

Relative Entropy and Catalytic Relative Majorization

Soorya Rethinasamy^{1,2} and Mark M. Wilde^{2,3}

¹*Birla Institute of Technology and Science, Pilani, Rajasthan 333031, India*

²*Hearne Institute for Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics and Astronomy,
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803, USA*

³*Center for Computation and Technology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803, USA*

Given two pairs of quantum states, a fundamental question in the resource theory of asymmetric distinguishability is to determine whether there exists a quantum channel converting one pair to the other. In this work, we reframe this question in such a way that a catalyst can be used to help perform the transformation, with the only constraint on the catalyst being that its reduced state is returned unchanged, so that it can be used again to assist a future transformation. What we find here, for the special case in which the states in a given pair are commuting, and thus quasi-classical, is that this catalytic transformation can be performed if and only if the relative entropy of one pair of states is larger than that of the other pair. This result endows the relative entropy with a fundamental operational meaning that goes beyond its traditional interpretation in the setting of independent and identical resources. Our finding thus has an immediate application and interpretation in the resource theory of asymmetric distinguishability, and we expect it to find application in other domains.

I. INTRODUCTION

The majorization partial ordering has been studied in the light of the following question [HLP52]: What does it mean for one probability distribution to be more disordered than another? While there exist several equivalent characterizations of majorization, the most fundamental is arguably the notion that a distribution p majorizes another distribution p' when p' can be obtained from p by the action of a doubly stochastic map. This captures the intuition that p' is more disordered than p (see Subsection A 4 for technical details).

The theory of majorization has several widespread applications, some of which are in quantum resource theories [CG19]. For example, transformations of pure bipartite states by means of local operations and classical communication can be analyzed in terms of majorization of the Schmidt coefficients of the states [Nie99]. Majorization has been shown to determine whether state transformations are possible not just in the resource theory of entanglement, but also coherence [ZMC+17, WY16] and purity [HHO03] as well.

As it turns out, majorization is a special case of a more general concept introduced in [Vei71] and now called relative majorization [Ren16, BG17]. This more general notion also has a rich history in the context of statistics, where it goes by the name of “statistical comparison” or “comparison of experiments” [Bla53]. To recall the notion, a pair (p, q) of probability distributions p and q relatively majorizes another pair (p', q') of probability distributions p' and q' if there exists a classical channel (conditional probability distribution) that converts p to p' and q to q' . That is, (p, q) relatively majorizes (p', q') if there exists a stochastic matrix N such that $p' = Np$ and $q' = Nq$. In each pair, if the second distribution is the uniform distribution, relative majorization collapses to majorization, demonstrating that relative majorization is indeed a generalization of majorization.




FIG. 1. (p, q) is a pair of distributions to be converted to another pair (p', q') by means of a classical channel and with the use of the catalyst pair (r, s) . The state t' after transformation has first marginal p' and second marginal r . Dotted arrows indicate marginal distributions.

Another generalization of majorization comes in the form of catalysis [JP99]. A catalyst is an ancillary distribution whose presence enables certain transformations that would otherwise be impossible, with the only constraint is that its reduced state is returned unchanged. Catalysis has found application in various resource theories, including entanglement [JP99, DK01], thermodynamics [BHN+15], and purity [BEG+19].

In this paper, we reformulate the transformation task in relative majorization by allowing for a catalyst that can aid the transformation. In this scenario, a catalyst consists of an arbitrary pair (r, s) of probability distributions r and s that can be used in conjunction with the original input pair (p, q) to generate the output pair (p', q') by means of a classical channel Λ acting on $p \otimes r$ and $q \otimes s$. To make the catalytic task non-trivial, we demand that the first and second marginals of $\Lambda(p \otimes r)$ are p' and r , respectively. We also demand that $\Lambda(q \otimes s)$ be exactly equal to $q' \otimes s$. As a consequence of this demand, the catalyst is returned unchanged and can be used in future catalytic tasks for distributions that are independent of p and p' . We call this task *relative majorization assisted by a catalyst with correlations*, and the task is succinctly summarized in Figure 1.

Let q and q' be distributions with rational entries and full support, and suppose that $p \neq p'$. One main result

of our paper is that it is possible to transform the pair (p, q) to the pair (p', q') in the above sense if and only if

$$D(p\|q) \geq D(p'\|q') \text{ and } \text{rank}(p) \leq \text{rank}(p') \quad (1)$$

where the relative entropy $D(p\|q)$ is defined as

$$D(p\|q) := \sum_x p(x) \ln \left(\frac{p(x)}{q(x)} \right). \quad (2)$$

Another contribution of our paper is that it is possible to perform an inexact, yet arbitrarily accurate transformation if the same conditions hold but q and q' are not required to have rational entries.

We establish these results by building on the prior work of [BHN⁺15, Mİ8]. As done in the prior works, we employ an embedding map as a technical tool [BHN⁺15], and we also allow for the catalyst to become correlated with the target distribution [Mİ8].

We note here that our results apply to the more general “quasi-classical” case in which the first pair consists of commuting quantum states ρ and σ and the second pair consists of commuting quantum states ρ' and σ' . This follows as a direct consequence of the fact that commuting quantum states are diagonal in the same basis and thus effectively classical, along with the fact that there is a unitary channel that takes the common basis of the first pair to the common basis of the second pair.

II. MAIN RESULT

We begin by stating the main result of our paper and the associated corollary. We present all proofs in Appendices C, D and E.

Theorem 1 (One Shot Characterization of Exact Pair Transformations). *Given probability distributions p, q, p', q' on the same alphabet where q and q' have full support and only rational entries, and $p \neq p'$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. $D(p\|q) > D(p'\|q')$ and $\text{rank}(p) \leq \text{rank}(p')$
2. For any $\gamma > 0$, there exist probability distributions r and s , a joint distribution t' , and a classical channel Λ such that

- (a) $\Lambda(p \otimes r) = t'$ with marginals p' and r
- (b) $\Lambda(q \otimes s) = q' \otimes s$
- (c) $D(t'\|p' \otimes r) < \gamma$

Furthermore, we can take $s = \eta$, where η is the uniform distribution on the support of r .

The theorem states that the relative entropy is the only relevant information quantity that characterizes pair transformations when catalysts are available. Furthermore, the relative entropy $D(t'\|p' \otimes r)$ can be made as

small as desired and thus the output of the classical channel Λ arbitrarily close to the product of p' and r . The condition on q and q' being rational can be relaxed by allowing for errors in the formation of the target state, as follows:

Theorem 2 (One Shot Characterization of Approximate Pair Transformations). *Given probability distributions p, q, p', q' on the same alphabet where $p \neq p'$, and q and q' are full rank, the the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. $D(p\|q) \geq D(p'\|q')$
2. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$, there exist probability distributions r, s and p'_ε , a joint distribution t'_ε , and a classical channel Λ such that
 - (a) $\Lambda(p \otimes r) = t'_\varepsilon$ with marginals p'_ε and r
 - (b) $\Lambda(q \otimes s) = q' \otimes s$
 - (c) $\|p' - p'_\varepsilon\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$
 - (d) $D(t'_\varepsilon\|p'_\varepsilon \otimes r) < \gamma$

Furthermore, we can take $s = \eta$, where η is the uniform distribution on the support of r .

The relative entropy $D(t'_\varepsilon\|p'_\varepsilon \otimes r)$ can be made as small as desired and thus the output of the classical channel Λ arbitrarily close to the product of p'_ε and r . Furthermore, the state p'_ε can be arbitrarily close to the target distribution p' in trace distance. Note that allowing for a slight error in the transformation of p while demanding no error in the transformation of q is consistent with the frameworks of [Mat10, WW19, BST19], with the framework of [WW19] being known as the “resource theory of asymmetric distinguishability” due to this asymmetry in the transformation.

Corollary 1. *Given probability distributions p and p' on the same alphabet where $p \neq p'$, the following conditions are equivalent.*

1. $H(p) \leq H(p')$
2. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$, there exist probability distributions r and p'_ε , a joint distribution t'_ε , and a unital classical channel Λ such that
 - (a) $\Lambda(p \otimes r) = t'_\varepsilon$ with marginals p'_ε and r
 - (b) $\|p' - p'_\varepsilon\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$
 - (c) $D(t'_\varepsilon\|p'_\varepsilon \otimes r) < \gamma$

A unital classical channel is one that preserves the uniform distribution. The corollary states that, given a catalyst, the condition on the transformation is based on the Shannon entropy only. Furthermore, the relative entropy $D(t'_\varepsilon\|p'_\varepsilon \otimes r)$ can be made as small as desired and thus the output of the classical channel Λ arbitrarily close to the product of p'_ε and r . Lastly, the state p'_ε can be arbitrarily close to the target distribution p' in trace distance.

III. DISCUSSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

In this section we discuss the various implications of our results. A catalyst is a special ancillary probability distribution whose presence enables certain transformations that would otherwise be impossible. In other words, a catalyst decreases the strength of the condition required for a transformation [JP99]. Additionally, allowing for the catalyst to be correlated with the target distribution, subject to the condition that its reduced state is returned unchanged, the strength of the condition is further reduced and previously impossible transformations become possible. Since the catalyst is return unchanged, the paradigm of catalytic majorization with correlations is physically relevant and justified.

In the resource theories of pure-state entanglement, purity, and pure-state coherence, state transformations in the absence of a catalyst are governed by the majorization partial order, whereas in the resource theory of quasi-classical thermodynamics, transformations are governed by thermomajorization [GJB⁺18]. The catalytic majorization condition is equivalent to an infinite set of conditions on the Rényi entropy [Kli07, Tur07]. The strength of the catalytic majorization condition lies strictly below the majorization condition, as there exist distributions p and q where $p \not\prec q$ but $p \succ_T q$ [JP99], proving that catalysis provides an advantage.

Catalytic majorization can be further relaxed. In catalytic majorization, the target state, after transformation, exists in a product state with the catalyst; i.e., the catalyst and the target state are independent after the transformation. Relaxing this additional assumption and allowing the final state to be a non-product state, with the condition that their local states remain unchanged, further reduces the strength of the required condition. This is a generalization of catalytic majorization, called catalytic majorization with correlations, as the product state is a special case of a general distribution.

Our result is a necessary and sufficient condition for the last case, where we allow catalysis and correlations. The result is a condition on relative entropy and neatly ties all the resource theories mentioned into a single paradigm. This also enhances the operational meaning of the relative entropy by establishing its relevance in the single-shot regime as well.

IV. RELATED WORK

There are several related generalizations and regimes of operations to the ones mentioned in this work. This section provides an overview of the landscape.

Majorization and relative majorization are most prominent in the single-shot regime. This regime has to do with tasks involving a single system.

There exists another regime that deals with situations in which many identically and independently distributed (i.i.d.) systems are available, often referred to

as the asymptotic regime. In the asymptotic regime, perhaps the more pertinent question is that of rate of conversion from initial to target distributions and not necessarily feasibility of the transformation. For the resource theories of pure-state entanglement, pure-state coherence, and quasi-classical thermodynamics, the rate of conversion is given by ratios of the entropy (pure-state entanglement and pure-state coherence) and relative entropy to the Gibbs distribution (quasi-classical thermodynamics). The asymptotic version of Blackwell’s “comparison of experiments” paradigm was studied in [Mat10, WW19, BST19]. In [WW19], the problem was approached by introducing the resource theory of asymmetric distinguishability, which allowed for analyzing this problem in a resource-theoretic way. The result of [WW19, BST19] is that, in the asymptotic regime, the rate of conversion between two pairs of probability distributions (p, q) and (p', q') is given by the ratio of the relative entropy of the pairs, thus enhancing the fundamental operational meaning of the relative entropy. The results in the various regimes and resource theories are presented in Table I.

Another generalization of majorization, called quantum majorization, was proposed to generalize classical stochasticity to the quantum regime [GJB⁺18]. A necessary and sufficient condition for the transformation of a pair of qubits to another has been given in [AU80]. However, it was shown that the conditions are necessary but not sufficient for quantum systems with dimensions greater than two [Mat14], and thus a more general result is lacking.

V. CONCLUSION

The majorization partial order was developed to capture the notion of disorder in probability distributions and governs transformations in various resource theories. The addition of a catalyst reduces the strength of the required condition by allowing for transformations that are not possible in the framework of majorization without catalysis. Furthermore, allowing correlations between the target and the catalyst further reduces the strength of the required condition to one based on relative entropies. The main result of our paper is that a pair (p, q) of probability distributions can be converted to another pair (p', q') of probability distributions assisted by a catalyst with correlations if and only if $D(p||q) \geq D(p'||q')$. This enhances the operational meaning of the relative entropy beyond the traditional independent and identical regime into the single-shot regime. This finding thus complements and enhances the previous finding from [BEG⁺19] in the context of entropy and the resource theory of purity.

There are several open questions yet to be tackled. The most pertinent is whether our result applies to pairs of quantum states (ρ, σ) and (τ, ω) , and quantum catalysts. Another avenue to be explored is whether our

Resource Theory	Asymptotic	One-Shot	One-shot + Catalysis	One-shot + Catalysis + Correlations
Entanglement	$H(p)/H(q)$	$p \succ q$	$H_\alpha(p) \leq H_\alpha(q)$	$H(p) \leq H(q)$
Coherence	$H(p)/H(q)$	$p \succ q$	$H_\alpha(p) \leq H_\alpha(q)$	$H(p) \leq H(q)$
Thermodynamics	$D(p\ \gamma)/D(q\ \gamma)$	$p \succ_{\text{thermo}} q$	$F_\alpha(p) \geq F_\alpha(q)$	$F(p) \geq F(q)$
Distinguishability	$D(p\ q)/D(p'\ q')$	$(p, q) \succ (p', q')$	$D_\alpha(p\ q) \geq D_\alpha(p'\ q')$	$\mathbf{D}(p\ q) \geq \mathbf{D}(p'\ q')$

TABLE I. Results in various regimes and resource theories. (The bold cell in bold indicates our result.) The last row is a general case of the rows above. The one-shot regime with catalysis depends on H_α and D_α , $\forall \alpha \in [-\infty, \infty]$ (see Subsections A 1, A 2). Furthermore, in the one-shot cases, moving further right reduces the strength of the required argument, by allowing for catalysis.

result applies to larger sets of distributions, and not just dichotomies, i.e., the conversion of $\{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k\}$ to $\{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k\}$ for $k > 2$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Vishal Katariya and Aby Philip for discussions. We acknowledge support from NSF Grant No. 1907615. SR thanks the Department of Physics and Astronomy at Louisiana State University for hospitality during his research visit in Fall 2019. SR also thanks the Department of Physics, Birla Institute of Technology and Science for this opportunity.

Appendix A: Notations and Definitions

We introduce the various measures and their properties in this section. Furthermore, we define some useful concepts and constructs used in the various theorems and lemmas.

1. Rényi Divergence

For probability distributions $p = \{p_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $q = \{q_i\}_{i=1}^n$, the Rényi divergence is defined $\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, 1, \infty, -\infty\}$ as follows [R61]

$$D_\alpha(p\|q) = \frac{\text{sgn}(\alpha)}{\alpha - 1} \ln \sum_{i=1}^n p_i^\alpha q_i^{1-\alpha}, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where,

$$\text{sgn}(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 & \alpha \geq 0 \\ -1 & \alpha < 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A2})$$

We also take some special limits for $\alpha \in \{0, 1, \infty, -\infty\}$.

$$D_0(p\|q) = -\ln \sum_{i:p_i \neq 0} q_i,$$

$$D_1(p\|q) = \sum_i p_i (\ln p_i - \ln q_i),$$

$$D_\infty(p\|q) = \ln \max_i \frac{p_i}{q_i},$$

$$D_{-\infty}(p\|q) = D_\infty(q\|p). \quad (\text{A3})$$

$D_\infty(p\|q)$ can also be expressed as

$$D_\infty(p\|q) = \ln \min \left\{ \lambda \mid \forall i, \lambda \geq \frac{p_i}{q_i} \right\}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

An important property of the Rényi divergence is that it obeys the data processing property, i.e. for all stochastic maps Λ and $\forall \alpha \in [-\infty, \infty]$, [vEH14]

$$D_\alpha(p\|q) \geq D_\alpha(\Lambda(p)\|\Lambda(q)). \quad (\text{A5})$$

Another important property of the Rényi divergence is that for $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$,

$$D_\alpha(p\|q) > 0 \quad (\text{A6})$$

for all probability distributions $p \neq q$. Additionally,

$$D(p\|q) = 0 \quad (\text{A7})$$

iff $p = q$.

