

ENTROPY UNCERTAINTY RELATIONS AND STRONG SUB-ADDITIVITY OF QUANTUM CHANNELS

LI GAO, MARIUS JUNGE, AND NICHOLAS LARACUENTE

ABSTRACT. We prove an entropic uncertainty relation for two quantum channels, extending the work of Frank and Lieb for quantum measurements. This is obtained via a generalized strong super-additivity (SSA) of quantum entropy. Motivated by Petz's algebraic SSA inequality, we also obtain a generalized SSA for quantum relative entropy. As a special case, it gives an improved data processing inequality.

1. INTRODUCTION

Uncertainty principle is a fundamental phenomenon in quantum mechanics. The celebrated Heisenberg's uncertainty principle states that the position and momentum of a quantum particle cannot be sharply defined at same time, i.e.

$$\sigma(Q)\sigma(P) \geq \frac{\hbar}{2}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\sigma(Q)$ and $\sigma(P)$ denote the standard derivation of the position and momentum respectively, and \hbar is the reduced Planck constant [21, 35]. Such uncertainty relations widely exist in quantum physics, such as energy-. In fact, for two observables described by Hermitian operators X and Z , Robertson [33] proved that

$$\sigma(X)\sigma(Z) \geq \frac{1}{2}|\langle\psi|[X, Z]|\psi\rangle|, \quad (1.2)$$

where $|\psi\rangle$ is the state of the quantum system and $[\cdot, \cdot]$ denotes the commutator. The Heisenberg's principle (1.1) is then a consequence for the commutation relation $[Q, P] = -i\hbar I$. Robertson's inequality shows that uncertainty principle (1.2) is a reflection of non-commutativity, which is an essential feature of quantum physics.

In statistical physics and information theory, entropy is a natural measure of uncertainty. Since Hirschman's first work [16] on entropic uncertainty relation, there has been a series of works on uncertainty principle via entropic quantities (see the survey [9] and the references therein). A notable one is that for the position Q and momentum P ,

$$h(Q) + h(P) \geq \log(e\pi\hbar), \quad (1.3)$$

where $h(Q) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{dQ}{dq} \log \frac{dQ}{dq} dq$ is the differential entropy and $\frac{dQ}{dq}$ is the probability density function w.r.t the Lebesgue measure dq . This inequality was proved by Beckner [2], and

also by Bialynicki-Birula and Mycielski [6] using sharp Hausdorff-Young inequality [2]. Moreover, it is known to be stronger than Heisenberg's principle (1.1) of standard deviation. For two observables X and Z of finite spectrum, Maassen and Uffink [24] discovered that

$$H(X) + H(Z) \geq \log \frac{1}{c}, \quad (1.4)$$

where $H(X) = -\sum_x P_X(x) \log P_X(x)$ is the Shannon entropy, and $c = \max_{x,z} |\langle x|z \rangle|^2$ is the maximum overlap between the eigenbasis $\{|x\rangle\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ and $\{|z\rangle\}_{z \in \mathcal{Z}}$ of X and Z respectively. A recent breakthrough was made by Berta *et al*, which extends Maassen-Uffink relation to mixed quantum states, and more importantly, in the presence of quantum memory [4].

Let H_M be as Hilbert space and $\mathbb{B}(H_M)$ be the bounded operator on H_M . A mixed quantum state on H_M is modelled by a positive and trace 1 element ρ , called a density operator. Its von Neumann entropy is defined as

$$H(\rho) = -\text{tr}(\rho \log \rho),$$

where tr is matrix trace. Berta *et al* showed that any joint quantum state ρ_{MC} on $H_M \otimes H_C$ satisfies the following uncertainty relation,

$$H(X|C) + H(Z|C) \geq H(M|C) + \log \frac{1}{c}. \quad (1.5)$$

Here C is a quantum reference system, $H(M|C) = H(\rho_{MC}) - H(\rho_C)$ is the conditional entropy of ρ_{MC} with respect to the system C (similarly, for $H(X|C)$ and $H(Z|C)$). It is worth noting that the constant c is independent of the system C . This result has been further generalized to arbitrary measurements by Frank and Lieb [12]. Recall that a positive operator value measurement (POVM) on H_M is a family of positive operators $\{E_x\}$ such that $\sum_x E_x = I$. Frank and Lieb [12] proved that: given two POVMs $\{E_x\}$ and $\{F_z\}$, any joint quantum state ρ_{MC} satisfy (1.4) with constant $c = \max_{x,z} \text{tr}(E_x F_z)$, called the maximum overlap of measurements.

In this paper, we consider the entropy uncertainty relation for two quantum channels. Mathematically, a quantum channel is a completely positive trace preserving map, which sends density operators to density operators. For simplicity, we only consider finite dimensional cases.

