Quantifying the unextendibility of entanglement
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The unextendibility or monogamy of entangled states is a key property of quantum entanglement. Unlike conventional ways of expressing entanglement monogamy via entanglement measure inequalities, we develop a state-dependent resource theory to quantify the unextendibility of bipartite entangled states. First, we introduce a family of entanglement measures called unextendible entanglement. Given a bipartite state \( \rho_{AB} \), the key idea behind these measures is to minimize a divergence between \( \rho_{AB} \) and any possibly reduced state \( \rho_{AB}' \) of an extension \( \rho_{ABB}' \) of \( \rho_{AB} \). These measures are intuitively motivated by the fact that the more a bipartite state is entangled, the less that each of its individual systems can be entangled with a third party. Second, we show that the unextendible entanglement is an entanglement monotone under two-extendible operations, which include local operations and one-way classical communication as a special case. Unextendible entanglement has several other desirable properties, including normalization and faithfulness. As applications, we show that the unextendible entanglement provides efficiently computable benchmarks for the rate of perfect secret key distillation or entanglement distillation, as well as for the overhead of probabilistic secret key or entanglement distillation.
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Quantum entanglement is one of the most counter-intuitive phenomena of quantum theory and a key ingredient in quantum technologies [HHHH09, Hay17, Wil17]. To explore and understand the power of entanglement fully, a comprehensive characterization and quantification of entanglement is needed.

One of the remarkable features of entanglement is its unshareability or unextendibility [Wer89, DPS02, DPS04], which is the fact that the entanglement in some entangled states cannot be shared among multiple subsystems. Unextendibility underscores a fundamental difference between classical correlations and quantum correlations, given that classical correlations can be shared among many parties. This unique property is related to the “monogamy of quantum entanglement” [Ter04], which has been characterized in various ways [CKW00, Ter04, KW04, Yan06, OV06, AI07, LDH+16, GG18]. Unextendibility arises in the contexts of Bell inequalities [TDS03], quantum key distribution [MCL06, MRDL09, KL17], and quantum communication [NH09, KDWW19, BBFS18].
In the aforementioned work [KDWW19], a systematic and consistent resource theory of unextendibility was developed, with the goal of quantifying and characterizing unextendibility. Several quantifiers of unextendibility were defined in [KDWW19], which generalized various measures proposed in earlier work [NH09, Bra08, MCL06, HMW13].

Motivated by the central role of unextendibility in understanding quantum entanglement, this paper introduces and develops a state-dependent resource theory of unextendible entanglement. We begin by introducing a family of entanglement measures called unextendible entanglement, where the key principle is to minimize the generalized divergence between a given state $\rho_{AB}$ and any possibly reduced state $\rho_{AB'}$ of an extension $\rho_{ABB'}$ of $\rho_{AB}$ (Section II). This approach is motivated by the intuition that the more a bipartite state is entangled, the less can its individual systems be entangled with a third party. Second, we show that this family of measures is monotone under two-extendible operations, which include local operations and one-way classical communication (1-LOCC) as a special case (Section II B). We furthermore prove several other desirable properties of the family of entanglement measures, including normalization and faithfulness. We also consider several key examples of unextendible entanglement based on Rényi relative entropies (Section II C), some of which are efficiently computable (Section III). Third, we show that the unextendible entanglement can be applied to establish efficiently computable fundamental limits to the rate of perfect secret key and entanglement distillation, as well as to the overhead of probabilistic secret key and entanglement distillation (Section IV). These last results indicate that the unextendible entanglement offers a practically meaningful look out onto the virtues of entanglement as a resource.

II. QUANTIFYING THE UNEXTENDIBILITY OF ENTANGLEMENT

Before we present our main results, let us first establish notation and review some preliminary concepts. Throughout, quantum systems are denoted by $A$, $B$, and $C$ and have finite dimensions. Systems described by the same letter are assumed to be isomorphic: $A_1 \cong A_2$ and $A \cong A'$. Linear operators acting on system $A$ are denoted by $L_A \in \mathcal{L}(A)$, Hermitian operators acting on system $A$ are denoted by $H_A \in \mathcal{H}(A)$, and positive semi-definite operators by $P_A \in \mathcal{P}(A)$. Quantum states of system $A$ are denoted by $\rho_A \in \mathcal{S}(A)$ and pure quantum states by $\Psi_A \in \mathcal{V}(A)$. A maximally entangled state $\Phi_{AB}$ of Schmidt rank $d$ is given by $\Phi_{AB} := \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i,j} |i_A\rangle\langle j_A| \otimes |i_B\rangle\langle j_B|$, where $\{|i_A\rangle\}_{i}$ and $\{|i_B\rangle\}_{i}$ are orthonormal bases for systems $A$ and $B$, respectively. Quantum channels are completely positive and trace preserving maps from $\mathcal{L}(A)$ to $\mathcal{L}(B)$ and denoted by $\mathcal{N}_{A\rightarrow B} \in \mathcal{Q}(A \rightarrow B)$.

In Section II B, we introduce the state-dependent resource theory of unextendible entanglement, as well as the generalized unextendible entanglement. In Section II C, we consider special cases of the generalized unextendible entanglement, which include those based on the quantum relative entropy [Ume62], the Petz–Rényi relative entropy [Pet86], the sandwiched Rényi relative entropy [MLDS+13, WWY14], and the geometric Rényi relative entropy [Mat15] (see also [FF19]). We also establish several desirable properties for these measures, including the fact that they are monotone under two-extendible operations.

A. State-dependent resource theory of unextendible entanglement

Unlike the usual framework of quantum resource theories [CG19] and that established for unextendibility in [KDWW19], the free states in our resource theory are state-dependent. Note that state-dependent resource theories were previously considered in a different context [RNBG19]. To be specific, given a bipartite state $\rho_{AB}$, the free states are those bipartite states that are possibly shareable between Alice and a third party $B'$, where system $B'$ is isomorphic to $B$. Mathematically,
the set of free states corresponding to a state $\rho_{AB}$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\rho_{AB}} := \{\sigma_{AB} | \rho_{AB} = \text{Tr}_B[\rho_{ABB'}], \sigma_{AB'} = \text{Tr}_B[\rho_{ABB'}], \rho_{ABB'} \in \mathcal{S}(ABB')\}. \quad (1)$$

The free operations in this resource theory consist of two-extendible operations [KDWW19], which contain 1-LOCC operations as a special case.

First, let us define a selective 1-LOCC operation. Such an operation consists of a set of CP maps of the following form:

$$\left\{ \mathcal{E}_{AB \rightarrow A'B'}^y = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} F_{A \rightarrow A'}^{x,y} \otimes G_{B' \rightarrow B'}^{x,y} \right\}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}, \quad (2)$$

where each map $F_{A \rightarrow A'}^{x,y}$ is completely positive, the sum map $\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}} F_{A \rightarrow A'}^{x,y}$ is trace-preserving, and each map $G_{B' \rightarrow B'}^{x,y}$ is completely positive and trace-preserving. A 1-LOCC channel is a special case for which $|\mathcal{Y}| = 1$.

Generalizing this, we define a selective two-extendible operation to consist of a set of CP maps of the following form:

$$\left\{ \mathcal{E}_{AB \rightarrow A'B'}^y \right\}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}, \quad (3)$$

such that $\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{E}_{AB \rightarrow A'B'}^y$ is trace-preserving, each map $\mathcal{E}_{AB \rightarrow A'B'}^y$ is completely positive and two-extendible [KDWW19], in the sense that there exists an extension map $\mathcal{E}_{AB_1B_2 \rightarrow A'B_1'B_2'}^{y}$ satisfying

1. Permutation covariance:

$$\mathcal{E}_{AB_1B_2 \rightarrow A'B_1'B_2'}^{y} \circ \mathcal{W}_{B_1B_2}^{\pi} = \mathcal{W}_{B_1'B_2'}^{\pi} \circ \mathcal{E}_{AB_1B_2 \rightarrow A'B_1'B_2'}^{y}, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{W}_{B_1B_2}^{\pi}$ is a unitary permutation channel (either identity or swap channel).

2. Non-signaling constraint:

$$\text{Tr}_{B_2} \circ \mathcal{E}_{AB_1B_2 \rightarrow A'B_1'B_2'}^{y} = \text{Tr}_{B_2} \circ \mathcal{E}_{AB_1B_2 \rightarrow A'B_1'B_2'}^{y} \circ \mathcal{R}_{\pi_{B_2}} = \mathcal{E}_{AB \rightarrow A'B'}^{y}, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{\pi_{B_2}}$ is a replacer channel that traces out the input on $B_2$ and replaces it with the maximally mixed state $\rho_{B_2}$.

The conditions above ensure that the two marginal operations

$$\mathcal{E}_{AB_1 \rightarrow A'B_1'}^{y} := \text{Tr}_{B_2} \circ \mathcal{E}_{AB_1B_2 \rightarrow A'B_1'B_2'}^{y}, \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{AB_2 \rightarrow A'B_2'}^{y} := \text{Tr}_{B_1} \circ \mathcal{E}_{AB_1B_2 \rightarrow A'B_1'B_2'}^{y}, \quad (7)$$

are operations that are in fact equal to the original operation:

$$\mathcal{E}_{AB \rightarrow A'B'}^{y} = \mathcal{E}_{AB_1 \rightarrow A'B_1'}^{y} = \mathcal{E}_{AB_2 \rightarrow A'B_2'}^{y}. \quad (8)$$

A two-extendible channel [KDWW19] is a special case of a selective two-extendible operation for which $|\mathcal{Y}| = 1$.

Selective 1-LOCC operations are a special case of selective two-extendible operations, observed by picking the extension map of $\mathcal{E}_{AB \rightarrow A'B'}^{y}$ in (2) as follows:

$$\mathcal{E}_{AB_1B_2 \rightarrow A'B_1'B_2'}^{y} := \sum_{x} F_{A \rightarrow A'}^{x,y} \otimes G_{B_1 \rightarrow B_1'}^{x,y} \otimes G_{B_2 \rightarrow B_2'}^{x,y}. \quad (9)$$

Such a choice satisfies the extension, permutation covariance, and non-signaling properties required of selective two-extendible operations. This inclusion was observed in [KDWW19] for two-extendible channels and 1-LOCC channels.
B. Generalized unextendible entanglement

A functional $D : S(A) \times S(A) \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is a generalized divergence [PV10, SW12] if for arbitrary Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$, arbitrary states $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in S(A)$, and an arbitrary channel $\mathcal{N}_{A \to B} \in \mathcal{Q}(A \to B)$, the following data processing inequality holds

$$D(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) \geq D(\mathcal{N}_{A \to B}(\rho_A) \| \mathcal{N}_{A \to B}(\sigma_A)).$$

(10)

A generalized divergence $D$ is said to be faithful if the inequality $D(\rho_A \| \rho_A) \leq 0$ holds for an arbitrary state $\rho_A$, and strongly faithful if $D(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) = 0$ if and only if $\rho_A = \sigma_A$. Examples of interest are the quantum relative entropy $\rho \rightarrow \sigma_A$.

Remark 1 (Channel representation) In [Ume62], the Petz-Rényi relative entropies [Pet86], and the sandwiched Rényi relative entropies [MLDS+13, WWY14], and the geometric Rényi relative entropies [Mat15, FF19].

Definition 1 (Generalized unextendible entanglement) The generalized unextendible entanglement of a bipartite state $\rho_{AB}$ is defined as

$$E^u(\rho_{AB}) := \frac{1}{2} \inf_{\rho_{ABB'}} \{D(\rho_{AB} \| \rho_{AB'}) : \text{Tr}_{B'}[\rho_{ABB'}] = \rho_{AB}, \rho_{ABB'} \in S(ABB')\},$$

(11)

so that the infimum is with respect to all possible extensions $\rho_{ABB'}$ of $\rho_{AB}$.

Definition 1 is motivated by the intuition that the more a bipartite state is entangled, the less can its individual systems be entangled with a third party.

Remark 1 (Channel representation) In [CW04], it was established that a state $\rho_{ABB'}$ is an extension of $\rho_{AB}$ if and only if there exists a quantum channel $\mathcal{R}_{C \to B'}$ such that $\rho_{ABB'} = \mathcal{R}_{C \to B'}(\Psi_{ABC})$, where $\Psi_{ABC}$ is a purification of $\rho_{AB}$. Using this correspondence, the generalized unextendible entanglement can be defined in a dynamical way as

$$E^u(\rho_{AB}) := \frac{1}{2} \inf_{\mathcal{R}_{C \to B'}} \{D(\rho_{AB} \| \rho_{AB'}) : \rho_{ABB'} = (\mathbf{1}_{AB} \otimes \mathcal{R}_{C \to B'})(|\Psi\rangle \langle \Psi|_{ABC})\},$$

(12)

where the infimum ranges over all quantum channels $\mathcal{N}_{C \to B'}$.

Theorem 1 (Two-extendible monotonicity) The generalized unextendible entanglement does not increase under the action of a two-extendible channel. That is, the following inequality holds

$$E^u(\rho_{AB}) \geq E^u(\mathcal{E}_{AB \to A'B'}(\rho_{AB})).$$

(13)

for $\rho_{AB}$ a bipartite state and $\mathcal{E}_{AB \to A'B'}$ a two-extendible channel.