The Rényi divergence is additive under products, i.e. for probability distributions p_1, p_2, q_1 and q_2 [vEH14],

$$D_\alpha(p_1\|q_1) + D_\alpha(p_2\|q_2) = D_\alpha(p_1 \otimes q_1\|p_2 \otimes q_2) \quad (\text{A8})$$

2. Rényi Entropy

For a probability distribution $p = \{p_i\}_{i=1}^n$, the Rényi entropy is defined $\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, 1, \infty, -\infty\}$ as follows [R61],

$$H_\alpha(p) = \frac{\text{sgn}(\alpha)}{1 - \alpha} \ln \sum_{i=1}^n p_i^\alpha. \quad (\text{A9})$$

Similarly, we also take some special limits for $\alpha \in \{0, 1, \infty, -\infty\}$.

$$\begin{aligned} H_0(p) &= \ln \text{rank}(p), \\ H_1(p) &= -\sum_i^n p_i \ln p_i, \\ H_\infty(p) &= -\ln p_{\max}, \\ H_{-\infty}(p) &= \ln p_{\min}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A10})$$

3. Quantum Rényi Divergence

The Rényi divergence from the classical regime can be extended to the quantum regime, but the extension is not unique. Classical probability distributions can be modeled as quantum density operators that are diagonal in an orthonormal basis. Thus, modelling two probability distributions is equivalent to working with two density operators that commute with each other, i.e., that are diagonalizable in the same basis. However, in general, this may not be possible, which leads to the non-uniqueness of the quantum extension. Note that any quantum extension should collapse to the classical case if the states commute.

Here, we use the quantum generalization from [Pet86]:

$$D_\alpha(\rho||\sigma) = \frac{\text{sgn}(\alpha)}{\alpha - 1} \ln [\text{Tr} \rho^\alpha \sigma^{1-\alpha}]. \quad (\text{A11})$$

The limits of $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$ are

$$\begin{aligned} D_0(\rho||\sigma) &= -\ln [\text{Tr}(\Pi_\rho \sigma)], \\ D_1(\rho||\sigma) &= \text{Tr}(\rho \ln \rho - \rho \ln \sigma), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A12})$$

where Π_ρ is the projector onto support of ρ . The quantum Rényi divergence obeys the data processing inequality for all CPTP maps Λ and $0 \leq \alpha \leq 2$ [Pet86]:

$$D_\alpha(\rho||\sigma) \geq D_\alpha(\Lambda(\rho)||\Lambda(\sigma)). \quad (\text{A13})$$

Another property of the quantum Rényi divergence is that for $\rho \neq \sigma$, [Pet86]

$$D(\rho||\sigma) > 0. \quad (\text{A14})$$

4. Majorization and its Extensions

The theory of majorization was developed to capture the notion of disorder. The crux of the theory is to answer the question: When is one probability distribution more disordered than another? The results can be succinctly put forth as follows [HLP52].

For two probability distributions $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^k$, we say that

“ p majorizes q ” or $p \succ q$ if for all $n = 1, \dots, k-1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n p_i^\downarrow &\geq \sum_{i=1}^n q_i^\downarrow, \\ \sum_{i=1}^k p_i^\downarrow &= \sum_{i=1}^k q_i^\downarrow, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A15})$$

where p^\downarrow is the reordering of p in descending order. If $p \succ q$, we say that q is more disordered than p .

There are several formulations for majorization that can be proven to be equivalent (see Lemma 1). Majorization has several applications, especially in entanglement transformations [Nie99]. It has been shown that majorization defines a partial order for states that can be transformed into another.

An extension of the theory of majorization comes in the form of catalysis. Given two distributions p, q such that $p \not\succeq q$, does there exist a distribution r such that $p \otimes r \prec q \otimes r$? If such a distribution exists, it can be used to transform q into p and be left unchanged. Since r is unaffected by the process, we call it the catalyst of the transformation. We say that p is catalytically majorized by q , written $p \prec_T q$, if there exists a catalyst r such that $p \otimes r \prec q \otimes r$. The theory of catalytic majorization is not as well understood as majorization. However, several important results have been shown [Kli07, Tur07].

5. Embedding Map

A mathematical tool frequently used in the resource theory of thermodynamics is an embedding map, which is a classical channel that maps a thermal distribution to a uniform distribution [BHN⁺15]. We use this tool in a more general sense needed in our context here, in order to map a probability distribution described by a set of rational numbers to a uniform distribution.

Consider the simplex of probability distributions $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^k$ and a set of natural numbers $\{d_i\}_{i=1}^k$ with $N = \sum_{i=1}^k d_i$. The embedding $\Gamma_d : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ is defined as

$$\Gamma_d(p) := \bigoplus_{i=1}^k p_i \eta_i = \left(\underbrace{\frac{p_1}{d_1}, \dots, \frac{p_1}{d_1}}_{d_1}, \dots, \underbrace{\frac{p_k}{d_k}, \dots, \frac{p_k}{d_k}}_{d_k} \right), \quad (\text{A16})$$

where $\eta_i = \left(\frac{1}{d_i}, \dots, \frac{1}{d_i}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$ is the uniform distribution.

Since Γ_d is an injective map, there exists a left-inverse for Γ_d denoted by $\Gamma_d^* : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ and defined as follows:

$$\Gamma_d^*(x) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_1} x_i, \sum_{i=d_1+1}^{d_1+d_2} x_i, \dots, \sum_{i=d_1+\dots+d_{n-1}+1}^N x_i \right). \quad (\text{A17})$$

Note that Γ_d^* is a classical channel, and furthermore, $\Gamma_d^* \circ \Gamma_d = \mathbb{I}$, where \mathbb{I} is the identity channel.

Appendix B: Technical Lemmas

The technical lemmas presented in this appendix have been established in prior work. Here we list them for convenience and completeness.

Lemma 1 (Majorization [MOA11, HLP52]). *Let x and y be probability distributions $\in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, the following are equivalent.*

1. $x \prec y$.
2. For $n = 1, \dots, k-1$, $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^\downarrow \geq \sum_{i=1}^n y_i^\downarrow$
and $\sum_{i=1}^k x_i^\downarrow = \sum_{i=1}^k y_i^\downarrow$.
3. $x = Dy$ for some $d \times d$ doubly stochastic matrix D .
4. For $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sum_{i=1}^d |x_i - t| \leq \sum_{i=1}^d |y_i - t|$.

Lemma 2 (Embedding of distribution with rational entries [BHN⁺15]). *For a distribution γ_d defined using a set of natural numbers $\{d_i\}_{i=1}^k$, where $\sum_{i=1}^k d_i = N$, as*

$$\gamma_d = \left(\frac{d_1}{N}, \dots, \frac{d_k}{N} \right), \quad (\text{B1})$$

then

$$\Gamma_d(\gamma_d) = \eta_N \quad (\text{B2})$$

where η_N is the uniform distribution of size N .

Proof. From the definition of an embedding map Γ_d (see Subsection A 5), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_d(\gamma_d) &= \left(\underbrace{\frac{d_1}{N}, \dots, \frac{d_1}{N}}_{d_1}, \dots, \underbrace{\frac{d_k}{N}, \dots, \frac{d_k}{N}}_{d_k} \right), \\ &= \left(\underbrace{\frac{1}{N}, \dots, \frac{1}{N}}_{d_1}, \dots, \underbrace{\frac{1}{N}, \dots, \frac{1}{N}}_{d_k} \right), \\ &= \left(\underbrace{\frac{1}{N}, \dots, \frac{1}{N}}_N \right), \\ &= \eta_N. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B3})$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 3 (Preservation of Rényi's Divergence [BHN⁺15]). *Let $p = \{p_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be a probability distribution and let $\{d_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be natural numbers with $N = \sum_{i=1}^k d_i$ and $\tilde{p} = \Gamma_d(p)$. Then for all $\alpha \in (-\infty, \infty)$,*

$$D_\alpha(p \parallel \gamma_d) = D_\alpha(\tilde{p} \parallel \eta_N), \quad (\text{B4})$$

where γ_d is as defined in Lemma 2 and Γ_d is as defined in Subsection A 5.

Proof. We split the proof into separate parts for different α values (see Subsection A 1).

