_1$ and $U_{\mathcal{D}_2} : E^n \rightarrow A'_2 D_2$ with $\log |A_1| \geq nR_1$ and $\log |A_2| \geq nR_2$, and $A_1 \cong A'_1$ and $A_2 \cong A'_2$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{V_1 A_1 V_2 A_2 D_1 D_2 F} &:= (U_{\mathcal{D}_1} \otimes U_{\mathcal{D}_2}) U_{\mathcal{N}}^{\otimes n} U_{\mathcal{E}} (|\Phi_{V_1 A_1}\rangle\langle\Phi_{V_1 A_1}| \otimes |\Phi_{V_2 A_2}\rangle\langle\Phi_{V_2 A_2}|) U_{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger (U_{\mathcal{N}}^{\otimes n})^\dagger (U_{\mathcal{D}_1}^\dagger \otimes U_{\mathcal{D}_2}^\dagger) \\ &\approx_\epsilon |\Phi_{V_1 A'_1}\rangle\langle\Phi_{V_1 A'_1}| \otimes |\Phi_{V_2 A'_2}\rangle\langle\Phi_{V_2 A'_2}| \otimes |\sigma_{D_1 D_2 F}\rangle\langle\sigma_{D_1 D_2 F}| =: \sigma_{V_1 A'_1 V_2 A'_2 D_1 D_2 F} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{K1})$$

where

$$|\Phi_{V_1 A_1}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|A_1|}} \sum_{i=1}^{|A_1|} |i\rangle_{V_1} |i\rangle_{A_1} \quad (\text{K2})$$

$$|\Phi_{V_2 A_2}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|A_2|}} \sum_{i=1}^{|A_2|} |i\rangle_{V_2} |i\rangle_{A_2}, \quad (\text{K3})$$

$\rho \approx_\epsilon \sigma$ means $\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \epsilon$ and $|\sigma_{D_1 D_2 F}\rangle$ is some pure state on $D_1 D_2 F$.

We define the *joint quantum capacity* of an isometry $U_{\mathcal{N}} : A \rightarrow BE$ to be

$$Q_J(U_{\mathcal{N}}) = \max \{R_1 + R_2 | (R_1, R_2) \text{ is achievable}\}. \quad (\text{K4})$$

Now, if (R_1, R_2) is an achievable rate pair, for any ϵ we have encoders and decoders satisfying Eq. (K1). Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
n(R_1 + R_2) + H(D_1)_\sigma - H(D_1F)_\sigma &\leq \log |A'_1| + \log |A'_2| + H(D_1)_\sigma - H(D_1F)_\sigma \\
&= H(A'_1)_\sigma + H(V_2)_\sigma + H(D_1)_\sigma - H(D_1F)_\sigma \\
&= H(A'_1V_2D_1)_\sigma - H(D_2)_\sigma \\
&= H(A'_1V_2D_1)_\sigma - H(A'_2V_2D_2)_\sigma \\
&\approx H(A_1V_2D_1)_\rho - H(A_2V_2D_2)_\rho \\
&= H(B^nV_2)_\mu - H(E^nV_2)_\mu
\end{aligned} \tag{K5}$$

where

$$\mu_{B^nE^nV_1V_2F} = U_{\mathcal{N}}^{\otimes n} U_{\mathcal{E}}(|\Phi_{V_1A_1}\rangle\langle\Phi_{V_1A_1}| \otimes |\Phi_{V_2A_2}\rangle\langle\Phi_{V_2A_2}|) U_{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger (U_{\mathcal{N}}^{\otimes n})^\dagger. \tag{K6}$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned}
n(R_1 + R_2) + H(D_1F)_\sigma - H(D_1)_\sigma &\leq \log |A'_1| + \log |A'_2| + H(D_1F)_\sigma - H(D_1)_\sigma \\
&= H(A'_1)_\sigma + H(V_2)_\sigma + H(D_1F)_\sigma - H(D_1)_\sigma \\
&= H(A'_1D_1V_2F)_\sigma - H(D_2F)_\sigma \\
&= H(A'_1D_1V_2F)_\sigma - H(A'_2V_2D_2F)_\sigma \\
&\approx H(B^nV_2F)_\mu - H(E^nV_2F)_\mu.
\end{aligned} \tag{K7}$$

Now, let

$$\tilde{\mu}_{B^nE^nV_2FT} = \frac{1}{2} \mu_{B^nE^nV_2F} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_T + \frac{1}{2} \mu_{B^nE^nV_2} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_F \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_T. \tag{K8}$$

This is a state that can be made with n copies of $U_{\mathcal{N}}$. Taking the average of Eq. (K5) and Eq. (K7), and letting $W = V_2FT$ we find

$$n(R_1 + R_2) \lesssim \frac{1}{2} (H(B^nV_2)_\mu - H(E^nV_2)_\mu + H(B^nV_2F)_\mu - H(E^nV_2F)_\mu) \tag{K9}$$

$$= H(B^nW)_{\tilde{\mu}} - H(E^nW)_{\tilde{\mu}} \tag{K10}$$

$$\leq I^{cc}(U_{\mathcal{N}}^{\otimes n}) = nI^{cc}(U_{\mathcal{N}}). \tag{K11}$$

This implies $Q_J(U_{\mathcal{N}}) \leq I^{cc}(U_{\mathcal{N}})$.

- [2] D. DiVincenzo, P. W. Shor, and J. A. Smolin, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 830 (1998), arXiv:quant-ph/9706061.
- [3] G. Smith and J. A. Smolin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 030501 (2007).
- [4] G. Smith and J. Yard, Science **321**, 1812 (2008), arXiv:0807.4935.
- [5] M. Hastings, Nat. Phys. **5**, 255 (2009), arXiv:0809.3972.
- [6] K. Li, A. Winter, X. Zou, and G. Guo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 120501 (2009), arXiv:0903.4308.
- [7] G. Smith and J. A. Smolin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 120503 (2009), arXiv:0904.4050.
- [8] T. S. Cubitt, J. Chen, and A. W. Harrow, Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on **57**, 8114 (2011).
- [9] T. Cubitt, D. Elkouss, W. Matthews, M. Ozols, D. Pérez-García, and S. Strelchuk, Nature communications **6** (2015).
- [10] C. E. Shannon, Bell Syst. Tech. J. **27**, 379 (1948).
- [11] C. H. Bennett, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **48**, 2637 (2002).
- [12] G. Smith, J. Smolin, and A. Winter, IEEE Trans. Info. Theory **54**, 4208 (2008), arXiv:quant-ph/0607039.
- [13] E. H. Lieb and M.-B. Ruskai, J. Math. Phys. **14**, 1938 (1973).
- [14] R. W. Yeung, Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on **43**, 1924 (1997).
- [15] N. Pippenger, Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on **49**, 773 (2003).
- [16] I. Devetak, M. Junge, C. King, and M. B. Ruskai, Communications in mathematical physics **266**, 37 (2006).
- [17] R. García-Patrón, S. Pirandola, S. Lloyd, and J. H. Shapiro, Physical review letters **102**, 210501 (2009).
- [18] J. Oppenheim and A. Winter, arXiv preprint quant-ph/0511082 (2005).
- [19] P. Hayden, R. Jozsa, D. Petz, and A. Winter, Communications in mathematical physics **246**, 359 (2004).
- [20] D. Petz, Communications in mathematical physics **105**, 123 (1986).
- [21] D. Petz, The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics **39**, 97 (1988).
- [22] I. Devetak and P. W. Shor, Comm. Math. Phys. **256**, 287 (2005), arXiv:quant-ph/0311131.