Proof. Let $\rho_{AB_1B_2}$ be an arbitrary extension of $\rho_{AB} = \rho_{AB_1}$. Since the channel $\mathcal{E}_{AB \to A'B'}$ is two-extendible, there exists an extending channel $\mathcal{E}_{AB_1B_2 \to A'B_1'B_2'}$ that satisfies the conditions stated in (4)–(5). In particular, the marginal channels $\mathcal{E}_{AB_1 \to A'B_1'}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{AB_2 \to A'B_2'}$ are each equal to the original channel $\mathcal{E}_{AB \to A'B'}$. Furthermore, the state $\mathcal{E}_{AB_1B_2 \to A'B_1'B_2'}(\rho_{AB_1B_2})$ is an extension of $\mathcal{E}_{AB_1 \to A'B_1'}(\rho_{AB_1})$ and $\mathcal{E}_{AB_2 \to A'B_2'}(\rho_{AB_2})$. Then we conclude that

$$D(\rho_{AB_1} \| \rho_{AB_2}) \geq D(\mathcal{E}_{AB \to A'B'}(\rho_{AB_1}) \| \mathcal{E}_{AB \to A'B'}(\rho_{AB_2}))$$

(14)

$$= D(\mathcal{E}_{AB_1 \to A'B_1'}(\rho_{AB_1}) \| \mathcal{E}_{AB_2 \to A'B_2'}(\rho_{AB_2}))$$

(15)

$$\geq 2E^u(\mathcal{E}_{AB \to A'B'}(\rho_{AB})).$$

(16)
The sandwiched Rényi relative entropy is defined for the generalized unextendible entanglement. The equality follows from the observations stated above. The final inequality follows from the definition of the generalized unextendible entanglement, by applying the fact that $\mathcal{E}_{AB_1B_2\rightarrow AB_1'B_2'}(\rho_{AB_1B_2})$ is an extension of $\mathcal{E}_{AB_1\rightarrow AB_1'}(\rho_{AB_1})$ and $\mathcal{E}_{AB_2\rightarrow AB_2'}(\rho_{AB_2})$. Since the inequality above holds for an arbitrary extension $\rho_{AB_1B_2}$ of $\rho_{AB}$, we can take an infimum over all such extensions and conclude (13). □

**Remark 2** Due to the fact that two-extendible channels contain 1-LOCC channels, it follows that the generalized unextendible entanglement does not increase under the action of a 1-LOCC channel.

**Proposition 2 (Faithfulness)** If the underlying generalized divergence is strongly faithful, then the generalized unextendible entanglement $E^u$ is non-negative and $E^u(\rho_{AB}) = 0$ if $\rho_{AB}$ is two-extendible. If the underlying generalized divergence is also continuous, then the state $\rho_{AB}$ is two-extendible if $E^u(\rho_{AB}) = 0$.

**Proof.** Non-negativity of $E^u$ follows from the assumption of strong faithfulness. Now suppose that $\rho_{AB}$ is two-extendible. Then there exists an extension $\rho_{AB_1B_2}$ such that $\rho_{AB} = \rho_{AB_1} = \rho_{AB_2}$. Then it follows that $E^u(\rho_{AB}) = 0$ by definition and from the assumption that the underlying divergence is strongly faithful.

Now suppose that $E^u(\rho_{AB}) = 0$. By the assumption of continuity, this means that there exists an extension $\rho_{AB_1B_2}$ of $\rho_{AB}$ such that $\rho_{AB} = \rho_{AB_1} = \rho_{AB_2}$. Then, by definition, $\rho_{AB}$ is two-extendible. □

### C. $\alpha$-unextendible entanglement

The $\alpha$-unextendible entanglement of a bipartite state $\rho_{AB}$ is defined by taking the generalized divergence in (11) to be the Petz–Rényi relative entropy [Pet86], the sandwiched Rényi relative entropy $\tilde{D}_\alpha(\omega\|\tau)$ [MLDS+13, WWY14], or the geometric Rényi relative entropy [Mat15]. The Petz–Rényi relative entropy is defined for $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ as follows:

$$D_\alpha(\omega\|\tau) := \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 Q_\alpha(\omega\|\tau),$$

$$Q_\alpha(\omega\|\tau) := \text{Tr}[\omega^\alpha\tau^{1-\alpha}].$$

The sandwiched Rényi relative entropy is defined for $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ as follows:

$$\tilde{D}_\alpha(\omega\|\tau) := \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 \tilde{Q}_\alpha(\omega\|\tau),$$

$$\tilde{Q}_\alpha(\omega\|\tau) := \left\|\omega^{1/2}\tau (1-\alpha)/2\alpha\right\|_{2\alpha}^{2\alpha}.$$

The geometric Rényi relative entropy is defined for $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ as follows:

$$\widehat{D}_\alpha(\omega\|\tau) := \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 \widehat{Q}_\alpha(\omega\|\tau),$$

$$\widehat{Q}_\alpha(\omega\|\tau) := \text{Tr} \left[ \tau \left( \tau^{-1/2} \omega \tau^{-1/2} \right)^\alpha \right].$$

For all of the above quantities, if $\alpha > 1$ and $\text{supp}(\omega) \not\subseteq \text{supp}(\tau)$, then $D_\alpha(\omega\|\tau) = \tilde{D}_\alpha(\omega\|\tau) = \widehat{D}_\alpha(\omega\|\tau) = +\infty$. (23)
The Petz–Rényi relative entropy obeys the data processing inequality for \( \alpha \in [0, 2] \) [Pet86], the sandwiched Rényi relative entropy obeys the data processing inequality for \( \alpha \in [1/2, \infty] \) [FL13, Bei13] (see also [Wil18]), and the geometric Rényi relative entropy obeys the data processing inequality for \( \alpha \in (0, 2] \) [Mat15, HM17]. In the case that \( \alpha = 1 \), we take the limit \( \alpha \to 1 \) to find that [Pet86, MLDS+13, WWY14]

\[
D(\omega||\tau) := \lim_{\alpha \to 1} \bar{D}_\alpha(\omega||\tau) = \lim_{\alpha \to 1} D_\alpha(\omega||\tau) = \text{Tr}[\omega \log_2 \omega - \log_2 \tau],
\]

where \( D(\omega||\tau) \) is the quantum relative entropy [Ume62]. The geometric Rényi relative entropy converges to the Belavkin–Staszewski relative entropy [BSS2] in the limit as \( \alpha \to 1 \):

\[
\lim_{\alpha \to 1} \bar{D}_\alpha(\omega||\tau) = \bar{D}(\omega||\tau) := \text{Tr}[\rho \log_2 (\rho^{1/2} \sigma^{-1} \rho^{-1/2})],
\]

which is known to obey the data processing inequality [HM17]. In the case that \( \alpha = \infty \), we take the limit \( \alpha \to \infty \) to find that [MLDS+13]

\[
D_{\max}(\omega||\tau) := \lim_{\alpha \to \infty} \bar{D}_\alpha(\omega||\tau) = \inf \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \omega \leq 2^\lambda \tau \right\},
\]

where \( D_{\max}(\omega||\tau) \) is the max-relative entropy [Dat09].

**Lemma 3 (Faithfulness)** Let \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty) \), and let \( \omega \) and \( \tau \) be quantum states. Then \( D_\alpha(\omega||\tau) \geq 0 \) and \( D_\alpha(\omega||\tau) = 0 \) if and only if \( \omega = \tau \). The same is true for the sandwiched and geometric Rényi relative entropies.

**Proof.** By utilizing the data processing inequality and the faithfulness of the classical Rényi relative entropy, it follows that the statements above are true for all of the quantum Rényi relative entropies for the range of \( \alpha \) for which data processing holds (see, e.g., [WWY14] for this kind of argument). To get outside of the range for \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \), we use the following inequality holding for \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \) [IRS17]:

\[
\alpha D_\alpha(\omega||\tau) \leq \bar{D}_\alpha(\omega||\tau).
\]

To get outside of the range for \( \alpha \in (1, \infty) \), we use the following inequality holding for \( \alpha \in (1, \infty) \):

\[
\bar{D}_\alpha(\omega||\tau) \leq D_\alpha(\omega||\tau).
\]

This inequality was proved in [WWY14, DL14] (following from Araki–Lieb–Thirring [Ara90, LT76]). For the same range, we also make use of the following inequality:

\[
\bar{D}_\alpha(\omega||\tau) \leq \bar{D}_\alpha(\omega||\tau).
\]

which also follows from Araki–Lieb–Thirring for \( \alpha \in (1, \infty) \) because

\[
\bar{Q}_\alpha(\omega||\tau) = \text{Tr}[\omega \log_2 (\omega^{(1-\alpha)/2\alpha} \tau^{(1-\alpha)/2\alpha})^\alpha] = \text{Tr}[\omega \log_2 (\omega^{1/2\alpha} \tau^{-1/2} \omega^{-1/2} \tau^{-1/2})^\alpha] \leq \text{Tr}[\omega \log_2 (\omega^{-1/2} \tau^{-1/2} \omega^{-1/2} \tau^{-1/2} \omega^{-1/2} \tau^{-1/2})^\alpha] = \text{Tr}[\omega \log_2 (\omega^{-1/2} \tau^{-1/2} \omega^{-1/2} \tau^{-1/2} \omega^{-1/2} \tau^{-1/2})^\alpha] = \bar{Q}_\alpha(\omega||\tau).
\]

This concludes the proof. \( \blacksquare \)
Definition 2 (\(\alpha\)-unextendible entanglement) The \(\alpha\)-Petz unextendible entanglement is defined for \(\alpha \in [0, \infty)\) as

\[
E^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{AB}) := \frac{1}{2} \inf_{\rho_{ABB'}} \{ D_\alpha(\rho_{AB} || \rho_{AB'}) : \Tr_{B'}[\rho_{ABB'}] = \rho_{AB}, \rho_{ABB'} \in \mathcal{S}(ABB') \},
\]

(35)

the \(\alpha\)-sandwiched unextendible entanglement is defined for \(\alpha \in (0, \infty)\) as

\[
\tilde{E}^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{AB}) := \frac{1}{2} \inf_{\rho_{ABB'}} \{ \tilde{D}_\alpha(\rho_{AB} || \rho_{AB'}) : \Tr_{B'}[\rho_{ABB'}] = \rho_{AB}, \rho_{ABB'} \in \mathcal{S}(ABB') \},
\]

(36)

and the \(\alpha\)-geometric unextendible entanglement is defined for \(\alpha \in (0, \infty)\) as

\[
\tilde{E}^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{AB}) := \frac{1}{2} \inf_{\rho_{ABB'}} \{ \tilde{D}_\alpha(\rho_{AB} || \rho_{AB'}) : \Tr_{B'}[\rho_{ABB'}] = \rho_{AB}, \rho_{ABB'} \in \mathcal{S}(ABB') \}.
\]

(37)

As the following propositions state, the \(\alpha\)-unextendible entanglement possesses several properties that are required for an entanglement measure [HHHH09], although we should clarify that we have only proven the monotonicity for two-extendible operations, which include \(1\)-LOCC operations. We do not expect for the unextendible entanglement to be monotone under all \(1\)-LOCC operations.

First, it is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1 and data processing that \(\alpha\)-unextendible entanglement is monotone under the action of a two-extendible channel for certain values of \(\alpha\):

Corollary 4 (Two-extendible monotonicity) For \(\alpha \in [0, 2]\), the \(\alpha\)-Petz unextendible entanglement does not increase under the action of a two-extendible channel. For \(\alpha \in [1/2, \infty]\), the \(\alpha\)-sandwiched unextendible entanglement does not increase under the action of a two-extendible channel. For \(\alpha \in (0, 2]\), the \(\alpha\)-geometric unextendible entanglement does not increase under the action of a two-extendible channel.

For certain values of \(\alpha \geq 1\), the above monotonicity statement can be strengthened, in the sense that the \(\alpha\)-unextendible entanglement is monotone under selective two-extendible operations. This property is stronger than what we previously proved in Theorem 1. As before, this implies that \(\alpha\)-unextendible entanglement is monotone under selective \(1\)-LOCC operations, since these are a special case of selective two-extendible operations.

Theorem 5 (Selective two-extendible monotonicity) Let \(\rho_{AB}\) be a bipartite state, and let \(\{ \mathcal{E}^y_{AB \rightarrow A'B'} \}_y \) be a selective two-extendible operation. Then the following inequality holds for the \(\alpha\)-Petz unextendible entanglement for all \(\alpha \in [1, 2]\):

\[
E^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{AB}) \geq \sum_{y: p(y) > 0} p(y) E^u_{\alpha}(\omega^y_{A'B'}),
\]

(38)

where

\[
p(y) := \Tr[\mathcal{E}^y_{AB \rightarrow A'B'}(\rho_{AB})],
\]

(39)

\[
\omega^y_{A'B'} := \frac{1}{p(y)} \mathcal{E}^y_{AB \rightarrow A'B'}(\rho_{AB}).
\]

(40)

The following inequality holds for the \(\alpha\)-sandwiched unextendible entanglement for all \(\alpha \in [1, \infty]\):

\[
\tilde{E}^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{AB}) \geq \sum_{y: p(y) > 0} p(y) \tilde{E}^u_{\alpha}(\omega^y_{A'B'}).
\]

(41)

The following inequality holds for the \(\alpha\)-geometric unextendible entanglement for all \(\alpha \in [1, 2]\):

\[
\tilde{E}^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{AB}) \geq \sum_{y: p(y) > 0} p(y) \tilde{E}^u_{\alpha}(\omega^y_{A'B'}).
\]

(42)
Proof. We first show the proof for (41). Let \( \rho_{AB_1B_2} \) be an arbitrary extension of \( \rho_{AB_1} \). Then define

\[
p(y) := \text{Tr}[\mathcal{E}^y_{AB_1B_2 \to A'B_1'B_2}(\rho_{AB_1B_2})],
\]
\[
\omega^y_{A'B_1B_2} := \frac{1}{p(y)} \mathcal{E}^y_{AB_1B_2 \to A'B_1'B_2}(\rho_{AB_1B_2}),
\]
where \( \mathcal{E}^y_{AB_1B_2 \to A'B_1'B_2} \) is the operation extending \( \mathcal{E}^y_{AB \to A'B'} \). Due to the fact that \( \text{Tr}_{B_2} \circ \mathcal{E}^y_{AB_1B_2 \to A'B_1'B_2} = \text{Tr}_{B_2} \circ \mathcal{E}^y_{AB_1B_2 \to A'B_1'B_2} \circ \mathcal{R}_{\pi_{B_2}} \), it follows that the values of \( p(y) \) in (39) and (43) are equal. Furthermore, due to the fact that the marginal operation \( \mathcal{E}^y_{AB_1 \to A'B'_1} = \text{Tr}_{B_2} \circ \mathcal{E}^y_{AB_1B_2 \to A'B_1'B_2} \) is equal to the original operation \( \mathcal{E}^y_{AB \to A'B'} \), we conclude that \( \omega^y_{A'B_1B_2} \) is an extension of \( \omega^y_{A'B'} \) for all \( y \).