- For $\alpha \notin \{-\infty, 0, 1, \infty\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha(p \parallel \gamma_d) &= \frac{\text{sgn}(\alpha)}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left[\sum_{i=1}^k p_i^\alpha (\gamma_d)_i^{1-\alpha} \right], \\ &= \frac{\text{sgn}(\alpha)}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left[\sum_{i=1}^k p_i^\alpha \left(\frac{d_i}{N} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right], \\ &= \frac{\text{sgn}(\alpha)}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left[\sum_{i=1}^k d_i \left(\frac{p_i}{d_i} \right)^\alpha \left(\frac{1}{N} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right], \\ &= \frac{\text{sgn}(\alpha)}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left[\left(\frac{1}{N} \right)^{1-\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^k d_i \left(\frac{p_i}{d_i} \right)^\alpha \right], \\ &= \frac{\text{sgn}(\alpha)}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{p}_i^\alpha \left(\frac{1}{N} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right], \\ &= D_\alpha(\tilde{p} \parallel \eta_N). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B5})$$

- For $\alpha = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} D_0(p \parallel \gamma_d) &= -\ln \left(\sum_{i, p_i \neq 0} (\gamma_d)_i \right), \\ &= -\ln \left(\sum_{i, p_i \neq 0} \frac{d_i}{N} \right), \\ &= -\ln \left(\sum_{i, \tilde{p}_i \neq 0} \frac{1}{N} \right), \\ &= D_0(\tilde{p} \parallel \eta_N). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B6})$$

- For $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} D_\infty(p \parallel \gamma_d) &= \ln \min \left\{ \lambda : \forall i, \lambda \geq \frac{p_i}{d_i/N} \right\}, \\ &= \ln \min \left\{ \lambda : \forall i, \lambda \geq \frac{p_i/d_i}{1/N} \right\}, \\ &= D_\infty(\tilde{p} \parallel \eta_N). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B7})$$

- For $\alpha \rightarrow -\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{-\infty}(p\|\gamma_d) &= D_{\infty}(\gamma_d\|p), \\
&= \ln \min \left\{ \lambda : \forall i, \lambda \geq \frac{d_i/N}{p_i} \right\}, \\
&= \ln \min \left\{ \lambda : \forall i, \lambda \geq \frac{1/N}{p_i/d_i} \right\}, \\
&= D_{\infty}(\eta_N\|\tilde{p}), \\
&= D_{-\infty}(\tilde{p}\|\eta_N). \tag{B8}
\end{aligned}$$

- For $\alpha = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
D_1(p\|\gamma_d) &= \sum_{i=1}^k p_i \ln \left(\frac{p_i}{d_i/N} \right), \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^k d_i \frac{p_i}{d_i} \ln \left(\frac{p_i/d_i}{1/N} \right), \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{p_i}{d_i} \ln \left(\frac{p_i/d_i}{1/N} \right), \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{p}_i \ln \left(\frac{\tilde{p}_i}{(\eta_N)_i} \right), \\
&= D_1(\tilde{p}\|\eta_N). \tag{B9}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for all $\alpha \in (-\infty, \infty)$,

$$D_{\alpha}(p\|\gamma_d) = D_{\alpha}(\tilde{p}\|\eta_N).$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 4 (Mixture reduces Rényi's Divergence [BHN⁺15]). *Let $p \neq q$ be probability distributions with q full rank. Then $\forall \alpha \in (-\infty, \infty)$ and $0 < \delta < 1$,*

$$D_{\alpha}((1-\delta)p + \delta q\|q) < D_{\alpha}(p\|q). \tag{B10}$$

Proof. We split the proof into separate parts for different α values.

For $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, joint convexity for probability distributions (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) states that, for a parameter $0 < \delta < 1$, [vEH14]

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\alpha}((1-\delta)A_1 + \delta A_2\|(1-\delta)B_1 + \delta B_2) \\
\leq (1-\delta)D_{\alpha}(A_1\|B_1) + \delta D_{\alpha}(A_2\|B_2). \tag{B11}
\end{aligned}$$

Setting $B_1 = B_2 = A_2 = q$ and $A_1 = p$, we see that,

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\alpha}((1-\delta)p + \delta q\|q) &\leq (1-\delta)D_{\alpha}(p\|q) \\
&< D_{\alpha}(p\|q), \tag{B12}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows because $D_{\alpha}(q\|q) = 0$ (See (A7)) and the second strict inequality follows because $D_{\alpha}(p\|q) > 0$ for $p \neq q$ (see (A6)).

For $\alpha > 1$, joint convexity does not hold. Denote $r = (1-\delta)p + \delta q$. Then, the statement of the lemma is equivalent to

$$\sum_{i=1}^k r_i^{\alpha} q_i^{1-\alpha} < \sum_{i=1}^k p_i^{\alpha} q_i^{1-\alpha}. \tag{B13}$$

Since $\alpha > 1$, $f(x) = x^{\alpha}$ is a convex function over all $x > 0$. Since $q_i^{1-\alpha} > 0$, the linear combination

$$F(p) = \sum_{i=1}^k q_i^{1-\alpha} p_i^{\alpha} \tag{B14}$$

is convex with respect to p . For $p \neq q$, $F(p) > 1$ which comes from positivity of Rényi's divergence $D_{\alpha}(p\|q)$.

Note that $F(q) = \sum_{i=1}^k q_i = 1$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
F(r) &\leq (1-\delta)F(p) + \delta F(q), \\
&= F(p) - \delta(F(p) - F(q)), \\
&< F(p), \tag{B15}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is by convexity and the second inequality is because $F(p) > F(q)$. Thus, we show the validity of (B13).

For $\alpha < 0$, if p is not full rank, $D_{\alpha}(p\|q) = \infty$. But q is full rank, implying that $D_{\alpha}((1-\delta)p + \delta q\|q)$ is finite and hence inequality holds. If p is full rank, we use a similar approach as the case for $\alpha > 1$ by defining $\alpha' = 1-\alpha$ and thus $\alpha' > 1$. We use the previous case.

This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 5 (Conversion into rational entries [BHN⁺15]). *Let $q = \{q_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be an ordered (descending) probability distribution of full rank. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a distribution \tilde{q} such that*

1. $\|q - \tilde{q}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$.
2. There exists a set of natural numbers $\{d_i\}_{i=1}^k$ such that $\tilde{q} = \{d_i/N\}$ with $N = \sum_{i=1}^k d_i$.
3. There exists a classical channel E such that $E(q) = \tilde{q}$ and for any other distribution p , $\|p - E(p)\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$.

Proof. We construct a \tilde{q} that satisfies statements 1 and 2. Then, we create channel E to satisfy statement 3. Since q is decreasing, $\min_i q_i = q_k$. Firstly, we choose an N such that,

$$q_k > \frac{k}{\sqrt{N}} > \frac{k}{N}. \tag{B16}$$

We now define \tilde{q} . For $i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$,

$$\tilde{q}_i = \frac{\lceil q_i N \rceil}{N} = \frac{d_i}{N}, \tag{B17}$$

and

$$\tilde{q}_k = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \tilde{q}_i = \frac{d_k}{N}. \quad (\text{B18})$$

Note that for $i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$, $\tilde{q}_i \geq q_i$ and $\tilde{q}_k \leq q_k$ since both are normalized to 1. Also note that,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \tilde{q}_k &= \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \tilde{q}_i, \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{\lceil q_i N \rceil}{N}, \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{q_i N}{N} + \frac{k-1}{N}, \\ &\leq 1 - q_k + \frac{k}{N}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B19})$$

where the first equality follows from (B18) and the second equality follows from (B17). Thus,

$$\tilde{q}_k \geq q_k - \frac{k}{N} > 0 \quad (\text{B20})$$

which follows from (B16) by the choice of N . Thus \tilde{q} is a valid probability distribution. Furthermore, we see that

$$\sum_{q_i > \tilde{q}_i} q_i + \sum_{q_i \leq \tilde{q}_i} q_i = \sum_{q_i > \tilde{q}_i} \tilde{q}_i + \sum_{q_i \leq \tilde{q}_i} \tilde{q}_i = 1. \quad (\text{B21})$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{q_i > \tilde{q}_i} q_i - \tilde{q}_i = \sum_{q_i \leq \tilde{q}_i} \tilde{q}_i - q_i. \quad (\text{B22})$$

Using this result, we show that

$$\begin{aligned} \|q - \tilde{q}\|_1 &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k |q_i - \tilde{q}_i|, \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{i: q_i > \tilde{q}_i} (q_i - \tilde{q}_i) + \sum_{i: q_i \leq \tilde{q}_i} (\tilde{q}_i - q_i) \right], \\ &= \sum_{i: q_i > \tilde{q}_i} (q_i - \tilde{q}_i), \\ &= q_k - \tilde{q}_k, \\ &\leq \frac{k}{N}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B23})$$

where the third equality follows from (B22) and the last inequality is due to (B20). Thus, if we pick $\varepsilon = \frac{k}{N}$, we can satisfy statements 1 and 2.

Lastly, we need to construct a channel that takes q to \tilde{q} . Such a channel must slightly increase the probabilities $q_i, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ and reduce q_k . Channels

are characterised by conditional probabilities $P(j|i)$ such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^k P(j|i) = 1, \quad (\text{B24})$$

which is just the normalization preservation.