Theorem (A). *Let H_A , H_B and H_M be finite dimensional Hilbert spaces and $\Phi_A : \mathbb{B}(H_M) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(H_A)$, $\Phi_B : \mathbb{B}(H_M) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(H_B)$ be two quantum channels. Then for any Hilbert space H_C and any bipartite quantum state $\rho \in \mathbb{B}(H_M \otimes H_C)$*

$$H(A|C)_{\Phi_A(\rho)} + H(B|C)_{\Phi_B(\rho)} \geq H(M|C)_\rho + \log \frac{1}{c}.$$

The constant c is given by the completely bounded norm

$$c = \|\Phi_B \circ \Phi_A^\dagger : S_1(H_A) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(H_B)\|_{cb}, \quad (1.6)$$

where $S_1(H_A)$ is the trace class operator on H_A and Φ_A^\dagger is the adjoint map of Φ_A .

Note that by Effros-Ruan's isomorphism [11, 7], the constant c equals to the operator norm of Choi matrix of $\Phi_B \circ \Phi_A^\dagger$, which is always finite. When the range of Φ_A and Φ_B are classical (commutative) systems, Theorem 1 recovers the Frank-Lieb uncertainty relation. From this perspective, Theorem 1 is a noncommutative generalization of Frank-Lieb's relation by allowing Φ_A and Φ_B to be quantum to quantum channels. Another special case is when $H_M = H_A \otimes H_B$ and $\Phi_A = \text{id}_A \otimes \text{tr}_B$, $\Phi_B = \text{tr}_A \otimes \text{id}$ being the partial traces: this recovers the strong sub-additivity (SSA) of von Neumann entropy proved by Lieb and Ruskai [23],

$$H(AC) + H(BC) - H(ABC) - H(C) \geq 0.$$

In fact, our Theorem A is derived from the following generalized SSA inequality.

Theorem (B). *Let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{M}$ and \mathcal{R} be finite dimensional von Neumann algebras equipped with trace $\tau_{\mathcal{A}}, \tau_{\mathcal{B}}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\tau_{\mathcal{R}}$ respectively. Suppose $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A}$ as a subalgebra, and denote $E_{\mathcal{R}}$ as the adjoint of the inclusion map. Given two quantum channels $\Phi_A : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ and $\Phi_B : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, for any density operator $\rho \in \mathcal{M}$,*

$$H(\Phi_A(\rho)) + H(\Phi_B(\rho)) \geq H(\rho) + H(E_{\mathcal{R}} \circ \Phi_A(\rho)) + \log \frac{1}{c}, \quad (1.7)$$

where the constant c is given by

$$c = \sup\{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\Phi_A^\dagger(a)\Phi_B^\dagger(b)) \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_+, b \in \mathcal{B}_+, E_{\mathcal{R}}(a) = 1, \tau_{\mathcal{B}}(b) = 1\},$$

Theorem B extends the algebraic SSA of Petz [26]: when $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{M}$ are subalgebras, $\Phi_A = E_{\mathcal{A}}, \Phi_B = E_{\mathcal{B}}$ are trace preserving conditional expectation, if $E_{\mathcal{A}} \circ E_{\mathcal{B}} = E_{\mathcal{B}} \circ E_{\mathcal{A}} = E_{\mathcal{R}}$, then

$$H(E_{\mathcal{A}}(\rho)) + H(E_{\mathcal{B}}(\rho)) \geq H(\rho) + H(E_{\mathcal{R}} \circ E_{\mathcal{A}}(\rho)).$$

The condition $E_{\mathcal{A}} \circ E_{\mathcal{B}} = E_{\mathcal{B}} \circ E_{\mathcal{A}} = E_{\mathcal{R}}$, called a commuting square, was first introduced by Popa [32], which is an important tool in the study of subfactors. Here, our constant $c = 1$ if and only if the commuting square holds. From this perspective, Theorem B gives an entropic characterization for commuting square.

Motivated by Petz's algebraic SSA [26, Theorem 12], our third result is a generalized SSA for relative entropy. Recall that for two density operators ρ and σ , the relative entropy is defined as $D(\rho||\sigma) := \text{tr}(\rho \log \rho - \rho \log \sigma)$.