From the data processing inequality for the sandwiched Rényi relative entropy for \( \alpha \in [1/2, 1) \cup (1, \infty) \), we conclude the following inequality:

\[
\overline{D}_\alpha(\rho_{AB_1} \parallel \rho_{AB_2}) \geq \overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{E}_{AB \to A'B'}(\rho_{AB_1}) \parallel \mathcal{E}_{AB \to A'B'}(\rho_{AB_2})),
\]
where the quantum channel \( \mathcal{E}_{AB \to A'B'} \) is defined as

\[
\mathcal{E}_{AB \to A'B'}(\cdot) := \sum_y \mathcal{E}^y_{AB \to A'B'}(\cdot) \otimes |y\rangle \langle y|.
\]

Since the marginal operations \( \mathcal{E}^y_{AB_1 \to A'B'_1} \) and \( \mathcal{E}^y_{AB_2 \to A'B'_2} \) are each equal to the original operation \( \mathcal{E}^y_{AB \to A'B'} \), we find that

\[
\mathcal{E}_{AB \to A'B'}(\rho_{AB_1}) = \sum_y \mathcal{E}^y_{AB_1 \to A'B'_1}(\rho_{AB_1}) \otimes |y\rangle \langle y|
\]
\[
= \sum_y p(y) \omega^y_{A'B'_1} \otimes |y\rangle \langle y|
\]
\[
= : \omega_{A'B'_1} Y,
\]
\[
\mathcal{E}_{AB \to A'B'}(\rho_{AB_2}) = \sum_y \mathcal{E}^y_{AB_2 \to A'B'_2}(\rho_{AB_2}) \otimes |y\rangle \langle y|
\]
\[
= \sum_y p(y) \omega^y_{A'B'_2} \otimes |y\rangle \langle y|
\]
\[
= : \omega_{A'B'_2} Y,
\]
which implies that

\[
\overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{E}_{AB \to A'B'}(\rho_{AB_1}) \parallel \mathcal{E}_{AB \to A'B'}(\rho_{AB_2}))
\]
\[
= \overline{D}_\alpha(\omega_{A'B'_1} Y \parallel \omega_{A'B'_2} Y)
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 \sum_{y:p(y)>0} p(y) \overline{Q}_\alpha(\omega^y_{A'B'_1} \parallel \omega^y_{A'B'_2})
\]
\[
\geq \sum_{y:p(y)>0} p(y) \left[ \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 \overline{Q}_\alpha(\omega^y_{A'B'_1} \parallel \omega^y_{A'B'_2}) \right]
\]
\[
= \sum_{y:p(y)>0} p(y) \overline{D}_\alpha(\omega^y_{A'B'_1} \parallel \omega^y_{A'B'_2})
\]
\[
\geq 2 \sum_{y:p(y)>0} p(y) E^\alpha(\omega^y_{A'B'_1})
\]
\[ 2 \sum_{y:p(y)>0} p(y) E^u_\alpha(\omega^y_{A'B'}). \]  

(58)

In the above, the first inequality follows from concavity of the logarithm and the fact that \( \alpha > 1 \). The second inequality follows because \( \omega^y_{A'B'} \) is such that \( \text{Tr}_{B_2} [\omega^y_{A'B'}] = \omega^y_{A'B'} \), so that we can then optimize over all extensions of \( \omega^y_{A'B'} \). Since the following inequality has been established for all extensions \( \rho_{AB_1B_2} \) of \( \rho_{AB} \):

\[ \frac{1}{2} \tilde{D}_\alpha (\rho_{AB_1} \|ho_{AB_2}) \geq \sum_{y:p(y)>0} p(y) E^u_\alpha(\omega^y_{A'B'}), \]

(59)

we conclude the inequality in (41).

The proof of (38) follows along similar lines, but instead using data processing for the Petz–Rényi relative entropy and the quantity \( Q_\alpha \) in (18). In the same way, the proof of (42) follows, but instead using data processing for the geometric Rényi relative entropy and the quantity \( Q_\alpha \) in (22).

The inequality in (41) for \( \alpha \in \{1, \infty\} \) follows by taking a limit. Alternatively, we can prove them directly. To establish the inequality in (41) for \( \alpha = 1 \) (for quantum relative entropy), we use the same reasoning but the following property of quantum relative entropy:

\[ D(\omega_{XB} \|	au_{XB}) = \sum_x p(x) D(\omega^x_B \|	au^x_B) + D(p\|q), \]

(60)

where

\[ \omega_{XB} := \sum_x p(x) |x \rangle \langle x|_X \otimes \omega^x_B, \]

(61)

\[ \tau_{XB} := \sum_x q(x) |x \rangle \langle x|_X \otimes \tau^x_B. \]

(62)

Similarly, the inequality in (42) for \( \alpha = 1 \) follows from the same reasoning and the following related property of Belavkin–Staszewski relative entropy:

\[ \tilde{D}(\omega_{XB} \|	au_{XB}) = \sum_x p(x) \tilde{D}(\omega^x_B \|	au^x_B) + D(p\|q). \]

(63)

For \( \alpha = \infty \), suppose that the optimal extendible state is \( \rho_{AB_1B_2} \), which satisfies \( \rho_{AB_1} = \rho_{AB} \) and \( E^{u}_{\max}(\rho_{AB_1}) = \frac{1}{2} D_{\max}(\rho_{AB_1} \|ho_{AB_2}) \). Also, suppose that \( E^{u}_{\max}(\rho_{AB_1}) = \frac{1}{2} \log_2 t \), which means that \( \rho_{AB_1} \leq t \rho_{AB_2} \). For any \( y \) such that \( p(y) > 0 \), due to complete positivity and two-extendibility of the map \( \mathcal{E}^y_{A'B'} \), we have that

\[ t \mathcal{E}^y_{AB_2 \rightarrow A'B'}(\rho_{AB_2})/p(y) \geq \mathcal{E}^y_{AB_1 \rightarrow A'B'}(\rho_{AB_1})/p(y) = \omega^y_{A'B'}. \]

(64)

Noting that \( \mathcal{E}^y_{AB_1B_2 \rightarrow A'B'_2}(\rho_{AB_1B_2})/p(y) \) is an extension of the state \( \omega^y_{A'B'} \), it follows that

\[ E^{u}_{\max}(\omega^y_{A'B'}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \log_2 t. \]

(65)

Therefore,

\[ E^{u}_{\max}(\rho_{AB_1}) = \frac{1}{2} \log_2 t \]

(66)
In the above, (68) is due to (65), while (69) is due to the concavity of the logarithm. □

**Proposition 6 (Faithfulness)** For \( \alpha \in (0, \infty) \), the \( \alpha \)-Petz unextendible entanglement of a bipartite state \( \rho_{\alpha} \) satisfies \( E_{\alpha}^u(\rho_{AB}) \geq 0 \), and \( E_{\alpha}^u(\rho_{AB}) = 0 \) if and only if \( \rho_{AB} \) is two-extendible. For \( \alpha \in (0, \infty) \), the \( \alpha \)-sandwiched unextendible entanglement of a bipartite state \( \rho_{AB} \) satisfies \( E_{\alpha}^u(\rho_{AB}) \geq 0 \), and \( E_{\alpha}^u(\rho_{AB}) = 0 \) if and only if \( \rho_{AB} \) is two-extendible.

**Proof.** This follows because the Petz, sandwiched, and geometric Rényi relative entropies satisfy all of the requirements, as given in Lemma 3, needed to invoke Proposition 2. □

Before stating the next proposition, recall that the Petz–Rényi mutual information of a bipartite state \( \rho_{AB} \) is defined as [GW15, Eq. (6.3) and Corollary 8]

\[
I_{\alpha}(A;B)_{\rho} := \min_{\sigma_B} D_{\alpha}(\rho_{AB}||\rho_A \otimes \sigma_B) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log_2 \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \text{Tr}_A[\rho_A^{1-\alpha} \rho_{AB}^\alpha] \right)^{1/\alpha} \right],
\]

and the sandwiched Rényi mutual information of a bipartite state \( \rho_{AB} \) is defined as [Bei13, GW15]

\[
\tilde{I}_{\alpha}(A;B)_{\rho} := \min_{\sigma_B} \tilde{D}_{\alpha}(\rho_{AB}||\rho_A \otimes \sigma_B),
\]

where the minimization in both cases is with respect to states \( \sigma_B \). We also define the geometric Rényi mutual information of \( \rho_{AB} \) in a similar way:

\[
\tilde{I}_{\alpha}(A;B)_{\rho} := \min_{\sigma_B} \tilde{D}_{\alpha}(\rho_{AB}||\rho_A \otimes \sigma_B),
\]

Also, recall that the Rényi entropy of a state \( \rho_A \) is defined for \( \alpha \in (0,1) \cup (1,\infty) \) as

\[
H_{\alpha}(A)_{\rho} := \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log_2 \text{Tr}[\rho_A^\alpha],
\]

and it is defined for \( \alpha \in \{0,1,\infty\} \) in the limit, so that

\[
H_0(A)_{\rho} := \log_2 \text{rank}(\rho_A),
H(A)_{\rho} := H_1(A)_{\rho} = \text{Tr}[\rho_A \log_2 \rho_A],
H_{\min}(A)_{\rho} := H_{\infty}(A)_{\rho} = -\log_2 \|\rho_A\|_{\infty}.
\]

The following lemmas relate the \( \alpha \)-mutual information to Rényi entropy when the bipartite state is pure. The first was established in the proof of [SBW15, Proposition 13].

**Lemma 7 ([SBW15])** Let \( \alpha \in (0, \infty) \). The \( \alpha \)-Petz Rényi mutual information of a pure bipartite state \( \psi_{AB} \) reduces to twice the \( \gamma \)-Rényi entropy of its marginal:

\[
I_{\alpha}(A;B)_{\psi} = 2H_\gamma(A)_{\psi},
\]

where \( \gamma := [2-\alpha] / \alpha \).
Lemma 8 Let $\alpha \in (0, \infty]$. The $\alpha$-sandwiched Rényi mutual information of a pure bipartite state $\psi_{AB}$ reduces to twice the $\beta$-Rényi entropy of its marginal:

$$I_\alpha(A;B)_\psi = 2H_\beta(A)_\psi,$$

where $\beta := [2\alpha - 1]^{-1}$.

Proof. See Appendix A.

Lemma 9 Let $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$. The $\alpha$-geometric Rényi mutual information of a pure bipartite state $\psi_{AB}$ reduces to twice the zero-Rényi entropy of its marginal:

$$\hat{I}_\alpha(A;B)_\psi = 2H_0(A)_\psi.$$

Proof. See Appendix B.

Then the following proposition uses the above lemmas to conclude that the $\alpha$-unextendible entanglement reduces to Rényi entropy of entanglement for pure states:

Proposition 10 (Reduction for pure states) Let $\psi_{AB}$ be a pure bipartite state. Then the $\alpha$-Petz unextendible entanglement reduces to the $\gamma$-Rényi entropy of entanglement:

$$E_\alpha(\psi_{AB}) = H_\gamma(\psi_A),$$

where $\gamma = [2 - \alpha]/\alpha$. The $\alpha$-sandwiched unextendible entanglement reduces to the $\beta$-Rényi entropy of entanglement:

$$\bar{E}_\alpha(\psi_{AB}) = H_\beta(\psi_A),$$

where $\beta = [2\alpha - 1]^{-1}$. The $\alpha$-geometric unextendible entanglement reduces to the zero-Rényi entropy of entanglement:

$$\hat{E}_\alpha(\psi_{AB}) = H_0(\psi_A).$$

Proof. For a pure state $\psi_{AB}$, any extension of it has the form $\sigma_{AB_1B_2} := \psi_A \otimes \sigma_{B_2}$ for some state $\sigma_{B_2}$ on system $B_2$. As such, it follows that

$$E_\alpha(\psi_{AB}) = \min_{\sigma_{B_2}} \frac{1}{2} D_\alpha(\psi_{AB} \| \psi_A \otimes \sigma_{B_2})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} I_\alpha(A;B)_\psi$$

$$= H_\gamma(\psi_A).$$

The first equality follows from applying the definition of $E_\alpha(\psi_{AB})$, and the second equality follows from the definition in (70). The final equality follows from Lemma 7.

The conclusions about $\bar{E}_\alpha(\psi_{AB})$ and $\hat{E}_\alpha(\psi_{AB})$ follow the same line of reasoning but using Lemma 8 and Lemma 9 instead, respectively.

Proposition 11 (Normalization) Let $\Phi^d_{AB}$ be a maximally entangled state of Schmidt rank $d$. Then $E_\alpha(\Phi^d_{AB}) = \log d$ for $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$, $\bar{E}_\alpha(\Phi^d_{AB}) = \log d$ for $\alpha \in (0, \infty]$, and $\hat{E}_\alpha(\Phi^d_{AB}) = \log d$ for $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$. 