Denote $\mathcal{I} = \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$ which are the indices for which $\tilde{q}_i \geq q_i$, $\Delta_i = \tilde{q}_i - q_i$ and $\Delta = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \Delta_i$. Note that $\tilde{q}_k = q_k - \Delta$.

Consider a channel E defined by

$$P(j|i) = \begin{cases} 1 & i = j, i, j \in \mathcal{I} \\ 0 & i \neq j, i, j \in \mathcal{I} \\ 1 - \left(\frac{\Delta}{q_k}\right) & i = j = k \\ 0 & j = k, i \in \mathcal{I} \\ \frac{\Delta_j}{q_k} & i = k, j \in \mathcal{I} \end{cases}. \quad (\text{B25})$$

We now prove that the normalization condition is met and $E(q) = \tilde{q}$. We begin with the normalization condition.

- For $i \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^k P(j|i) \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}, j \neq i} P(j|i) + P(i|i) + P(k|i), \\ &= 0 + 1 + 0, \\ &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B26})$$

- for $i = k$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^k P(j|k) \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} P(j|k) + P(k|k), \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \left(\frac{\Delta_j}{q_k}\right) + 1 - \left(\frac{\Delta}{q_k}\right), \\ &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B27})$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{j=1}^k P(j|i) = 1, \quad (\text{B28})$$

which is the normalization preservation.

Next, we show that $E(q) = \tilde{q}$. Let $q' = E(q)$. We need to show that $\tilde{q} = q'$.

- For $j \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
q'_j &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}, i \neq j} P(j|i)q_i + P(j|j)q_j + P(j|k)q_k, \\
&= 0 + q_j + \frac{\Delta_j}{q_k}q_k, \\
&= q_j + \Delta_j, \\
&= \tilde{q}_j.
\end{aligned} \tag{B29}$$

- For $j = k$,

$$\begin{aligned}
q'_k &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} P(k|i)q_i + P(k|k)q_k, \\
&= 0 + \left(1 - \frac{\Delta}{q_k}\right)q_k, \\
&= q_k - \Delta, \\
&= \tilde{q}_k.
\end{aligned} \tag{B30}$$

Thus, we have proven that $\tilde{q} = q'$.

Finally, we need to show that, for any other distribution p , $\|p - E(p)\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$. Denote $E(p) = \tilde{p}$. We see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|p - \tilde{p}\|_1 &= p_k - \tilde{p}_k, \\
&= p_k - \left(1 - \frac{\Delta}{q_k}\right)p_k, \\
&= \left(\frac{\Delta}{q_k}\right)p_k, \\
&\leq \frac{\Delta}{q_k}, \\
&\leq \frac{k}{Nq_k}, \\
&\leq \epsilon \frac{\sqrt{N}}{k}, \\
&= \epsilon \frac{\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{k}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}, \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{k}},
\end{aligned} \tag{B31}$$

where the first equality is from the last equality of (B23), the first inequality is because $p_k \leq 1$, the second inequality is because $\Delta = q_k - \tilde{q}_k \leq \frac{k}{N}$, the third inequality is because $\frac{k}{N} = \varepsilon$, $q_k \geq \frac{k}{\sqrt{N}}$ and the last equality is because $\frac{N}{k} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. Thus, for any other distribution p , $\|p - E(p)\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$. Furthermore, we can show that E maps the basis vectors to probability distributions with non-zero entries, proving that is indeed stochastic. This completes the proof. \square

Remark: For a full rank distribution p , the distribution $E(p)$ (as defined above) is full rank. The reasoning is as follows:

- The channel increases all entries except the last entry. Thus, all entries except the last entry in $E(p)$ are strictly greater than 0 since p is full rank.
- The last entry in $E(p)$ is $\left(1 - \frac{\Delta}{q_k}\right)p_k$. Since $\Delta = q_k - \tilde{q}_k$, by choice of N , we see that this entry is strictly greater than 0 as well (see (B20)).

Thus, the distribution $E(p)$ is full rank for a full rank p .

Remark: A classical channel E is defined using a conditional probability distribution. In other words, given an input distribution $p(x)$ and a channel $E(y|x)$, the output distribution $p'(y)$ is given by

$$p'(y) = \sum_x E(y|x)p(x). \tag{B32}$$

A reversal channel of a classical channel can be defined as follow. From Bayes' Theorem, we know that

$$E(y|x)p(x) = E'(x|y)p'(y). \tag{B33}$$

Summing both sides of (B33) over x and noticing that $\sum_x E'(x|y) = 1$ is the normalization condition, we recover (B32).

Similarly, summing both sides of the Equation (B33) over y , we see that

$$p(x) = \sum_y E'(x|y)p'(y), \tag{B34}$$

and thus, a reversal channel E' can be defined.

Lemma 6 (Splitting of channel [BHN⁺15]). *Consider a channel, such that, for some fixed probability distribution $u = (u_1, \dots, u_\ell, 0, \dots, 0)$, the channel gives output $u' = (u'_1, \dots, u'_\ell, 0, \dots, 0)$. Moreover $\Lambda(w) = w$ holds for some full rank distribution w . Then $\Lambda = \Lambda_1 \oplus \Lambda_2$ where Λ_1 acts on the first ℓ elements and Λ_2 acts on the remaining $n - \ell$ elements.*

Proof. Consider the joint probability of two random variables X and Y given by the distribution w and the channel. $X = 0$ denotes inputs are from the first group (items from 1 to ℓ), and $X = 1$ means inputs are from the second group (items from $\ell + 1$ to n). Similarly, Y denotes similar events for the outputs.

Since the channel preserves w , we have that $P(Y = 0) = P(X = 0)$ and $P(Y = 1) = P(X = 1)$. Moreover, since the channel sends t into t' , this means that $P(Y = 0|X = 0) = 1$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
P(Y = 0) &= P(Y = 0|X = 0)P(X = 0) \\
&\quad + P(Y = 0|X = 1)P(X = 1), \\
P(Y = 0) &= P(X = 0) + P(Y = 0|X = 1)P(X = 1).
\end{aligned} \tag{B35}$$

Thus,

$$P(Y = 0|X = 1)P(X = 1) = 0. \quad (\text{B36})$$

Since, for arbitrary distributions, $P(X = 1) \neq 0$, we see that,

$$P(Y = 0|X = 1) = 0. \quad (\text{B37})$$

Rewritten,

$$P(Y = 0|X = 0) = P(Y = 1|X = 1) = 1. \quad (\text{B38})$$

This means that first group elements are always mapped to first group and similarly for the second group. So the channel can be split into two channels. This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 7 (Continuity [vEH14]). *The relative entropy $D(p||q)$ is continuous in both arguments p and q , when q has full rank.*

Lemma 8 (Inclusion of support [Ren05]). *Let ρ_{AB} be a density operator in $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. Then*

$$\text{supp}(\rho_{AB}) \subseteq \text{supp}(\rho_A) \otimes \text{supp}(\rho_B). \quad (\text{B39})$$

Proof. Suppose that ρ_{AB} is a pure state. Then $\rho_{AB} = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. Let $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \alpha_z |\phi^z\rangle \otimes |\psi^z\rangle$ be the Schmidt decomposition of $|\psi\rangle$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp}(\rho_{AB}) &= \{|\psi\rangle\} \\ &\subseteq \text{span}\{|\phi^z\rangle_{z \in \mathcal{Z}}\} \otimes \text{span}\{|\psi^z\rangle_{z \in \mathcal{Z}}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B40})$$

Since $\text{span}\{|\phi^z\rangle_{z \in \mathcal{Z}}\} = \text{supp}(\rho_A)$ and $\text{span}\{|\psi^z\rangle_{z \in \mathcal{Z}}\} = \text{supp}(\rho_B)$, we see that the lemma is true.