Theorem (C). *Let $\Phi_A : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}, \Phi_B : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be two quantum channels and $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{B}$ is a subalgebra. Assume that $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}$ is a density operator and there exists a conditional expectation $E_R^\dagger : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ preserving the state $\Phi_B(\sigma)$. Then for any quantum state $\rho \in \mathcal{M}$, we have*

$$D(\rho||\sigma) + D(E_R \circ \Phi_B(\rho)||E_R \circ \Phi_B(\sigma)) \geq D(\Phi_A(\rho)||\Phi_A(\sigma)) + D(\Phi_B(\rho)||\Phi_B(\sigma)) - \kappa$$

The constant κ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha(t) \log c(t) dt, \alpha(t) = \frac{\pi}{2(\cosh(\pi t) + 1)} \\ c(t) &= \sup_b \tau_{\mathcal{M}} \left(\Phi_B^\dagger(b) \Phi_A^\dagger \left(\Phi_A(\rho)^{\frac{1+it}{2}} \Phi_A(\sigma)^{\frac{-1-it}{2}} \right) \sigma \Phi_A^\dagger \left(\Phi_A(\rho)^{\frac{1+it}{2}} \Phi_A(\sigma)^{\frac{-1-it}{2}} \right)^* \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the supremum is for all $b \in \mathcal{B}_+$ such that $E_R^\dagger(b) = 1$.

In particular, the above theorem gives an improvement of data processing inequality when $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{C}$ are trivial system.

The rest of paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we discuss the connection between entropic quantities and noncommutative L_p -norms. Section 3 use complex interpolation of L_p -spaces to prove Theorem B, which differs with method of Frank and Lieb for uncertainty relation of measurements. Section 4 reviews the operator space structure of noncommutative L_p -spaces and derive Theorem A. Section 5 discusses Petz's relative entropy SSA and prove Theorem C.

Notations: We use italic letters $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{R} \dots$ for von Neumann algebras and subscript letter to index Hilbert space $H_A, H_B, H_C \dots$. We will often use the short notation $H_{AB} = H_A \otimes H_B$ for the tensor product space. Given a finite dimensional Hilbert space H , we denote $\mathbb{B}(H)$ (resp. $\mathbb{B}(H)_+$) as the set of bounded operators (resp. positive operators), and tr as the standard matrix trace. We use 1 for the identity operator in $\mathbb{B}(H)$ and id for the identity map. We write A^* as the adjoint of an operator A and Φ^\dagger as the adjoint of a map Φ with respect to trace inner product.

Acknowledgement: LG is partially supported by NSF grant DMS-2154903. NL is supported as an IBM Postdoc at The University of Chicago. MJ was partially supported by NSF Grant DMS 1800872 and NSF RAISE-TAQS 1839177.

Note: Theorem A is announced in the conference proceeding [13] of *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory 2018*. Theorem B, Theorem C, as well as the proof of Theorem A in this paper are new.

2. ENTROPY AND L_p -NORM

2.1. Noncommutative L_p -norm and von Neumann entropy. We briefly review the connection between entropies and L_p -norms. The readers are referred to the survey [31] for more information on noncommutative L_p -space. For simplicity, throughout the paper we restrict ourselves to finite dimensional von Neumann algebras, i.e. *-subalgebras of matrix algebras. Let \mathcal{M} be a finite dimensional von Neumann algebra and τ be a faithful trace on \mathcal{M} . For $0 < p < \infty$, the non-commutative L_p -norm is defined

$$\|a\|_{L_p(\mathcal{M}, \tau)} = \tau(|a|^p)^{1/p}, \quad a \in \mathcal{M},$$

and we denote by $L_p(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ or simply $L_p(\mathcal{M})$ for the L_p -space. In particular, $L_\infty(\mathcal{M}) := \mathcal{M}$. The basic example is Schatten p -class $S_p(H) = L_p(\mathbb{B}(H), \text{tr})$, which is the L_p -space of $\mathbb{B}(H)$ with respect to the matrix trace tr . As classical L_p -spaces, non-commutative L_p -spaces forms a complex interpolation family,

$$L_{p_\theta}(\mathcal{M}) = [L_{p_0}(\mathcal{M}), L_{p_1}(\mathcal{M})]_\theta,$$

where $\frac{1}{p_\theta} = \frac{1-\theta}{p_0} + \frac{\theta}{p_1}$ and $1 \leq p_0 \leq p_1 \leq \infty$. We refer to [3] for the definition of complex interpolation.

The (quantum) states on \mathcal{M} are given by density operators, which are positive and trace 1. We denote

$$D(\mathcal{M}) = \{\rho \in \mathcal{M} \mid \rho \geq 0, \tau(\rho) = 1\}, \quad D_+(\mathcal{M}) = \{\rho \in D(\mathcal{M}) \mid \rho > 0\}$$

as the state space and faithful state space respectively. The von Neumann entropy of a quantum state ρ is defined as

$$H(\rho) = -\tau(\rho \log \rho).$$

This definition naturally extends to all positive operators. In general, $H(\rho)$ can be either negative or positive. Indeed, if the trace differs by a constant factor,

$$\tilde{\tau}_{\mathcal{M}} = \lambda \tau_{\mathcal{M}}, \quad \tilde{\rho} = \lambda^{-1} \rho,$$

the von Neumann entropy is up to a global constant

$$H_\tau(\rho) = H_{\tilde{\tau}}(\tilde{\rho}) + \log \lambda.$$

Example 2.1. i) For the matrix trace $(\mathbb{B}(H), \text{tr})$, $H(\rho) \geq 0$.

ii) For normalized trace $\tau(1) = 1$, $H(\rho) \leq 0$.

iii) Consider $L_\infty(\mathbb{R}, dx)$ equipped with Lebesgue measure, $h(f) = -\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) \log f(x) dx$ is called differential entropy, which can be either positive or negative.