Proof. This follows directly from Proposition 10 and the fact that the Rényi entropy of the maximally mixed state (reduced state of $\Phi^{d}_{AB}$) is equal to $\log d$ for all values of $\beta$. ■

Proposition 12 (Convexity) The $\alpha$-Petz unextendible entanglement $E^u_{\alpha}$ is convex when $\alpha \in (0,1]$ and quasi-convex when $\alpha \in [1,2]$. The $\alpha$-sandwiched unextendible entanglement $\overline{E}^u_{\alpha}$ is convex when $\alpha \in [1/2,1]$ and quasi-convex when $\alpha > 1$. The $\alpha$-geometric unextendible entanglement $\widehat{E}^u_{\alpha}$ is convex when $\alpha \in (0,1]$ and quasi-convex when $\alpha \in (1,2]$. That is, let $\overline{\sigma}_{AB} := \sum_i p_i^\alpha \rho_{AB}^i$, where $\{p_i\}_i$ is a probability distribution and $\{\rho_{AB}^i\}$ is a set of quantum states on system $AB$.

$$E^u_{\alpha}(\overline{\sigma}_{AB}) \leq \begin{cases} \max_i E^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{AB}^i) & \alpha \in (1,2], \\ \sum_i p_i E^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{AB}^i) & 0 < \alpha \leq 1, \end{cases}$$

(86)

$$\overline{E}^u_{\alpha}(\overline{\sigma}_{AB}) \leq \begin{cases} \max_i \overline{E}^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{AB}^i) & \alpha > 1, \\ \sum_i p_i \overline{E}^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{AB}^i) & \frac{1}{2} \leq \alpha \leq 1, \end{cases}$$

(87)

and

$$\widehat{E}^u_{\alpha}(\widehat{\sigma}_{AB}) \leq \begin{cases} \max_i \widehat{E}^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{AB}^i) & \alpha \in (1,2], \\ \sum_i p_i \widehat{E}^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{AB}^i) & 0 < \alpha \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

(88)

Proof. This is a simple corollary of the facts that $D_\alpha$ is jointly quasi-convex for $\alpha \in (1,2]$ and jointly convex for $\alpha \in (0,1]$ [Pet86], $\overline{D}_\alpha$ is jointly quasi-convex for $\alpha > 1$ and jointly convex for $\alpha \in [1/2,1]$ [FL13], and $\widehat{D}_\alpha$ is jointly quasi-convex for $\alpha \in (1,2]$ and jointly convex for $\alpha \in (0,1]$ [HM17]. ■

Aside from the above properties, the $\alpha$-unextendible entanglement is also subadditive:

Proposition 13 (Subadditivity) Let $\rho_{A_1B_1} \in S(A_1B_1)$ and $\rho_{A_2B_2} \in S(A_2B_2)$ be two bipartite states. Then the following subadditivity inequality holds for $\alpha \in [0,\infty)$

$$E^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{A_1B_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2}) \leq E^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{A_1B_1}) + E^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{A_2B_2}),$$

(89)

for $\alpha \in (0,\infty]$

$$\overline{E}^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{A_1B_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2}) \leq \overline{E}^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{A_1B_1}) + \overline{E}^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{A_2B_2}),$$

(90)

and for $\alpha \in (0,\infty)$

$$\widehat{E}^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{A_1B_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2}) \leq \widehat{E}^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{A_1B_1}) + \widehat{E}^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{A_2B_2}),$$

(91)

where the entanglement is evaluated across the $A:B$ cut.

Proof. Let $\sigma_{A_1B_1B'_1}$ and $\sigma_{A_2B_2B'_2}$ be arbitrary extensions of $\rho_{A_1B_1}$ and $\rho_{A_2B_2}$, respectively. Consider the state $\sigma_{A_1B_1B'_1} \otimes \sigma_{A_2B_2B'_2}$. Then it follows that

$$\text{Tr}_{B'_1B'_2}[\sigma_{A_1B_1B'_1} \otimes \sigma_{A_2B_2B'_2}] = \text{Tr}_{B'_1}[\sigma_{A_1B_1B'_1}] \otimes \text{Tr}_{B'_2}[\sigma_{A_2B_2B'_2}] = \rho_{A_1B_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2},$$

(92)

so that $\sigma_{A_1B_1B'_1} \otimes \sigma_{A_2B_2B'_2}$ is an extension of $\rho_{A_1B_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2}$. Thus

$$E^u_{\alpha}(\rho_{A_1B_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2}) \leq \frac{1}{2}D_\alpha(\rho_{A_1B_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2}\|\sigma_{A_1B'_1} \otimes \sigma_{A_2B'_2})$$

(93)

$$= \frac{1}{2}D_\alpha(\rho_{A_1B_1}\|\sigma_{A_1B'_1}) + \frac{1}{2}D_\alpha(\rho_{A_2B_2}\|\sigma_{A_2B'_2}).$$

(94)

Taking an infimum over all extensions $\sigma_{A_1B_1B'_1}$ and $\sigma_{A_2B_2B'_2}$ leads to the inequality in (89). The inequalities in (90) and (91) are established similarly. ■
D. Unextendible entanglement (using relative entropy)

As mentioned above, the quantum relative entropy is a particular instance of the Petz- and sandwiched Rényi relative entropy when $\alpha \to 1$. Unextendible entanglement in terms of these measures has already been defined above and several of its properties have been established, but it is notable enough that we define it explicitly here as follows:

**Definition 3 (Unextendible entanglement)** For a bipartite state $\rho_{AB}$, the unextendible entanglement is defined as

$$E_u(\rho_{AB}) := \frac{1}{2} \inf_{\rho_{ABB}'} \{ D(\rho_{AB}\|\rho_{AB}') : \text{Tr}_{B'}[\rho_{ABB}'] = \rho_{AB}, \rho_{ABB}' \in S(ABB') \} ,$$

(95)

where $D$ is the quantum relative entropy from (24).

As proved above, it obeys the following properties: selective two-extendible monotonicity, faithfulness, reduction to entropy of entanglement for pure bipartite states, normalization, convexity, and subadditivity.

Regarding the third property mentioned above, it is a special case of Proposition 10 for $\alpha = 1$, and it states that for pure bipartite states, the unextendible entanglement evaluates to the von Neumann entropy of the reduced state. Although the proof has already been given, we can see it with a straightforward proof consisting of a few steps: Let $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$ be a pure state. Any extension of $\psi_{AB}$ is of the form $\sigma_{ABB'} := |\psi\rangle_{AB} \otimes \sigma_{B'}$ for some state $\sigma_{B'}$ on system $B'$. As so, $\text{Tr}_{B'}[\sigma_{ABB'}] = \rho_A \otimes \sigma_{B'}$, where $\rho_A = \text{Tr}_{B}[\psi_{AB}]$. Then it follows that

$$E_u(\psi_{AB}) = \inf_{\sigma_{B'}} \frac{1}{2} D(\psi_{AB}\|\psi_{A} \otimes \sigma_{B'}) = \frac{1}{2} I(A;B)_{\psi} = H(A)_{\psi},$$

(96)

where the second equality follows from the definition of quantum mutual information.

III. EFFICIENTLY COMPUTABLE ENTANGLEMENT MEASURES

A. Max-unextendible entanglement

Another interesting instance of the sandwiched Rényi relative entropy is the max-relative entropy, as recalled in (26). The max-relative entropy was originally defined and studied in [Dat09]. Here we adopt the max-relative entropy to define the max-unextendible entanglement. It turns out that this measure is additive and can be calculated efficiently by means of a semidefinite program.

**Definition 4 (Max-unextendible entanglement)** For a given bipartite state $\rho_{AB}$, the max-unextendible entanglement is defined as

$$E_u^{\text{max}}(\rho_{AB}) := \frac{1}{2} \inf_{\rho_{ABB}'} \{ D_{\text{max}}(\rho_{AB}\|\rho_{AB}') : \text{Tr}_{B'}[\rho_{ABB}'] = \rho_{AB}, \rho_{ABB}' \in S(ABB') \} .$$

(97)

From the definition of max-unextendible entanglement, it follows that it can be computed efficiently by means of a semidefinite program (SDP). To be more specific, the following two optimization problems satisfy strong duality and both evaluate to $2^{-2E_u^{\text{max}}(\rho_{AB})}$.
IV

Let

\[ \rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{P}(A) \]

such that the support of \( \rho \) is contained in the support of \( \sigma \). Let \( \Pi_\rho \) denote the projection onto the support of \( \rho \). Then the min-relative entropy of \( \rho \) to \( \sigma \) is defined as

\[ D_{\min}(\rho \| \sigma) := -\log \text{Tr} [\Pi_\rho \sigma]. \]  

With \( D_{\min} \), we define the min-unextendible entanglement as follows.
Definition 5 (Min-unextendible entanglement) For a given bipartite state $\rho_{AB}$, the min-unextendible entanglement is defined as

$$E_{u}^{\text{min}}(\rho_{AB}) := \frac{1}{2} \inf \left\{ D_{\text{min}}(\rho_{AB}||\rho_{AB}') : \text{Tr}_{B'}[\rho_{ABB}'] = \rho_{AB}, \; \rho_{ABB}' \in S(ABB') \right\}. \quad (106)$$

Much like the max-unextendible entanglement, the min-unextendible entanglement can also be calculated as the solution to a semidefinite program and shown to be additive. Let $P_{AB}$ denote the projection onto the support of the state $\rho_{AB}$. The following two optimization problems satisfy strong duality and both evaluate to $2^{\frac{1}{2}} - E_{u}^{\text{min}}(\rho_{AB})$.

**primal problem**

$$\begin{align*}
\max & \quad \text{Tr}[P_{AB}\sigma_{AB'}] \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad \text{Tr}_{B'}[\sigma_{ABB'}] = \rho_{AB}, \quad \sigma_{ABB'} \geq 0
\end{align*} \quad (107)$$

**dual problem**

$$\begin{align*}
\min & \quad \text{Tr}[\rho_{AB}X_{AB}] \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad X_{AB} \otimes 1_{B'} \geq P_{AB} \otimes 1_B, \\
& \quad X_{AB} = X_{AB}^{\dagger}
\end{align*} \quad (108)$$

Proposition 15 (Additivity) Let $\rho_{A_1B_1} \in S(A_1B_1)$ and $\rho_{A_2B_2} \in S(A_2B_2)$ be bipartite states. It holds that

$$E_{u}^{\text{min}}(\rho_{A_1B_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2}) = E_{u}^{\text{min}}(\rho_{A_1B_1}) + E_{u}^{\text{min}}(\rho_{A_2B_2}), \quad (109)$$

where the entanglement is evaluated across the $A:B$ cut.

**Proof.** The proof follows similarly to the proof of Proposition 14, by using the primal and dual programs, along with strong duality. ■

The min-unextendible entanglement of a pure bipartite state can be computed explicitly and possesses an operational interpretation.

Proposition 16 Let $|\psi\rangle_{AB} := \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sqrt{\alpha_i} |\psi_i^A\rangle |\psi_i^B\rangle$ be a pure state in $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$, with $\alpha_1 \geq \cdots \alpha_k > 0$. Then the following equality holds

$$E_{u}^{\text{min}}(\rho_{AB}) = -\log \alpha_1. \quad (110)$$

**Proof.** This follows from (80) by taking the limit $\alpha \to 0$. Alternatively, we briefly outline another proof as follows. For a pure state $\psi_{AB}$, any extension of it has the form $\sigma_{ABB'} := |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{AB} \otimes \sigma_{B'}$ for some state on system $B'$. Then $\text{Tr}_{B'}[\sigma_{ABB'}] = \psi_A \otimes \sigma_{B'}$. Suppose that a spectral decomposition of $\sigma_{B'}$ is $\sigma_{B'} = \sum_n p_n |e_n\rangle \langle e_n|$. Then

$$\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{2} D_{\text{min}}(\psi_{AB}||\psi_A \otimes \sigma_{B'}) & = -\frac{1}{2} \log \sum_{i,j,m,n} \sqrt{\alpha_i \alpha_j \alpha_m p_n} \langle \psi_i^A | \psi_i^B \rangle \langle \psi_m^A | \psi_m^B \rangle |e_n\rangle \langle e_n| \langle \psi_j^A | \psi_j^B \rangle \\
& = -\frac{1}{2} \log \sum_{i,n} \alpha_i^2 p_n |\psi_i^B| |e_n\rangle |e_n\rangle^2 \\
& \geq -\frac{1}{2} \log \sum_{i,n} p_n |\psi_i^B| |e_n\rangle |e_n\rangle^2 \\
& = -\log \alpha_1.
\end{align*} \quad (111)$$

(112)
The inequality is achievable by choosing $\sigma_{B'} = |\psi_1^B\rangle\langle\psi_1^B|$. Thus $E_{\min}^u(\psi_{AB}) = -\log \alpha_1$.

The min-unextendible entanglement $E_{\min}^u(\psi_{AB})$ has an operational interpretation in terms of deterministic entanglement transformation [DFJY05], which we briefly introduce as follows. Let $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$ be two pure bipartite states for systems $AB$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be an integer. We define $f(m)$ to be the maximum integer $n$ such that $\psi_1^\otimes m$ can be transformed into $\psi_2^\otimes n$ by LOCC deterministically. The deterministic entanglement transformation rate from $\psi_1$ to $\psi_2$, written $D(\psi_1 \rightarrow \psi_2)$, is defined as

$$D(\psi_1 \rightarrow \psi_2) := \sup_{m \geq 1} \frac{f(m)}{m}. \quad (115)$$

Intuitively, for sufficiently large $m$, one can transform $m$ copies of $\psi_1$ exactly into $mD(\psi_1 \rightarrow \psi_2)$ copies of $\psi_2$ by LOCC. We have the following proposition, which is a consequence of Proposition 16 and the developments in [DFJY05]:

**Proposition 17** Let $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$ be a pure state in $AB$ and $\Phi_2$ be the Bell state. Then the following equality holds

$$D(\psi \rightarrow \Phi_2) = E_{\min}^u(\psi_{AB}). \quad (116)$$

## C. Unextendible fidelity

Let $\rho, \sigma \in S(A)$ be two quantum states. The (root) fidelity between $\rho$ and $\sigma$ is defined as [Uhl76]

$$F(\rho, \sigma) := \|\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\sigma}\|_1 = \text{Tr}\left[\sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma}\rho\sqrt{\sigma}}\right]. \quad (117)$$

Here we define the unextendible fidelity of a state $\rho_{AB}$:

**Definition 6 (Unextendible fidelity)** For a given bipartite state $\rho_{AB}$, the unextendible fidelity is defined as

$$F_u(\rho_{AB}) := \max_{\rho_{ABB'} \in S(ABB')} \{F(\rho_{AB}, \rho_{ABB'}) : \text{Tr}_{B'}[\rho_{ABB'}] = \rho_{AB}, \rho_{ABB'} \in S(ABB')\}. \quad (118)$$

Suppose that $\Psi_{ABC}$ is a purification of $\rho_{AB}$. By applying Remark 1, we see the unextendible fidelity can be alternatively understood as a measure of how well one can recover the state $\rho_{AB}$ if system $B$ is lost and a recovery operation is performed on the purification system $C$ alone, due to the following equivalent definition

$$F_u(\rho_{AB}) = \max_{\mathcal{R}_{C \rightarrow B'}} \{F(\rho_{AB}, \rho_{ABB'}) : \rho_{ABB'} = (\mathds{1}_{AB} \otimes \mathcal{R}_{C \rightarrow B'}) (|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{ABC})\}, \quad (119)$$

where the maximum ranges over all quantum channels $\mathcal{N}_{C \rightarrow B'}$. The unextendible fidelity is thus similar in spirit to fidelity of recovery from [SW15], but one finds that it is a different measure when analyzing it in more detail.