For mixed states, let $\rho_{AB} = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \rho_{AB}^x$ be the decomposition into pure states for ρ_{AB} . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp}(\rho_{AB}) &= \text{span}\left\{\bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \text{supp}(\rho_{AB}^x)\right\}, \\ &\subseteq \text{span}\left\{\bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \text{supp}(\rho_A^x) \otimes \text{supp}(\rho_B^x)\right\}, \\ &\subseteq \left(\text{span}\left\{\bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \text{supp}(\rho_A^x)\right\}\right) \otimes \\ &\quad \left(\text{span}\left\{\bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \text{supp}(\rho_B^x)\right\}\right), \\ &= \text{supp}(\rho_A) \otimes \text{supp}(\rho_B). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B41})$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 9 (Superadditivity of D_1 [CLPG18]). *Let $\mathcal{H}_{AB} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ be a bipartite Hilbert space, and ρ_{AB}, σ_{AB} be two density operators. If $\sigma_{AB} = \sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} D(\rho_{AB}||\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B) &= D(\rho_{AB}||\rho_A \otimes \rho_B) + D(\rho_A||\sigma_A) + D(\rho_B||\sigma_B). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B42})$$

Thus,

$$D(\rho_{AB}||\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B) \geq D(\rho_A||\sigma_A) + D(\rho_B||\sigma_B). \quad (\text{B43})$$

Proof. Using the definition of Quantum Rényi's Divergence (from Subsection A 3), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} D(\rho_{AB}||\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B) &= \text{Tr}[\rho_{AB}(\ln \rho_{AB} - \ln \sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B)], \\ &= \text{Tr}[\rho_{AB}(\ln \rho_{AB} - \ln \rho_A \otimes \rho_B)] \\ &\quad + \text{Tr}[\rho_{AB}(\ln \rho_A \otimes \rho_B - \ln \sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B)], \\ &= D(\rho_{AB}||\rho_A \otimes \rho_B) \\ &\quad + D(\rho_A \otimes \rho_B||\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B), \\ &= D(\rho_{AB}||\rho_A \otimes \rho_B) + D(\rho_A||\sigma_A) \\ &\quad + D(\rho_B||\sigma_B). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B44})$$

Since $D(\rho_{AB}||\rho_A \otimes \rho_B) \geq 0$ (See (A14)), we see that $D(\rho_{AB}||\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B) \geq D(\rho_A||\sigma_A) + D(\rho_B||\sigma_B)$, thus concluding the proof. \square

Lemma 10 (Superadditivity of D_0). *Let $\mathcal{H}_{AB} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ be a bipartite Hilbert space and ρ_{AB}, σ_{AB} be two density operators. If $\sigma_{AB} = \sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B$, then*

$$D_0(\rho_{AB}||\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B) \geq D_0(\rho_A||\sigma_A) + D_0(\rho_B||\sigma_B). \quad (\text{B45})$$

Proof. From Lemma 8, we see that $\text{supp}(\rho_{AB}) \subseteq \text{supp}(\rho_A) \otimes \text{supp}(\rho_B)$ and thus,

$$\Pi_{\rho_{AB}} \leq \Pi_{\rho_A} \otimes \Pi_{\rho_B}. \quad (\text{B46})$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} D_0(\rho_{AB}||\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B) &= -\ln(\text{Tr}[\Pi_{\rho_{AB}}(\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B)]), \\ &\geq -\ln(\text{Tr}[(\Pi_{\rho_A} \otimes \Pi_{\rho_B})(\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B)]), \\ &= -\ln(\text{Tr}[(\Pi_{\rho_A} \sigma_A \otimes \Pi_{\rho_B} \sigma_B)]), \\ &= -\ln(\text{Tr}[\Pi_{\rho_A} \sigma_A] \text{Tr}[\Pi_{\rho_B} \sigma_B]), \\ &= -\ln(\text{Tr}[\Pi_{\rho_A} \sigma_A]) - \ln(\text{Tr}[\Pi_{\rho_B} \sigma_B]), \\ &= D_0(\rho_A||\sigma_A) + D_0(\rho_B||\sigma_B). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B47})$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Lemmas 9 and 10 are results based on the Quantum Rényi divergence. However, any result that holds for the quantum case, must hold for the classical case. This is because, allowing the quantum states to be commuting, we can diagonalize them in the same basis and thus are effectively quasi-classical.

Lemma 11 (Müller [M18]). *Let $p_A, p'_A \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be probability distributions with $p_A^\downarrow \neq p'_A^\downarrow$. Then, there exists a probability distribution q_B and an extension p'_{AB} with marginals p'_A and q_B such that*

$$p_A \otimes q_B \succ p'_{AB} \quad (\text{B48})$$

if, and only if, $H_0(p_A) \leq H_0(p'_A)$ and $H(p_A) < H(p'_A)$. Moreover, if these inequalities are satisfied, we can always choose B and p'_{AB} such that $D(p'_{AB}||p'_A \otimes q_B) < \varepsilon$, for any choice of $\varepsilon > 0$.

Appendix C: Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. We begin with statement 1 implies statement 2; i.e., we suppose $D(p\|q) > D(p'\|q')$ and $\text{rank}(p) \leq \text{rank}(p')$, and prove the existence of a classical channel Λ , probability distributions r and s , and a joint distribution t' that satisfy the conditions of statement 2.

Since q and q' have rational entries, without loss of generality, we pick $q = (\frac{d_1}{N}, \dots, \frac{d_k}{N})$ and $q' = (\frac{d'_1}{N}, \dots, \frac{d'_k}{N})$ for integers $\{d_i\}$ and $\{d'_i\}$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^k d_i = \sum_{i=1}^k d'_i = N$ respectively.

Using Lemma 3 and Statement 1, we see that

$$D(\Gamma_d(p)\|\eta_N) > D(\Gamma_{d'}(p')\|\eta_N). \quad (\text{C1})$$

Define $\tilde{p} \equiv \Gamma_d(p)$ and $\tilde{p}' \equiv \Gamma_{d'}(p')$. Thus,

$$D(\tilde{p}\|\eta_N) > D(\tilde{p}'\|\eta_N). \quad (\text{C2})$$

Using the definition of the relative entropy (see Subsection A 1), we see that, for any probability distribution p

$$D(p\|\eta_N) = \ln(N) - H(p). \quad (\text{C3})$$

Thus, from (C2) and (C3)

$$H(\tilde{p}) < H(\tilde{p}'). \quad (\text{C4})$$

Since $\text{rank}(p) \leq \text{rank}(p')$, we see that

$$\text{rank}(\tilde{p}) \leq \text{rank}(\tilde{p}'). \quad (\text{C5})$$

From the definition of Rényi entropy H_0 (see Subsection A 2) and (C5), we see that

$$H_0(\tilde{p}) \leq H_0(\tilde{p}'). \quad (\text{C6})$$

Using (C4) and (C6), we see that, from Lemma 11, there exists a probability distribution r and an extension v' with marginals \tilde{p}' and r such that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p} \otimes r &\succ v', \\ D(v'\|\tilde{p}' \otimes r) &< \gamma, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C7})$$

for any choice of $\gamma > 0$. In other words, there exists a bistochastic map Φ (see Lemma 1) such that

$$\Phi(\tilde{p} \otimes r) = v'. \quad (\text{C8})$$

Using Lemma 6, we see that r can be considered, without loss of generality, to be of full rank. Concretely, if r is of rank d (less than full rank), then define $u = \tilde{p} \otimes r$, $u' = v'$ and $w = \eta_N \otimes \eta$. Using Lemma 6, Φ can be split into $\Phi_1 \oplus \Phi_2$. If r is of full rank, $\Phi = \Phi_1$.

Finally consider

$$\tilde{\Lambda} = (\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ \Phi_1 \circ (\Gamma_d \otimes \mathbb{I}). \quad (\text{C9})$$

Since this is a composition of stochastic maps, the overall map is stochastic.

Proving 2a)

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(p \otimes r) &= [(\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ \Phi_1 \circ (\Gamma_d \otimes \mathbb{I})](p \otimes r), \\ &= [(\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ \Phi_1](\tilde{p} \otimes r), \\ &= [(\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I})]v'. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C10})$$

We now define $t' = [(\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I})]v'$. We notice that the marginals of t' are $\Gamma_{d'}^*(\tilde{p}') = p'$ and r .

Proving 2b)

We need to show that $\Lambda(q \otimes s) = q' \otimes s$ for some s . Pick $s = \eta$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(q \otimes \eta) &= [(\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ \Phi_1 \circ (\Gamma_d \otimes \mathbb{I})](q \otimes \eta), \\ &= [(\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ \Phi_1](\eta_N \otimes \eta), \\ &= [(\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I})](\eta_N \otimes \eta), \\ &= q' \otimes \eta. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C11})$$

where the second equality is from Lemma 2. Thus, $\Lambda(q \otimes s) = q' \otimes s$.

Proving 2c)

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &> D(v'\|\tilde{p}' \otimes r), \\ &\geq D(t'\|p' \otimes r), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C12})$$

where the first inequality is from (C7) and the second inequality is from the data-processing inequality (A5) using channel $[(\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I})]$. Thus, $D(t'\|p' \otimes r) \leq \gamma$.