By examining (19) and (117), one immediately finds that $\tilde{D}_{1/2}(\rho\|\sigma) = -\log F^2(\rho, \sigma)$. Thus, we establish the following equivalence between unextendible fidelity and 1/2-sandwiched unextendible entanglement:

$$F_u(\rho_{AB}) := \max_{\substack{\rho_{ABB'} \in S(ABB') \\ \text{Tr}_{B'}[\rho_{ABB'}] = \rho_{AB}}} F(\rho_{AB}, \rho_{ABB'}) \quad (120)$$
two optimization problems satisfy strong duality and both evaluate to $2^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{D}_{1/2}(\rho_{AB}\|\rho_{AB'})$ (121)

$$\max_{\rho_{AB\rho'_{B}} \in S(ABB')} \quad 2^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{D}_{1/2}(\rho_{AB}\|\rho_{AB'})$$

\[\text{Tr}_{B'}[\rho_{AB'}] = \rho_{AB}\]

\[\sigma_{ABB'} \geq 0\]

$$= 2^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{D}_{1/2}(\rho_{AB})$$ (122)

Since the fidelity function is SDP computable [Wat13], it follows that the unextendible fidelity can be computed efficiently by means of a semidefinite program. To be more specific, the following two optimization problems satisfy strong duality and both evaluate to $F^u(\rho_{AB})$. For completeness, we show in detail how to derive the dual problem in Appendix C.

**Primal problem**

$$\max \quad \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[X_{AB}] + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[X_{AB}^\dagger]$$

s.t.

$$\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\rho_{AB} & X_{AB} \\
X_{AB}^\dagger & \text{Tr}_{B'} \sigma_{ABB'}
\end{array}\right) \succeq 0$$ (123)

$$\rho_{AB} = \text{Tr}_{B'} \sigma_{ABB'}$$

$$\sigma_{ABB'} \geq 0$$

**Dual problem**

$$\min \quad \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[(W_{AB} + Z_{AB})\rho_{AB}]$$

s.t.

$$\left(\begin{array}{cc}
W_{AB} & -1_{AB} \\
-1_{AB} & Y_{AB'}
\end{array}\right) \succeq 0$$ (124)

$$Z_{AB} \otimes 1_{B'} \succeq Y_{AB'} \otimes 1_B$$

$$Z_{AB} \otimes 1_{B'} \geq Y_{AB'} \otimes 1_B$$

We also establish the following equivalent dual representation of $F^u(\rho_{AB})$ in Appendix C:

$$\inf \quad \sqrt{\text{Tr}[Y_{AB'}^{-1}\rho_{AB}] \text{Tr}[Z_{AB} \rho_{AB}]}$$

s.t.

$$Z_{AB} \otimes 1_{B'} \succeq Y_{AB'} \otimes 1_B$$

$$Y_{AB'} \succeq 0.$$ (125)

As a direct consequence of this dual representation, we find that the extendible fidelity is multiplicative.

**Proposition 18 (Multiplicativity)** Let $\rho_{A_1B_1} \in S(A_1B_1)$ and $\rho_{A_2B_2} \in S(A_2B_2)$ be bipartite states. The following equality holds

$$F^u(\rho_{A_1B_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2}) = F^u(\rho_{A_1B_1}) F^u(\rho_{A_2B_2}),$$ (126)

where the entanglement is evaluated across the $A|B$ cut.

**Proof.** For the “$\geq$” part, suppose that $\rho_{A_1B_1B'_1}$ and $\rho_{A_2B_2B'_2}$ achieve $F^u(\rho_{A_1B_1})$ and $F^u(\rho_{A_2B_2})$, respectively. Since

$$\text{Tr}_{B'_1B'_2} \left[ \rho_{A_1B_1B'_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2B'_2} \right] = \rho_{A_1B_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2},$$ (127)

the state $\rho_{A_1B_1B'_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2B'_2}$ is a feasible solution for $F^u(\rho_{A_1B_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2})$. So

$$F^u(\rho_{A_1B_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2}) \geq F(\rho_{A_1B_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2}, \rho_{A_1B'_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B'_2})$$ (128)

$$= F(\rho_{A_1B_1}, \rho_{A_1B'_1}) F(\rho_{A_2B_2}, \rho_{A_2B'_2})$$ (129)

$$= F^u(\rho_{A_1B_1}) F^u(\rho_{A_2B_2}),$$ (130)

where the first equality follows from the multiplicativity of the fidelity.
For the “≤” part, we employ the dual representation in (125). Let \((Y_{A_1B_1}', Z_{A_1B_1})\) and \((Y_{A_2B_2}', Z_{A_2B_2})\) be feasible solutions for \(F^u(\rho_{A_1B_1})\) and \(F^u(\rho_{A_2B_2})\), respectively. Set \(Y_{A_1A_2B_1B_2}' \equiv Y_{A_1B_1}' \otimes Y_{A_2B_2}'\) and \(Z_{A_1A_2B_1B_2} \equiv Z_{A_1B_1} \otimes Z_{A_2B_2}\). Since

\[
Z_{A_1A_2B_1B_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B_1'B_2'} = (Z_{A_1B_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B_1'}) \otimes (Z_{A_2B_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B_2'}) \geq (Y_{A_1B_1}' \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B_1'}) \otimes (Y_{A_2B_2}' \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B_2'}) = Y_{A_1A_2B_1B_2}'
\]

(131)

\((Y_{A_1A_2B_1B_2}', Z_{A_1A_2B_1B_2})\) is a feasible solution. Then

\[
F^u(\rho_{A_1B_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2}) \leq \sqrt{\text{Tr}[Y_{A_1A_2B_1B_2}'^{-1}(\rho_{A_1B_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2})] \text{Tr}[Z_{A_1A_2B_1B_2}(\rho_{A_1B_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2})]}
\]

(133)

\[
= \sqrt{\text{Tr}[Y_{A_1B_1}'^{-1}\rho_{A_1B_1}] \text{Tr}[Z_{A_1B_1}\rho_{A_1B_1}] \sqrt{\text{Tr}[Y_{A_2B_2}'^{-1}\rho_{A_2B_2}] \text{Tr}[Z_{A_2B_2}\rho_{A_2B_2}]}}.
\]

(134)

Since the above inequality holds for all feasible solutions, we find that

\[
F^u(\rho_{A_1B_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2}) \leq F^u(\rho_{A_1B_1})F^u(\rho_{A_2B_2}).
\]

(135)

This concludes the proof.

Considering the relation between unextendible fidelity and the 1/2-sandwiched unextendible entanglement, Proposition 18 demonstrates that the logarithmic unextendible fidelity is an additive unextendible entanglement measure different from the min- and max-unextendible entanglements.

**Corollary 19** Let \(\rho_{A_1B_1} \in \mathcal{S}(A_1B_1)\) and \(\rho_{A_2B_2} \in \mathcal{S}(A_2B_2)\) be bipartite states. The following additivity relation holds

\[
\tilde{E}_{1/2}^u(\rho_{A_1B_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2B_2}) = \tilde{E}_{1/2}^u(\rho_{A_1B_1}) + \tilde{E}_{1/2}^u(\rho_{A_2B_2}),
\]

(136)

where the entanglement is evaluated across the \(A|B\) cut.

**Proposition 20** Let \(\psi_{AB}\) be a pure bipartite state. Then the following equality holds

\[
F^u(\psi_{AB}) = \lambda_{\text{max}}(\rho_A),
\]

(137)

where \(\rho_A = \text{Tr}_B \psi_{AB}\) and \(\lambda_{\text{max}}(\rho_A)\) is the maximal eigenvalue of \(\rho_A\).

**Proof.** Let \(\psi_{AB}\) be a pure bipartite state. Using the relation between unextendible fidelity and 1/2-sandwiched unextendible entanglement, we find that

\[
F^u(\psi_{AB}) = 2^{-\tilde{E}_{1/2}^u(\psi_{AB})} = 2^{-H_{\text{min}}(A)\psi} = \lambda_{\text{max}}(\rho_A),
\]

(138)

where the second equality follows from Proposition 10.

\[\]

**IV. APPLICATIONS FOR SECRET KEY AND ENTANGLEMENT DISTILLATION**

**A. Overhead of probabilistic entanglement distillation**

Entanglement distillation aims at obtaining maximally entangled states from less entangled bipartite states shared between two parties via certain free operations. As a central task in quantum information processing, various approaches [VP98, Rai99, VW02, Rai00, HHH00, CW04, WD17b,
LDS18, WD16, FWTD19, KDWW19, RFWG19] have been developed to characterize and approximate the performance of the rates of deterministic entanglement distillation.

Here, instead of considering the rates of deterministic entanglement distillation, we consider the overhead of probabilistic entanglement distillation [BDSW96, CCGFZ99, PSBZ01, NFB14, CB07, RST+18] under selective two-extendible operations (which include 1-LOCC operations as a special case). It turns out that the relative entropy induced unextendible entanglement $E^u(\rho_{AB})$, given in Definition 3, provides a lower bound on the overhead of probabilistic entanglement distillation of a bipartite state $\rho_{AB}$.

We begin by defining the overhead of probabilistic entanglement distillation:

**Definition 7** The overhead of distilling $m$ ebits from several independent copies of a bipartite state $\rho_{AB}$ is given by the minimum number of copies of $\rho_{AB}$ needed, on average, to produce $m$ copies of the ebit $\Phi_2$ using 1-LOCC operations:

$$E_{ov}(\rho_{AB}, m) := \inf \left\{ \frac{n}{p} : \Lambda(\rho_{AB}^\otimes n) \to \Phi_2^\otimes m \text{ with prob. } p, \text{ } \Lambda \text{ is 1-LOCC} \right\}. \quad (139)$$

We can also define the overhead when selective two-extendible operations are allowed:

$$E_{ov,2}(\rho_{AB}, m) := \inf \left\{ \frac{n}{p} : \Lambda(\rho_{AB}^\otimes n) \to \Phi_2^\otimes m \text{ with prob. } p, \text{ } \Lambda \text{ is selective two-extendible} \right\}. \quad (140)$$

The following inequality is a trivial consequence of definitions and the fact that a 1-LOCC operation is a special kind of selective two-extendible operation:

$$E_{ov}(\rho_{AB}, m) \geq E_{ov,2}(\rho_{AB}, m). \quad (141)$$

**Theorem 21** For a bipartite state $\rho_{AB}$, the overhead of distilling $m$ ebits from $\rho_{AB}$ is bounded from below as

$$E_{ov,2}(\rho_{AB}, m) \geq \frac{m}{E^u(\rho_{AB})}, \quad (142)$$

where $E^u(\rho_{AB})$ is the unextendible entanglement from Definition 3.

**Proof.** We first show that any generalized unextendible entanglement $E^u$ satisfying selective two-extendible monotonicity, normalization, and subadditivity serves as a lower bound on the overhead. Let us suppose that the selective two-extendible operation $\Lambda$ outputs $\Phi_2^\otimes m$ from $\rho_{AB}^\otimes n$ with probability $p$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that

$$\Lambda(\rho_{AB}^\otimes n) = p|0\rangle\langle 0|_{X_B} \otimes \Phi_2^\otimes m + (1 - p)|1\rangle\langle 1|_{X_B} \otimes \tau, \quad (143)$$

where $\tau$ is some bipartite state and $X_B$ is a flag system indicating whether the conversion is successful. We have

$$nE^u(\rho_{AB}) \geq E^u(\rho_{AB}^\otimes n) \geq pE^u(\Phi_2^\otimes m) = pm, \quad (144)$$

where the first inequality follows from subadditivity, the second inequality follows from selective two-extendible monotonicity, and the last equality follows from normalization. Since $n$ and $p$ are arbitrary, we conclude that the following bound holds for all integer $n \geq 1$ and $p \in (0, 1]$:

$$\frac{n}{p} \geq \frac{m}{E^u(\rho_{AB})}. \quad (145)$$

As the relative entropy induced unextendible entanglement $E^u(\rho_{AB})$ satisfies all these required properties, we conclude the lower bound in (142). \qed
Remark 3 In Theorem 5, Proposition 11, and Proposition 13, we have proved that the \( \alpha \)-Petz unextendible entanglement for \( \alpha \in [1,2] \), the \( \alpha \)-sandwiched unextendible entanglement for \( \alpha \in [1,\infty) \), and the \( \alpha \)-geometric unextendible entanglement for \( \alpha \in [1,2] \) satisfy selective two-extendible monotonicity, normalization, and subadditivity, respectively. That is to say, all these entanglement measures can be used as lower bounds. However, due to the fact that all these divergences are monotonically increasing on \( [\text{Tom15}] \) and \( D(\omega||\tau) \leq \tilde{D}(\omega||\tau) \) [HP91], \( E^u(\rho_{AB}) \) is the smallest unextendible entanglement measure among these choices and gives the tightest lower bound. What is more, recently the authors of [FSP19] proposed a method to accurately approximate the quantum relative entropy via semidefinite programming. This enables us to estimate the lower bound using available semidefinite programming solvers.

B. Perfect entanglement distillation

We can also consider the setting in which the goal is to distill ebits perfectly from a bipartite state by using two-extendible or 1-LOCC channels. This is certainly less realistic than the above scenario, but it is still a core part of zero-error quantum information theory [GdAM16].