This completes the proof that statement 1 implies statement 2. We now look at the reverse direction; i.e., we assume a classical channel Λ that satisfies the conditions of statement 2. Let $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha(p\|q) + D_\alpha(r\|s) &= D_\alpha(p \otimes r\|q \otimes s) \\ &\geq D_\alpha(\Lambda(p \otimes r)\|\Lambda(q \otimes s)), \\ &= D_\alpha(t'\|q' \otimes s), \\ &\geq D_\alpha(p'\|q') + D_\alpha(r\|s), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C13})$$

where the first equality follows from additivity of Rényi divergence (A8), the first inequality follows from the data-processing property (A5) and the last inequality follows from Lemmas 9 and 10 for $\alpha = 1$ and $\alpha = 0$ respectively.

Thus, since we showed that r, s can be taken to be full rank, $D_\alpha(r\|s)$ is finite and can be subtracted, and thus we can conclude that

$$D_\alpha(p\|q) \geq D_\alpha(p'\|q'). \quad (\text{C14})$$

We now split into two cases.

$\alpha = 0$. Thus, $D_0(p\|q) \geq D_0(p'\|q')$. Since this is true for all q, q' , it must be true for $q = q' = \eta$. From the

definition of Rényi divergence D_0 (see Subsection A 1), we see that

$$\text{rank}(p) \leq \text{rank}(p'). \quad (\text{C15})$$

$\alpha = 1$. Thus, $D(p||q) \geq D(p'||q')$. Consider the case of equality. Since it holds true for all q, q' , pick $q = q' = \eta$. Thus,

$$H(p) = H(p'). \quad (\text{C16})$$

Furthermore, equality implies that (See (C13)),

$$D(t'||q' \otimes s) = D(p'||q') + D(r||s). \quad (\text{C17})$$

We know that

$$D(t'||q' \otimes s) = D(t'||p' \otimes r) + D(p'||q') + D(r||s), \quad (\text{C18})$$

from Lemma 9. Thus,

$$D(t'||p' \otimes r) = 0 \quad (\text{C19})$$

which implies (see (A7))

$$t' = p' \otimes r. \quad (\text{C20})$$

Since we know that $p \otimes r \succ t'$ (since $\Lambda(p \otimes r) = t'$ from statement 2), this implies

$$p \otimes r \succ p' \otimes r \implies p \succ_T p'. \quad (\text{C21})$$

Coupled with $H(p) = H(p')$, it shows that $p = p'$, which is against our assumption. Thus $D(p||q) > D(p'||q')$.

This concludes the proof. \square

Appendix D: Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. We begin with statement 1 implies statement 2; i.e., we suppose $D(p||q) \geq D(p'||q')$, and prove the existence of a classical channel Λ , probability distributions p'_ε , r and s , and a joint distribution t'_ε that satisfy the conditions of statement 2.

In general, q and q' do not have rational entries. However, the set of probability distributions with rational entries is dense in the set of all distributions. Thus, using Lemma 5, we can always pick probability distributions q_d and $q'_{d'}$ (defined below) that are arbitrarily close to q and q' respectively.

Without loss of generality, we pick $q_d = (\frac{d_1}{N}, \dots, \frac{d_k}{N})$ and $q'_{d'} = (\frac{d'_1}{N}, \dots, \frac{d'_k}{N})$ for integers $\{d_i\}$ and $\{d'_i\}$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^k d_i = \sum_{i=1}^k d'_i = N$ respectively.

Furthermore, Lemma 5 shows that there exists classical channels E and E' such that $E(q) = q_d$ and $E'(q') = q'_{d'}$ such that,

$$\begin{aligned} \|q_d - q\|_1 &\leq \varepsilon_1, \\ \|E(p) - p\|_1 &\leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\varepsilon_1}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D1})$$

for all probability distributions p and,

$$\begin{aligned} \|q'_{d'} - q'\|_1 &\leq \varepsilon_2, \\ \|E'(p') - p'\|_1 &\leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\varepsilon_2}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D2})$$

for all probability distributions p' .

Define the reversal channel of E' as E'^* (see Remark B). Then,

$$E'^*(q'_{d'}) = q'. \quad (\text{D3})$$

Now define

$$p'' = (1 - \delta)p' + \delta q' \quad (\text{D4})$$

for $0 < \delta < 1$. Note that $\|p'' - p'\|_1 \leq \delta$ and p'' is full rank. From Lemma 4 and statement 1, we see that

$$D(p||q) > D(p''||q'). \quad (\text{D5})$$

From Lemma 7, we see that $D(p||q)$ is continuous in both arguments p and q , when q is full rank. Thus in the $\varepsilon_1 \rightarrow 0$ limit, we see that

$$D(p||q) = D(E(p)||q_d). \quad (\text{D6})$$

Similarly, in the $\varepsilon_2 \rightarrow 0$ limit,

$$D(p''||q') = D(E'(p'')||q'_{d'}). \quad (\text{D7})$$

Thus, using (D5), (D6), and (D7), we conclude that

$$D(E(p)||q_d) > D(E'(p'')||q'_{d'}). \quad (\text{D8})$$

Further, using Lemma 3 and (D8), we see that

$$D(\Gamma_d(E(p))||\eta_N) > D(\Gamma_{d'}(E'(p''))||\eta_N). \quad (\text{D9})$$

Define $\tilde{E}(p) \equiv \Gamma_d(E(p))$ and $\tilde{E}'(p'') \equiv \Gamma_{d'}(E'(p''))$. Thus,

$$D(\tilde{E}(p)||\eta_N) > D(\tilde{E}'(p'')||\eta_N). \quad (\text{D10})$$

Using the definition of the relative entropy (see Subsection A 1), we see that, for any probability distribution p ,

$$D(p||\eta_N) = \ln(N) - H(p). \quad (\text{D11})$$

Thus, from (D10) and (D11),

$$H(\tilde{E}(p)) < H(\tilde{E}'(p'')). \quad (\text{D12})$$

Since p'' is full rank, from Remark B, we see that $E'(p'')$ is full rank and thus $\tilde{E}'(p'')$ is full rank as well. From the definition of H_0 (see Subsection A 2), we see that

$$H_0(\tilde{E}(p)) \leq H_0(\tilde{E}'(p'')). \quad (\text{D13})$$

Using (D12) and (D13), we see that, from Lemma 11, there exists a probability distribution r and an extension v'' with marginals $\tilde{E}'(p'')$ and r such that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}(p) \otimes r &\succ v'', \\ D(v''||\tilde{E}'(p'') \otimes r) &< \gamma, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D14})$$

for any choice of $\gamma > 0$. In other words, there exists a bistochastic map Φ (see Lemma 1) such that

$$\Phi(\tilde{E}(p) \otimes r) = v'' \quad (\text{D15})$$

Using Lemma 6, we see that r can be considered, without loss of generality, to be of full rank. Concretely, if r is of rank d (less than full rank), then define $u = \tilde{E}(p) \otimes r$, $u' = v''$ and $w = \eta_N \otimes \eta$. Using Lemma 6, Φ can be split into $\Phi_1 \oplus \Phi_2$. If r is of full rank, $\Phi = \Phi_1$.

Finally consider

$$\tilde{\Lambda} = (E'^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ (\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ \Phi_1 \circ (\Gamma_d \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ (E \otimes \mathbb{I}). \quad (\text{D16})$$

Since this is a composition of stochastic maps, the overall map is stochastic.

Proving 2a) and 2c)

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(p \otimes r) &= [(E'^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ (\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ \Phi_1 \circ (\Gamma_d \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ (E \otimes \mathbb{I})](p \otimes r), \\ &= [(E'^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ (\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ \Phi_1 \circ (\Gamma_d \otimes \mathbb{I})](E(p) \otimes r), \\ &= [(E'^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ (\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ \Phi_1](\tilde{E}(p) \otimes r), \\ &= [(E'^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ (\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I})]v'' \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D17})$$

We now define $t'_\epsilon = [(E'^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ (\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I})]v''$. We notice that the marginals of t'_ϵ are $p'_\epsilon = E'^*(\Gamma_{d'}^*(\tilde{E}'(p'')))$ and r .

Note that,

$$\begin{aligned} \|p'_\epsilon - p'\|_1 &= \|E'^*(\Gamma_{d'}^*(\tilde{E}'(p''))) - p'\|_1 \\ &\leq \|E'^*(\Gamma_{d'}^*(\tilde{E}'(p''))) - \Gamma_{d'}^*(\tilde{E}'(p''))\|_1 \\ &\quad + \|\Gamma_{d'}^*(\tilde{E}'(p'')) - p'\|_1 \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\epsilon_2}) + \|\Gamma_{d'}^*(\Gamma_{d'}(E'(p''))) - p'\|_1 \\ &= \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\epsilon_2}) + \|E'(p'') - p'\|_1 \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\epsilon_2}) + \|E'(p'') - p''\|_1 + \|p'' - p'\|_1 \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\epsilon_2}) + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\epsilon_1}) + \delta, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D18})$$

where the first inequality is because of the triangle inequality of the trace distance, the second inequality is from (D2), the second equality is from (A17), the third inequality is because of the triangle inequality of the trace distance and the last inequality is because of (D2) and (D4).

Since ϵ_1 , ϵ_2 and δ are arbitrarily chosen we can set them to ϵ . Thus $\Lambda(p \otimes r) = t'_\epsilon$ with marginals p'_ϵ and r . Furthermore, $\|p'_\epsilon - p'\|_1 \leq \epsilon$.

Proving 2b)

We need to show that $\Lambda(q \otimes s) = q' \otimes s$ for some s . Pick $s = \eta$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(q \otimes \eta) &= [(E'^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ (\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ \Phi_1 \circ (\Gamma_d \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ (E \otimes \mathbb{I})](q \otimes \eta), \\ &= [(E'^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ (\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ \Phi_1 \circ (\Gamma_d \otimes \mathbb{I})](q_d \otimes \eta), \\ &= [(E'^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ (\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ \Phi_1](\eta_N \otimes \eta), \\ &= [(E'^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ (\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I})](\eta_N \otimes \eta), \\ &= [(E'^* \otimes \mathbb{I})](q_{d'} \otimes \eta), \\ &= q' \otimes \eta, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D19})$$

where the third equality follows because Φ_1 is bistochastic. Thus $\Lambda(q \otimes s) = q' \otimes s$.

Proving 2d)

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &> D(v'' \| \tilde{E}''(p') \otimes r), \\ &\geq D(t'_\epsilon \| p'_\epsilon \otimes r), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D20})$$

where the first inequality is from (D14) and the second inequality is from the data-processing inequality (A5) using channel $[(E'^* \otimes \mathbb{I}) \circ (\Gamma_{d'}^* \otimes \mathbb{I})]$. Thus, $D(t'_\epsilon \| p'_\epsilon \otimes r) \leq \gamma$.

This completes the proof that statement 1 implies statement 2. We now look at the reverse direction; i.e., we assume a stochastic map Λ .

$$\begin{aligned} D(p \| q) + D(r \| s) &= D(p \otimes r \| q \otimes s), \\ &\geq D(\Lambda(p \otimes r) \| \Lambda(q \otimes s)), \\ &= D(t'_\epsilon \| q' \otimes s), \\ &\geq D(p'_\epsilon \| q') + D(r \| s), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D21})$$

where the first equality follows from additivity of relative entropy (A8), the first inequality follows from the data-processing property (A5) and the last inequality follows from Lemma 9. Thus, since we showed that r, s can be taken to be full rank, $D(r \| s)$ is finite and can be subtracted.

$$D(p \| q) \geq D(p'_\epsilon \| q'). \quad (\text{D22})$$

Using Lemma 7,

$$D(p \| q) \geq D(p' \| q'). \quad (\text{D23})$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Appendix E: Proof of Corollary 1

Proof. Simply pick $q = q' = \eta$ and apply Theorem 2. Since Λ preserves the uniform distribution, it is a unital classical channel. \square

- [BEG⁺19] Paul Boes, Jens Eisert, Rodrigo Gallego, Markus P. Müller, and Henrik Wilming. Von neumann entropy from unitarity. *Physical Review Letters*, 122(21):210402, May 2019. arXiv:1807.08773.
- [BG17] Francesco Buscemi and Gilad Gour. Quantum relative Lorenz curves. *Physical Review A*, 95(1):012110, January 2017. arXiv:1607.05735.
- [BHN⁺15] Fernando G. S. L. Brandao, Michal Horodecki, Nelly Huei Ying Ng, Jonathan Oppenheim, and Stephanie Wehner. The second laws of quantum thermodynamics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(11):3275–3279, February 2015. arXiv:1305.5278.
- [Bla53] David Blackwell. Equivalent comparisons of experiments. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 24(2):265–272, June 1953.
- [BST19] Francesco Buscemi, David Sutter, and Marco Tomamichel. An information-theoretic treatment of quantum dichotomies. July 2019. arXiv:1907.08539.
- [CG19] Eric Chitambar and Gilad Gour. Quantum resource theories. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 91(2):025001, April 2019. arXiv:1806.06107.
- [CLPG18] Angela Capel, Angelo Lucia, and David Perez-Garcia. Superadditivity of quantum relative entropy for general states. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(7):4758–4765, July 2018. arXiv:1705.03521.
- [DK01] Sumit Daftuar and Matthew Klimesh. Mathematical structure of entanglement catalysis. *Physical Review A*, 64(4):042314, September 2001. arXiv:quant-ph/0104058.
- [GJB⁺18] Gilad Gour, David Jennings, Francesco Buscemi, Runyao Duan, and Iman Marvian. Quantum majorization and a complete set of entropic conditions for quantum thermodynamics. *Nature Communications*, 9:5352, December 2018. arXiv:1708.04302.
- [HHO03] Michal Horodecki, Pawel Horodecki, and Jonathan Oppenheim. Reversible transformations from pure to mixed states and the unique measure of information. *Physical Review A*, 67(6):062104, June 2003. arXiv:quant-ph/0212019.
- [HLP52] G. H. Hardy, D. E. Littlewood, and G. Pólya. *Inequalities*. Cambridge Mathematical Library. Cambridge University Press, 1952.
- [JP99] Daniel Jonathan and Martin B. Plenio. Entanglement-assisted local manipulation of pure quantum states. *Physical Review Letters*, 83(17):3566–3569, October 1999. arXiv:quant-ph/9905071.
- [Kli07] Matthew Klimesh. Inequalities that collectively completely characterize the catalytic majorization relation. September 2007. arXiv:0709.3680.
- [M⁺18] Markus P. Müller. Correlating thermal machines and the second law at the nanoscale. *Physical Review X*, 8(4):041051, December 2018. arXiv:1707.03451.
- [Mat10] Keiji Matsumoto. Reverse test and characterization of quantum relative entropy, 2010. arXiv:1010.1030.
- [Mat14] Keiji Matsumoto. An example of a quantum statistical model which cannot be mapped to a less informative one by any trace preserving positive map, September 2014. arXiv:1409.5658.
- [MOA11] Albert Marshall, Ingram Olkin, and Barry C. Arnold. *Inequalities: Theory of majorization and its applications*. Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, New York, 2011.
- [Nie99] Michael A. Nielsen. Conditions for a class of entanglement transformations. *Physical Review Letters*, 83(2):436–439, July 1999. arXiv:quant-ph/9811053.
- [Pet86] Dnes Petz. Quasi-entropies for finite quantum systems. *Reports on Mathematical Physics*, 23(1):57 – 65, 1986.
- [Ren05] Renato Renner. *Security of quantum key distribution*. PhD thesis, ETH Zurich, December 2005. arXiv:quant-ph/0512258.
- [Ren16] Joseph M. Renes. Relative submajorization and its use in quantum resource theories. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 57(12):122202, December 2016. arXiv:1510.03695.
- [R61] Alfrd Rnyi. On measures of entropy and information. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 1: Contributions to the Theory of Statistics*, pages 547–561, Berkeley, Calif., 1961. University of California Press.
- [Tur07] S. Turgut. Catalytic transformations for bipartite pure states. *Journal of Physics A*, 40(40):12185–12212, September 2007.
- [vEH14] Tim van Erven and Peter Harremoës. Rényi divergence and Kullback-Leibler divergence. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(7):3797–3820, July 2014. arXiv:1206.2459.
- [Vei71] Arthur F. Veinott. Least d-majorized network flows with inventory and statistical applications. *Management Science*, 17(9):547–567, May 1971.
- [WW19] Xin Wang and Mark M. Wilde. Resource theory of asymmetric distinguishability for quantum channels. May 2019. arXiv:1905.11629.
- [WY16] Andreas Winter and Dong Yang. Operational resource theory of coherence. *Physical Review Letters*, 116(12):120404, March 2016. arXiv:1506.07975.
- [ZMC⁺17] Huangjun Zhu, Zhihao Ma, Zhu Cao, Shao-Ming Fei, and Vlatko Vedral. Operational one-to-one mapping between coherence and entanglement measures. *Physical Review A*, 96(3):032316, September 2017. arXiv:1704.01935.