The one-shot 1-LOCC perfect distillable entanglement of \( \rho_{AB} \) is defined to be the maximum number of ebits achievable via a 1-LOCC channel; that is,

\[
E^{(1)}_{1-\text{LOCC}}(\rho_{AB}) := \sup \{ \log_2 d : \Lambda_{AB} \rightarrow \hat{A}\hat{B}(\rho_{AB}) = \Phi^d_{\hat{A}\hat{B}}, \Lambda \in \text{1-LOCC} \},
\]

where \( \Phi^d_{\hat{A}\hat{B}} \) is a maximally entangled state of Schmidt rank \( d \). The 1-LOCC perfect distillable entanglement of a state \( \rho_{AB} \) is then defined as the regularization of \( E^{(1)}_{1-\text{LOCC}}(\rho_{AB}) \):

\[
E_{1-\text{LOCC}}(\rho_{AB}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E^{(1)}_{1-\text{LOCC}}(\rho_{AB}^\otimes n).
\]

Note that the following inequality is a direct consequence of the definitions:

\[
E^{(1)}_{1-\text{LOCC}}(\rho_{AB}) \leq E_{1-\text{LOCC}}(\rho_{AB}).
\]

The one-shot two-extendible perfect distillable entanglement and two-extendible perfect distillable entanglement of \( \rho_{AB} \) are defined similarly:

\[
E^{(1)}_{2-\text{EXT}}(\rho_{AB}) := \sup \{ \log_2 d : \Lambda_{AB} \rightarrow \hat{A}\hat{B}(\rho_{AB}) = \Phi^d_{\hat{A}\hat{B}}, \Lambda \in \text{2-EXT} \},
\]

\[
E_{2-\text{EXT}}(\rho_{AB}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E^{(1)}_{2-\text{EXT}}(\rho_{AB}^\otimes n),
\]

and the following inequality is a direct consequence of definitions:

\[
E^{(1)}_{2-\text{EXT}}(\rho_{AB}) \leq E_{2-\text{EXT}}(\rho_{AB}).
\]

Immediate consequences of definitions and the fact that 1-LOCC operations are contained in the set of two-extendible operations are the following inequalities:

\[
E^{(1)}_{1-\text{LOCC}}(\rho_{AB}) \leq E^{(1)}_{2-\text{EXT}}(\rho_{AB}), \quad E_{1-\text{LOCC}}(\rho_{AB}) \leq E_{2-\text{EXT}}(\rho_{AB}).
\]

The min-unextendible entanglement \( E^u_{\min}(\rho) \), as given in Definition 5, serves as an upper bound on the two-extendible perfect distillable entanglement of \( \rho \).
Theorem 22  For bipartite state $\rho_{AB}$, its asymptotic perfect distillable entanglement under two-extendible operations is bounded from above by the min-unextendible entanglement:

$$E_{2-\text{EXT}}(\rho_{AB}) \leq E^{u}_{\text{min}}(\rho_{AB}).$$  

(153)

Proof. For given bipartite state $\rho_{AB}$, suppose that there is a two-extendible channel $\Lambda_{AB \rightarrow \hat{A}\hat{B}}$ that transforms $\rho_{AB}$ to a maximally entangled state $\Phi^d_{\hat{A}\hat{B}}$. By the monotonicity of the min-unextendible entanglement, the following inequality holds

$$E^{u}_{\text{min}}(\rho_{AB}) \geq E^{u}_{\text{min}}(\Lambda_{AB \rightarrow \hat{A}\hat{B}}(\rho_{AB})) = E^{u}_{\text{min}}(\Phi^d_{\hat{A}\hat{B}}) = \log_2 d.$$  

(154)

Therefore, by optimizing over all two-extendible protocols, it follows that the one-shot perfect distillable entanglement of $\rho_{AB}$ is bounded as

$$E^{(1)}_{2-\text{EXT}}(\rho_{AB}) \leq E^{u}_{\text{min}}(\rho_{AB}).$$  

(155)

Applying the same reasoning to the tensor-power state $\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}$, we find that

$$E_{2-\text{EXT}}(\rho_{AB}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E^{(1)}_{2-\text{EXT}}(\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E^{u}_{\text{min}}(\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}) = E^{u}_{\text{min}}(\rho_{AB}),$$  

(156)

where the final equality is a consequence of Proposition 15.

C. Private states and unextendible entanglement

In this section, we review the definition of a private state [HHHO05, HHHHO09], and then we establish a bound on the number of private bits contained in a private state in terms of the state’s unextendible entanglement. These results find application in the next two sections, where we investigate scenarios similar to what we considered for entanglement distillation. Namely, the next two sections consider the overhead of probabilistic secret key distillation and the distillable perfect secret key.

We first review what is meant by a private state [HHHO05, HHHHO09]. Let $\rho_{ABA'B'} \in S(H_{ABA'B'})$ be a state shared between spatially separated parties Alice and Bob, such that

$$K \equiv \dim(H_A) = \dim(H_B).$$  

(157)

Alice possesses systems $A$ and $A'$ and Bob possesses systems $B$ and $B'$. A state $\rho_{ABA'B'}$ is called a private state [HHHO05, HHHHO09] if Alice and Bob can extract a secret key from it by performing local measurements on $A$ and $B$, which is product with any purifying system of $\rho_{ABA'B'}$. That is, $\rho_{ABA'B'}$ is a private state of $\log_2 K$ private bits if, for any purification $|\varphi^p\rangle_{ABA'B'E}$ of $\rho_{ABA'B'}$, the following holds:

$$(M_A \otimes M_B \otimes \text{Tr}_{A'B'})(\varphi^p_{ABA'B'E}) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} |k\rangle_B \otimes |k\rangle_B \otimes \sigma_E,$$  

(158)

where $M(\cdot) = \sum_{k} |k\rangle_B \langle k| \otimes |k\rangle_B \langle k|$ is a projective measurement channel and $\sigma_E$ is some state on the purifying system. The systems $A$ and $B$ are known as key systems, and $A'$ and $B'$ are known as shield systems. Interestingly, it was shown that a private state of $\log K$ private bits can be written in the following form [HHHO05, HHHHO09]

$$\gamma_{ABA'B'} := U_{ABA'B'} (\Phi_{AB} \otimes \sigma_{A'B'}) U_{ABA'B'}^\dagger,$$  

(159)
where $\Phi_{AB}$ is a maximally entangled state of Schmidt rank $K$, $\sigma_{A'B'}$ is an arbitrary state, and
\[
U_{ABA'B'} := \sum_{i,j=1}^{K} |i\rangle_A \otimes |j\rangle_B \otimes U_{ij}^{ij}_{A'B'}.
\]
(160)
is a controlled unitary known as a “twisting unitary” with each $U_{ij}^{ij}$ a unitary.

We now establish some bounds on the number of private bits contained in a private state, in terms of its unextendible entanglement. As it turns out, the unextendible entanglement of a private state is bounded from below by the generalized mutual information of $\Phi_{AB}$. Recall that the generalized mutual information of a state $\rho_{AB}$ is defined as follows [SW12]:
\[
I_{D}(A;B|\rho) := \inf_{\sigma_B} D(\rho_{AB} \parallel \rho_A \otimes \sigma_B),
\]
(161)where $D$ is the generalized divergence discussed in Section II B.

**Proposition 23** For a $\gamma$-bipartite private state of the form in (159), the following bound holds
\[
E^u(\gamma_{AB'A'B'}) \geq \frac{1}{2} I_{D}(A;B|\Phi).
\]
(162)

**Proof.** Since a maximally entangled state is not extendible, the only possible extension of $\gamma_{AB'A'B'}$ has the following form:
\[
\gamma_{ABEA'B'E'} = U_{ABA'B'} (\Phi_{AB} \otimes \sigma_{EA'B'E'}) U_{ABA'B'}^\dagger
\]
(163)
\[
= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i,j} |i\rangle_A \otimes |j\rangle_B \otimes U_{ij}^{ii}_{A'B'} \sigma_{EA'B'E'}^i U_{ij}^{jj}_{A'B'} U_{ij}^{ii}_{A'B'}^\dagger, 
\]
(164)where $\sigma_{EA'B'E'}$ is an extension of $\sigma_{A'B'}$ such that $E \simeq B$ and $E' \simeq B'$. Observe that if we define a different twisting unitary $V_{ABA'B'}$ as
\[
V_{ABA'B'} := \sum_{i,j} |i\rangle_A \otimes |j\rangle_B \otimes U_{ij}^{ii}_{A'B'}, 
\]
(165)
\[
= \sum_{i} |i\rangle_A \otimes I_B \otimes U_{ij}^{ii}_{A'B'}, 
\]
(166)then
\[
V_{ABA'B'} (\Phi_{AB} \otimes \sigma_{EA'B'E'}) V_{ABA'B'}^\dagger = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i,j} |i\rangle_A \otimes |j\rangle_B \otimes U_{ij}^{ii}_{A'B'} \sigma_{EA'B'E'}^i (U_{ij}^{jj}_{A'B'})^\dagger, 
\]
(167)
\[
= \gamma_{ABEA'B'E'}
\]
(168)
Then we find that
\[
\gamma_{AE'A'E'} = \text{Tr}_{BB'}[\gamma_{ABEA'B'E'}] 
\]
(169)
\[
= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i} |i\rangle_A \otimes \text{Tr}_{B'}[U_{ij}^{ii}_{A'B'} \sigma_{EA'B'E'}^i (U_{ij}^{jj}_{A'B'})^\dagger] 
\]
(170)
Now consider that
\[
D(\gamma_{AB'A'B'} \parallel \gamma_{AE'A'E'}) 
\]
(171)
where the inequality follows from monotonicity under partial trace. Observe that

\[
V_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'}^\dagger \gamma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'} V_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'}
= \left( \sum_{i,i'} |i\rangle \langle i'|_{\mathcal{A} \otimes I_{\mathcal{B}'} \otimes U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii'}\dagger} \right) \left( \frac{1}{d} \sum_i |i\rangle \langle i|_{\mathcal{A} \otimes \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{B}'}[U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii'} \sigma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'} \gamma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'} (U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii'})\dagger]} \right)
\times \left( \sum_{i',i''} |i''\rangle \langle i'|_{\mathcal{A} \otimes I_{\mathcal{B}'} \otimes U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii''}\dagger} \right)
= \frac{1}{d} \sum_i |i\rangle \langle i|_{\mathcal{A} \otimes U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii}\dagger} \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{B}'}[U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii} \sigma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'} \gamma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'} (U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii})\dagger] U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii},
\]

so that

\[
\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{A} \mathcal{B}'}[V_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'}^\dagger \gamma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'} V_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'}]
= \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{A} \mathcal{B}'} \left[ \frac{1}{d} \sum_i |i\rangle \langle i|_{\mathcal{A} \otimes U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii}\dagger} \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{B}'}[U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii} \sigma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'} \gamma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'} (U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii})\dagger] U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii} \right]
= \frac{1}{d} \sum_i \langle i| \otimes \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{B}'} \left[ U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii} \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{B}'}[U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii} \sigma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'} \gamma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'} (U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii})\dagger] U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii} \right]
= \frac{1}{d} \sum_i |i\rangle \langle i|_{\mathcal{A} \otimes \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{B}'}[U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii} \sigma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'} \gamma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'} (U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii})\dagger]}
= \frac{1}{d} \sum_i |i\rangle \langle i|_{\mathcal{A} \otimes \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{B}'}[U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii} \sigma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'} \gamma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'} (U_{\mathcal{A}'}^{ii})\dagger]}
= \pi_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathcal{E}}.
\]

So we find that

\[
\mathbf{D}(\gamma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'} \| \gamma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'} \geq \mathbf{D}(\Phi_{\mathcal{AB}} \| \pi_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathcal{E}}) \geq I_{\mathbf{D}}(A; B)_{\Phi}.
\]

Since this bound holds for any extension \(\gamma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'} \| \gamma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'}\) of \(\gamma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'}\), we conclude (162) after normalizing by 1/2.

As a corollary of Proposition 23 and Lemmas 7, 8, and 9, we find that if the generalized divergence is set to be the Petz-, sandwiched, or geometric Rényi relative entropy, then the unextendible entanglement of a \(\gamma\)-bipartite private state is bounded from below by the amount of secret key that can be extracted from the state.

**Corollary 24** If the generalized divergence is the Petz-, sandwiched, or geometric Rényi relative entropy with \(\alpha\) set so that data processing is satisfied, then the following bound holds

\[
E_{\alpha}^{\gamma}(\gamma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'} \| \gamma_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}'} \geq \log_2 K.
\]

Note that the corollary above includes the relative entropy, the min-relative entropy, and the max-relative entropy.
D. Overhead of probabilistic secret key distillation

Related to the overhead of probabilistic entanglement distillation discussed previously in Section IV A, we can also consider the overhead of probabilistic secret key distillation. The basic definitions are similar to those from Section IV A.

We now define the overhead of probabilistic secret key distillation:

**Definition 8** The overhead of distilling \( k \) private bits from several independent copies of a bipartite state \( \rho_{AB} \) is given by the minimum number of copies of \( \rho_{AB} \) needed, on average, to produce some private state \( \gamma^k_{ABA'B'} \) with logarith \( K = k \) using 1-LOCC operations:

\[
K_{ov}(\rho_{AB}, k) := \inf \left\{ \frac{n}{p} : \Lambda(\rho_{AB}^\otimes n) \to \gamma^k_{ABA'B'} \text{ with prob. } p, \Lambda \text{ is 1-LOCC} \right\}.
\]

We can also define the overhead when selective two-extendible operations are allowed:

\[
K_{ov,2}(\rho_{AB}, k) := \inf \left\{ \frac{n}{p} : \Lambda(\rho_{AB}^\otimes n) \to \gamma^k_{ABA'B'} \text{ with prob. } p, \Lambda \text{ is selective two-extendible} \right\}.
\]

Note that it is not necessary to produce a particular private state \( \gamma^k_{ABA'B'} \), but rather just some private state \( \gamma^k_{ABA'B'} \) having \( k \) private bits.

The following inequality is a trivial consequence of definitions and the fact that a 1-LOCC operation is a special kind of selective two-extendible operation:

\[
K_{ov}(\rho_{AB}, k) \geq K_{ov,2}(\rho_{AB}, k).
\]

**Theorem 25** For a bipartite state \( \rho_{AB} \), the overhead of distilling \( k \) private bits from \( \rho_{AB} \) is bounded from below by

\[
E_{ov,2}(\rho_{AB}, k) \geq \frac{k}{E^u(\rho_{AB})},
\]

where the unextendible entanglement is given in Definition 95.

**Proof.** The proof proceeds exactly the same as the proof of Theorem 21, but we instead invoke Corollary 24 in (144). \( \square \)

E. Perfect secret key distillation

Considering the importance of a \( \gamma \)-bipartite private state, it is natural to consider the task of secret key distillation, which aims to distill a private state \( \gamma_{ABA'B'} \), defined in (159), from a given bipartite state, using available operations.

The one-shot 1-LOCC perfect distillable key of \( \rho_{AB} \) is defined to be the maximum number of private bits achievable via a 1-LOCC channel; that is,

\[
K_{1-LOCC}^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}) := \sup \{ k : \Lambda_{AB \to ABA'B'}(\rho_{AB}) = \gamma^k_{ABA'B'}, \Lambda \in \text{1-LOCC} \},
\]

where \( \gamma^k_{ABA'B'} \) is any private state with \( k \) private bits. The 1-LOCC perfect distillable key of a state \( \rho_{AB} \) is then defined as the regularization of \( K_{1-LOCC}^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}) \):

\[
K_{1-LOCC}(\rho_{AB}) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} K_{1-LOCC}^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}^\otimes n).
\]
Note that the following inequality holds as a direct consequence of definitions:

\[ K_{1\text{-LOCC}}^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}) \leq K_{1\text{-LOCC}}(\rho_{AB}). \]  

(190)

The one-shot two-extendible perfect distillable key and two-extendible perfect distillable key of \( \rho_{AB} \) are defined similarly:

\[ K_{2\text{-EXT}}^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}) := \sup \{ k : \Lambda_{AB} \to \hat{A} \hat{B} \Lambda'_{A'B'}(\rho_{AB}) = \gamma^k_{A\hat{B},A'B'}, \Lambda \in 2\text{-EXT} \}, \]  

(191)

\[ K_{2\text{-EXT}}(\rho_{AB}) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} K_{2\text{-EXT}}^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}^\otimes n), \]  

(192)

and the following inequality holds as a direct consequence of definitions:

\[ K_{2\text{-EXT}}^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}) \leq K_{2\text{-EXT}}(\rho_{AB}). \]  

(193)

Immediate consequences of definitions and the fact that 1-LOCC operations are contained in the set of two-extendible operations are the following inequalities:

\[ K_{1\text{-LOCC}}^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}) \leq K_{2\text{-EXT}}^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}), \quad K_{1\text{-LOCC}}(\rho_{AB}) \leq K_{2\text{-EXT}}(\rho_{AB}), \]  

(194)

The min-unextendible entanglement \( E_{\text{min}}^u(\rho) \), as given in Definition 5, serves as an upper bound on the two-extendible perfect distillable key of \( \rho \).

**Theorem 26** For a bipartite state \( \rho_{AB} \), its asymptotic perfect distillable key under two-extendible operations is bounded from above as

\[ K_{2\text{-EXT}}(\rho_{AB}) \leq E_{\text{min}}^u(\rho_{AB}). \]  

(195)

**Proof.** The proof proceeds exactly as in the proof of Theorem 22, but we instead invoke Corollary 24 in (154). \( \blacksquare \)

**F. Examples**

In this section, we apply our bounds on the overhead of probabilistic entanglement or secret key distillation to two classes of states: isotropic states and erased states. We compare our lower bounds and other known estimations of the overhead to upper bounds derived from known distillation protocols. In particular, we show that our lower bound on the overhead of distillation is tight for erased states.

To begin with, recall the Rains relative entropy [Rai00, ADMVV02]:

\[ R(\rho_{AB}) := \min_{\sigma_{AB} \in \text{PPT}'} D(\rho_{AB} \| \sigma_{AB}), \]  

(196)

where PPT\(^\prime\)(A:B) is a set of subnormalized states defined as

\[ \text{PPT}^\prime(A:B) := \{ \sigma_{AB} : \sigma_{AB} \geq 0, \| \sigma_{AB}^{T_B} \|_1 \leq 1 \}. \]  

(197)

Since selective LOCC preserves the set PPT\(^\prime\) [TWW17, Eq. (23)], it follows that the Rains relative entropy \( R(\rho_{AB}) \) is monotone under selective LOCC by an argument similar to that given in the proof of Theorem 5. Thus, the Rains relative entropy \( R(\rho_{AB}) \) can be used to estimate the overhead of distillation under selective LOCC via an approach similar to that given in the proof of Theorem 21.
Isotropic states: We investigate the class of so-called isotropic states \( \rho_r \), defined as
\[
\rho_r = r \cdot \Phi(d) + (1 - r) \frac{I - \Phi(d)}{d^2 - 1},
\]
where \( r \in [0, 1] \), so that \( \rho_r \) is a convex mixture of a maximally entangled state and its orthogonal complement. Let us consider the case \( d = 2 \) for simplicity. Figure 1 plots the unextendible entanglement and Rains relative entropy for the overhead of probabilistic entanglement or secret key distillation for this set of states.

Erased states: We also consider the class of erased states, which are the Choi states of quantum erasure channels [GBP97]:
\[
\rho^e_{A'B'} = (1 - \varepsilon)\Phi_{AB} + \varepsilon|e\rangle\langle e|_{A'} \otimes \pi_B,
\]
where \( \varepsilon \in [0, 1] \), \( \Phi_{AB} \) is the maximally entangled state and \(|e\rangle\) is some state that is orthogonal to \( \pi_A \). For simplicity, we choose \( d_A = d_B = 2 \) (qubit system), and \( d_{A'} = d_A + 1 = 3 \). This state can be obtained by Alice and Bob preshare a two-qubit maximally entangled state \( \Phi_{AB} \), Alice transmits her local copy with probability \( 1 - \varepsilon \) and “erases” it (replaces it with the erasure flag state \( e \)) with probability \( \varepsilon \).

Interestingly, there is a simple formula for the unextendible entanglement of the erased state.

Proposition 27 The unextendible entanglement of the erased state \( \rho^e_{A'B'} \) is \( E^u(\rho^e_{A'B'}) = 1 - \varepsilon \).

Proof. Note that the erased state \( \rho^e_{A'B'} \) can be written in the following direct-sum form:
\[
\rho^e_{A'B'} = (1 - \varepsilon)\Phi_{AB} \oplus \varepsilon\pi_B = \begin{bmatrix}
(1 - \varepsilon)\Phi_{AB} & 0 \\
0 & \varepsilon\pi_B
\end{bmatrix}
\]
From this fact, one can see that each extension \( \rho_{A'BB'} \) of \( \rho^e_{A'B'} \) has the form
\[
\rho_{A'BB'} := \begin{bmatrix}
(1 - \varepsilon)\sigma_{ABB'} & 0 \\
0 & \varepsilon\sigma_{BB'}
\end{bmatrix}
\]
such that $\text{Tr}_{B'} \sigma_{AB'B'} = \Phi_{AB}$ and $\text{Tr}_{B'} \sigma_{BB'} = \pi_B$. What is more, any extension of $\Phi_{AB}$ necessarily has the form $\sigma_{AB'B'} := \Phi_{AB} \otimes \tau_{B'}$, where $\tau_{B'}$ is a state on system $B'$. Thus

$$E^u(\rho_{AB}^\varepsilon) = \inf_{\rho_{A'B'B} \text{ st. Eq. (201)}} \frac{1}{2} D(\rho_{AB}^\varepsilon\|\rho_{A'B'})$$

$$= \inf_{\tau_{B',\rho_{B'}}} \frac{1}{2} D \left( \begin{bmatrix} (1-\varepsilon)\Phi_{AB} & 0 \\ 0 & \varepsilon\pi_B \end{bmatrix} \left| \begin{bmatrix} (1-\varepsilon)\pi_A \otimes \tau_{B'} & 0 \\ 0 & \varepsilon\sigma_{B'} \end{bmatrix} \right. \right)$$

$$= (1-\varepsilon) \inf_{\tau_{B'}} \frac{1}{2} D(\Phi_{AB}\|\pi_A \otimes \tau_{B'}) + \varepsilon \inf_{\sigma_{B'}} \frac{1}{2} D(\pi_B\|\sigma_{B'})$$

$$= (1-\varepsilon) \frac{1}{2} I(A;B)_{\Phi}$$

$$= (1-\varepsilon),$$

where $I(A;B)_{\rho}$ is the quantum mutual information of $\rho_{AB}$.

**Theorem 28** For the erased state $\rho_{AB}^\varepsilon$, we have

$$E_{ov}(\rho_{AB}^\varepsilon, 1) = E_{ov,2}(\rho_{AB}^\varepsilon, 1) = \frac{1}{E^u(\rho_{AB}^\varepsilon)} = \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}. \quad (207)$$

**Proof.** In Theorem 21, we showed that $1/E^u(\rho_{AB}^\varepsilon) \equiv 1/(1-\varepsilon)$ is a lower bound on the overhead of probabilistically distilling one ebit from $\rho_{AB}^\varepsilon$.

To show the tightness of the lower bound, we propose a one-way LOCC protocol that achieves this lower bound. Given $\rho_{AB}^\varepsilon$, Alice detects whether her local system is erased or not by performing a binary measurement $\{1_A, |\varepsilon\rangle\langle\varepsilon|\}$. With probability $1-\varepsilon$, she finds that the system is not erased. Then she sends this information to Bob, and the protocol finishes with one ebit shared between them.

Therefore, our estimation on the overhead of distilling ebits from erased states under selective one-way LOCC is optimal in the sense that the upper bound on the overhead of the above protocol matches our lower bound from Theorem 21, thus characterizing the ability of probabilistic distillation for erased states. Note that this result can be generalized to multiple copies of the erased state.

In the following proposition, we further consider the overhead of distillation under LOCC operations for the erased states.

**Proposition 29** The Rains bound of the erased state $\rho_{AB}^\varepsilon$ is $R(\rho_{AB}^\varepsilon) = 1-\varepsilon$, which implies that the overhead of distillation under selective LOCC for $\rho_{AB}^\varepsilon$ is given by $(1-\varepsilon)^{-1}$.

**Proof.** Since $1/R(\rho)$ is a lower bound on the overhead of distillation using selective LOCC, it follows from the optimality of erased state distillation under one-way LOCC that $1/(1-\varepsilon) \geq 1/R(\rho_{AB}^\varepsilon)$. This gives $R(\rho_{AB}^\varepsilon) \geq 1-\varepsilon$.

It then suffices to construct a feasible state to achieve the lower bound, and here we follow an approach similar to that from [TWW17, Proposition 11]. Consider the following state

$$\sigma_{AB} := \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2} (|00\rangle\langle00| + |11\rangle\langle11|) + \varepsilon |\varepsilon\rangle\langle\varepsilon| \otimes \pi_B. \quad (208)$$

The state $\sigma_{AB}$ is a separable state and thus $\sigma_{AB} \in \text{PPT}'(A':B)$. It then holds that

$$R(\rho_{AB}^\varepsilon) \leq D(\rho_{AB}^\varepsilon\|\sigma_{AB}) \quad (209)$$
\[ D \left( (1 - \varepsilon)\Phi_{AB} \oplus \varepsilon \pi_B \right) \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{2} (|00\rangle\langle 00| + |11\rangle\langle 11|) \oplus \varepsilon \pi_B \]  
\[ = (1 - \varepsilon) D(\Phi_{AB} \parallel (|00\rangle\langle 00| + |11\rangle\langle 11|)/2) \]  
\[ = 1 - \varepsilon. \]  

This concludes the proof.

Proposition 29 indicates an interesting fact that the optimal protocol for distilling one ebit from erased states under one-way LOCC operations matches the lower bound \(1/R(\rho'_{A:B}) \equiv 1/(1 - \varepsilon)\) on the overhead under LOCC operations. This reveals that one-way LOCC operations have the same power and performance as LOCC operations in probabilistically distilling ebits from erased states.

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have established a state-dependent resource theory, which is useful in quantifying the unextendibility of entanglement. Our approach was inspired by the fact that the more a bipartite state is entangled, the less that each of its individual systems can be entangled with a third party. Our work has extended this fundamental feature to a quantifiable property, by considering the state-dependent free states. Our results shed light on fundamental problems in the study of manipulating entanglement as a resource. In particular, we have introduced a comprehensive set of measures called unextendible entanglement that directly quantify the unextendibility of entanglement, and we have shown that they are monotone under two-extendible operations, which include local operations and one-way classical communication as a special case. Unextendible entanglement has several other desirable properties—some of the unextendible entanglement quantities are simple to analyze and are efficiently computable.

Furthermore, as applications, the unextendible entanglement quantities in our work have found immediate operational applications in evaluating the overhead of probabilistic entanglement or secret key distillation, as well in bounding the rate of perfect entanglement or secret key distillation. Applying the unextendible entanglement, we in particular characterize the optimal overhead of distilling one ebit from the erased states under 1-LOCC operations. We also remark that our results on the overhead can be easily extended to the probabilistic state conversion task, which has been considered for the special pure-state case in \([\text{Vid}99, \text{AOP}16]\).

An important problem for future work is to investigate to what extent the bounds on the asymptotic distillable secret key or entanglement can be approached. One potential approach is to explore the connections to distinguishability distillation (i.e., hypothesis testing) \([\text{Nag}06, \text{Hay}07, \text{ANSV}08, \text{MO}15, \text{WW}19]\). It is also of interest to consider the extension to resource theory of \(k\)-unextendibility as well as entanglement dilution \([\text{BDSW}96, \text{HIT}01, \text{VDC}02, \text{WD}17a, \text{BD}11, \text{WW}18]\). The techniques applied in \([\text{XFWD}17]\) might be useful. We hope that the idea of a state-dependent resource theory could provide insights for the study of other topics in quantum resource distillation \([\text{LBT}19, \text{VCH}19, \text{RFW}19]\), including, for example, coherence \([\text{RFWA}18, \text{F}W\text{L}^{+}18, \text{LRA}19, \text{ZLY}^{+}19]\) or non-stabilizerness \([\text{BK}05, \text{BH}12, \text{CAB}12, \text{WWS}18, \text{FL}19, \text{KT}19, \text{WWS}19]\). Another interesting direction is to develop the continuous-variable setting, where the results of \([\text{LKA}W19]\) could be helpful, as well as the dynamical setting of quantum channels.
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Appendix A: Proof of Lemma 8

Without loss of generality, let $\sigma_B$ be an arbitrary state with support equal to the support of the reduced state $\psi_B$. Then we have that

\[ \tilde{D}_\alpha(\psi_{AB}||\psi_A \otimes \sigma_B) \]
\[ = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 Tr \left[ \left( \psi_{AB}^{1/2} (\psi_A \otimes \sigma_B)^{1-\alpha} \psi_{AB}^{1/2} \right)^{\alpha} \right] \]
\[ = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 Tr \left[ \left( \psi_{AB} (\psi_A \otimes \sigma_B)^{1-\alpha} \psi_{AB} \right)^{\alpha} \right] \]
\[ = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 Tr \left[ \left( |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{AB} (\psi_A \otimes \sigma_B)^{1-\alpha} |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{AB} \right)^{\alpha} \right] \]
\[ = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 Tr \left[ \left( \left| \langle\psi|_{AB} (\psi_A \otimes \sigma_B)^{1-\alpha} \right| |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{AB} \right)^{\alpha} \right] \]
\[ = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 Tr \left[ \left( Tr \left[ \psi_{AB} (\psi_A \otimes \sigma_B)^{1-\alpha} \right] |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{AB} \right)^{\alpha} \right] \]
\[ = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 \left[ \psi_{AB} (\psi_A \otimes \sigma_B)^{1-\alpha} \right] \]
For any pure bipartite state $\psi_{AB}$, there exists an operator $X_A$ such that $\psi_{AB} = X_A \Gamma_{AB} X_A^\dagger$ and $\text{Tr}[X_A X_A^\dagger] = 1$, which implies that $\psi_A = X_A X_A^\dagger$. Note that we define

$$
\Gamma_{AB} := |\Gamma\rangle\langle\Gamma|_{AB}, \quad |\Gamma\rangle_{AB} := \sum_{i=1}^d |i\rangle_A |i\rangle_B,
$$

(A8)

where $\{|i\rangle_A\}_i$ and $\{|i\rangle_B\}_i$ are orthonormal bases. Furthermore, by taking the polar decomposition of $X_A$, there exists a unitary $U_A$ and a density operator $\rho_A$ (having the same spectrum as $\psi_A$) such that $X_A = U_A \sqrt{\rho_A}$. Then consider that the last line above is equal to

$$
\frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 \text{Tr} \left[ \psi_{AB} (\psi_A \otimes \sigma_B)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \right] = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 \text{Tr} \left[ X_A \Gamma_{AB} X_A^\dagger \left( X_A X_A^\dagger \otimes \sigma_B \right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \right],
$$

(A9)

$$
= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 \text{Tr} \left[ X_A \Gamma_{AB} X_A^\dagger \left( \left( X_A X_A^\dagger \right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \otimes \sigma_B^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \right) \right],
$$

(A10)

$$
= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 \text{Tr} \left[ \Gamma_{AB} \left( X_A X_A^\dagger \right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \otimes \sigma_B^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \right],
$$

(A11)

$$
= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 \text{Tr} \left[ \Gamma_{AB} \left( \sqrt{\rho_A U_A^\dagger} \left( U_A \rho_A U_A^\dagger \right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} U_A \sqrt{\rho_A} \otimes \sigma_B^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \right) \right],
$$

(A12)

$$
= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 \text{Tr} \left[ \Gamma_{AB} \left( \rho_A^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \otimes \sigma_B^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \right) \right],
$$

(A13)

$$
= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 \text{Tr} \left[ \Gamma_{AB} \left( \frac{1}{\alpha} T(\sigma_A^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \otimes I_B) \right) \right],
$$

(A14)

$$
= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 \text{Tr} \left[ \frac{1}{\alpha} \psi_A T(\sigma_A^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}) \right].
$$

(A15)

In the above, $T(\sigma)$ denotes the transpose of the state $\sigma$. Now taking a minimum over states $\sigma$ and applying [MLDS+13, Lemma 12], we find that

$$
\min_{\sigma} \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 \text{Tr} \left[ \rho_A^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} T(\sigma_A^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}) \right] = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 \left\| \frac{1}{\alpha} \psi_A T(\sigma_A^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}) \right\|_{\alpha/(2\alpha-1)}
$$

$$
= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \frac{2\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \log_2 \text{Tr} \left[ (\rho_A^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}})^{\alpha/(2\alpha-1)} \right],
$$

(A16)

$$
= \frac{2\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 1} \log_2 \text{Tr}[\rho_A^{\frac{1}{2\alpha-1}}],
$$

(A17)

$$
= \frac{2}{1 - (1/[2\alpha - 1])} \log_2 \text{Tr}[\rho_A^{\frac{1}{2\alpha-1}}],
$$

(A18)

$$
= 2H_{[2\alpha-1]^{-1}}(\rho_A).
$$

(A19)

The conclusion that $H_{[2\alpha-1]^{-1}}(\rho_A) = H_{[2\alpha-1]^{-1}}(\psi_A)$ follows because $\rho_A$ and $\psi_A$ have the same spectrum.

**Appendix B: Proof of Lemma 9**

Consider that

$$
\psi_{AB} = \psi_A^{1/2} \Gamma_{AB} \psi_A^{1/2},
$$

(B1)
where

\[ \Gamma_{AB} := |\Gamma\rangle \langle \Gamma|_{AB}, \quad \Gamma_{AB} := \sum_{i=1}^{d} |i\rangle_{A} \langle i|_{B}, \]  

(B2)

\{ |i\rangle_{A}\}_{i} and \{ |i\rangle_{B}\}_{i} are the orthonormal bases for the Schmidt decomposition of \( \psi_{AB} \), and \( d \) is the Schmidt rank of \( \psi_{AB} \). Then, by noting that it suffices to optimize over states \( \sigma_{B} \) having the same support as \( \psi_{B} \), we find that

\[ \hat{I}_{\alpha}(A; B)_{\psi} := \min_{\sigma_{B}} \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log_{2} \text{Tr} \left[ (\psi_{A} \otimes \sigma_{B}) \left( (\psi_{A} \otimes \sigma_{B})^{-1/2} \psi_{AB} (\psi_{A} \otimes \sigma_{B})^{-1/2} \right)^{\alpha} \right] \]  

(B3)

Consider that

\[ \text{Tr} \left[ (\psi_{A} \otimes \sigma_{B}) \left( (\psi_{A}^{-1/2} \otimes \sigma_{B}^{-1/2}) \psi_{AB} (\psi_{A}^{-1/2} \otimes \sigma_{B}^{-1/2}) \right)^{\alpha} \right] = \text{Tr} \left[ (\psi_{A} \otimes \sigma_{B}) \left( \frac{\sigma_{B}^{-1/2} \Gamma_{AB} \sigma_{B}^{-1/2}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_{B}^{-1}]} \right)^{\alpha} \right] \]  

(B5)

\[ = \text{Tr} \left[ (\psi_{A} \otimes \sigma_{B}) \left( \frac{\sigma_{B}^{-1/2} \Gamma_{AB} \sigma_{B}^{-1/2}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_{B}^{-1}]} \right)^{\alpha} \right] \left( \text{Tr}[\sigma_{B}^{-1}] \right)^{\alpha} \]  

(B6)

\[ = \text{Tr} \left[ (\psi_{A} \otimes \sigma_{B}) \frac{\sigma_{B}^{-1/2} \Gamma_{AB} \sigma_{B}^{-1/2}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_{B}^{-1}]} \right] \left( \text{Tr}[\sigma_{B}^{-1}] \right)^{\alpha - 1} \]  

(B7)

\[ = \text{Tr} \left[ (\psi_{A} \Gamma_{AB}) \left( \text{Tr}[\sigma_{B}^{-1}] \right)^{\alpha - 1} \right] \]  

(B8)

\[ = (\text{Tr}[\sigma_{B}^{-1}])^{\alpha - 1} \]  

(B9)

In the fourth step, we are using the fact that \( \sigma_{B}^{-1/2}|\Gamma\rangle_{AB} \) is a vector with norm

\[ \|\sigma_{B}^{-1/2}|\Gamma\rangle_{AB}\|_{2} = \sqrt{\langle \Gamma|_{AB} \sigma_{B}^{-1/2} \sigma_{B}^{-1/2} |\Gamma\rangle_{AB}} = \sqrt{\langle \Gamma|_{AB} \sigma_{B}^{-1} |\Gamma\rangle_{AB}} \]  

(B11)

(B12)

Then it follows that

\[ \hat{I}_{\alpha}(A; B)_{\psi} = \min_{\sigma_{B}} \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log_{2} \left( \text{Tr}[\sigma_{B}^{-1}] \right)^{\alpha - 1} \]  

(B14)

\[ = \min_{\sigma_{B}} \log_{2} \text{Tr}[\sigma_{B}^{-1}] \]  

(B15)

The minimum value occurs when \( \sigma_{B} \) is the maximally mixed state \( \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^{d} |i\rangle \langle i|_{B} \). To conclude this final step, one can use the Lagrange multiplier method. So then the equality in the statement of Lemma 9 follows.

Appendix C: Dual SDP of unextendible fidelity

Here we derive the dual SDP of the primal SDP (123) for unextendible fidelity. We follow an argument similar to that given in [BT16]. We first bring the primal program into standard form...
which expresses the primal problem as a maximization over \(X \geq 0\) of the functional \(\text{Tr}[XA]\) subject to \(\Phi(X) = B\). Hence, we set
\[
X = \begin{pmatrix}
X_{11} & X_{12} & \cdots \\
Z_{AB} & X_{22} & \cdots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots
\end{pmatrix}, \quad A = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix}
0 & \mathbb{1}_{AB} & 0 \\
\mathbb{1}_{AB} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix}
\rho_{AB} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \rho_{AB}
\end{pmatrix},
\]
and
\[
\Phi(X) := \begin{pmatrix}
X_{11} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & X_{22} - \text{Tr}_{B} \sigma_{ABB'} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \text{Tr}_{B'} \sigma_{ABB'}
\end{pmatrix}
\]
(C2)
The variables with the placeholder '·' are of no interest. The dual SDP is a minimization over self-adjoint \(Y\) of the functional \(\text{Tr}[YB]\) subject to \(\Phi^{\dagger}(Y) \geq A\). The dual variables and adjoint map can be determined to be
\[
Y = \begin{pmatrix}
Y_{11} & \cdots & \cdots \\
\cdots & Y_{22} & \cdots \\
\cdots & \cdots & Y_{33}
\end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi^{\dagger}(Y) := \begin{pmatrix}
Y_{11} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & Y_{22} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & Y_{33} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B'} - Y_{22} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B}
\end{pmatrix}
\]
(C3)
This leads to the following dual problem:
\[
\min \quad \text{Tr} [(Y_{11} + Y_{33})\rho_{AB}]
\]
\[
s.t. \quad \begin{pmatrix}
Y_{11} & 0 \\
0 & Y_{22}
\end{pmatrix} \geq \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix}
0 & \mathbb{1}_{AB} \\
\mathbb{1}_{AB} & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\]
\[
Y_{33} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B'} \geq Y_{22} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B}
\]
\[
Y_{11}, Y_{22}, Y_{33} \in \mathcal{H}(AB)
\]
(C4)
The Slater condition for strong duality is satisfied, using the fact that the primal problem is feasible and the dual problem is strictly feasible. Let \(\sigma_{B'}\) be a quantum state, the operator
\[
X^* = \begin{pmatrix}
\rho_{AB} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \rho_{A} \otimes \sigma_{B'} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \rho_{AB} \otimes \sigma_{B'}
\end{pmatrix}
\]
(C5)
is primal feasible since \(X \geq 0\) and \(\Phi(X^*) = B\). For the dual problem, the operator
\[
Y^* = \begin{pmatrix}
\mathbb{1}_{AB} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \mathbb{1}_{AB} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 2\mathbb{1}_{AB}
\end{pmatrix}
\]
(C6)
is strictly feasible since
\[
\Phi^{\dagger}(Y^*) = \begin{pmatrix}
\mathbb{1}_{AB} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \mathbb{1}_{AB} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \mathbb{1}_{AB} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B'}
\end{pmatrix} \geq \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix}
0 & \mathbb{1}_{AB} & 0 \\
\mathbb{1}_{AB} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} = A.
\]
(C7)
The dual problem (C4) can be further simplified since the matrix inequality holds if and only if \(Y_{11}, Y_{22} > 0\) and \(Y_{22} \geq Y_{11}^{-1}\) [Wat13]. Without loss of generality we can choose \(Y_{22} = Y_{11}^{-1}\), and the problem simplifies to
\[
\inf \quad \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [(Y_{AB'}^{-1} + Z_{AB})\rho_{AB}]
\]
\[
s.t. \quad Z_{AB} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B'} \geq Y_{AB'} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B}
\]
\[
Y_{AB'} > 0
\]
(C8)
By the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality, it holds that
\[
\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [Y_{AB}'^{-1} \rho_{AB}] + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [Z_{AB} \rho_{AB}] \geq \sqrt{\text{Tr}[Y_{AB}'^{-1} \rho_{AB}] \text{Tr}[Z_{AB} \rho_{AB}]} \tag{C9}
\]
for every $Y_{AB}' > 0$, with equality when the two terms are equal. For any feasible pair $(Y_{AB}', Z_{AB})$, there exists a constant $\lambda > 0$ such that the two trace terms evaluated on $(\lambda Y_{AB}', \lambda Z_{AB})$ are equal. Hence, we can restrict the optimization to such rescaled pairs of operators, resulting
\[
\inf \sqrt{\text{Tr}[Y_{AB}'^{-1} \rho_{AB}] \text{Tr}[Z_{AB} \rho_{AB}]}
\]
\[
\text{s.t. } Z_{AB} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B'} \geq Y_{AB}' \otimes \mathbb{1}_B \tag{C10}
\]
\[
Y_{AB}' > 0
\]
We remark that this equivalent representation of the dual problem is essential when proving the multiplicativity of unextendible fidelity.