The connection between von Neumann entropy and L_p -norm is as follows:

Lemma 2.2. *i) For $\rho \in \mathcal{M}_+$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \frac{\tau(\rho^p) - \tau(\rho)}{p-1} &= -H(\rho) \\ \lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \frac{\|\rho\|_p - \|\rho\|_1}{p-1} &= -H(\rho) - \tau(\rho) \log \tau(\rho),\end{aligned}$$

and the two limits converges uniformly on $D(\mathcal{M})$.

ii) If the path $\rho : [1, 1 + \varepsilon) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{M})$ satisfies $\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \rho(p) = \rho$, then

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\tau(\rho(p)^p) - 1}{p-1} = \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\rho(p)\|_p - 1}{p-1} = -H(\rho)$$

Proof. For the first limit, we note that for positive number $x > 0$, $p \mapsto \frac{x^p - 1}{p-1}$ is monotone increasing and $\lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \frac{x^p - 1}{p-1} = x \log x$. By monotone convergence theorem,

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\tau(\rho^p) - \tau(\rho)}{p-1} = \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\tau(\rho^p - \rho)}{p-1} = \tau(\rho \log \rho).$$

In finite dimensions, $D(\mathcal{M})$ is a compact set, hence by Dini's theorem, the convergence on $D(\mathcal{M})$ is uniform. For the second limit, define the function

$$f(p) = \tau(\rho^p), p \in [1, \infty)$$

Then f is continuously differentiable, $f(1) = \tau(\rho)$ and $f'(1^+) = -H(\rho)$. Using L'Hôpital rule,

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{f(p)^{\frac{1}{p}} - f(1)}{p-1} \\ = f(1) \left(-\log f(1) + \frac{f'(1^+)}{f(1)} \right) = f'(1^+) - f(1) \log f(1) = -H(\rho) - \tau(\rho) \log \tau(\rho)\end{aligned}$$

This justifies the second limit. For the uniform convergence on $D(\mathcal{M})$, we note that

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \frac{\tau(\rho^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} - \tau(\rho)}{p-1} = \lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \frac{\tau(\rho^p) - \tau(\rho)}{p-1} + \lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \frac{\tau(\rho^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} - \tau(\rho^p)}{p-1}$$

By mean value theorem,

$$\frac{x^{\frac{1}{p}} - x}{p-1} = -\frac{1}{p_0^2} x^{\frac{1}{p_0}} \ln x$$

for some $p_0 \in (1, p)$. Note that on $D(\mathcal{M})$, $\tau(\rho^p) \rightarrow 1$ uniformly. Then when $p \rightarrow 1$,

$$\frac{\tau(\rho^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} - \tau(\rho^p)}{p-1} = -\frac{1}{p_0^2} \tau(\rho^p)^{\frac{1}{p_0}} \ln \tau(\rho^p) \rightarrow 0$$

uniformly, which justifies the uniform convergence of the second limit. Then ii) follows from the uniform convergence of i). ■

2.2. Amalgamated L_p norm and conditional entropy. An important tool in our analysis is the amalgamated L_p -space introduced by Junge and Parcet [19]. Let $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$ be a subalgebra, and let $\tau_{\mathcal{N}}$ be the trace of \mathcal{N} , which can be different with the trace $\tau_{\mathcal{M}}$ of \mathcal{M} . For $1 \leq p, q \leq \infty$, fix $\frac{1}{r} = |\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}|$. Given $x \in \mathcal{M}$, the amalgamated L_p^q norm is as follows: for $p \leq q$,

$$\|x\|_{L_p^q(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M})} = \inf_{x=ayb} \|a\|_{L_{2r}(\mathcal{N}, \tau_{\mathcal{N}})} \|y\|_{L_q(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}})} \|b\|_{L_{2r}(\mathcal{N}, \tau_{\mathcal{N}})} ;$$

where the infimum is for all factorization $x = ayb$ such that $a, b \in \mathcal{N}$ and $y \in \mathcal{M}$; for $p \geq q$

$$\|x\|_{L_p^q(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M})} = \sup_{\|a\|_{L_{2r}(\mathcal{N})} = \|b\|_{L_{2r}(\mathcal{N})} = 1} \|axb\|_{L_p(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}})} ,$$

where the supremum is for all $a, b \in \mathcal{N}$ with $\|a\|_{L_{2r}(\mathcal{N}, \tau_{\mathcal{N}})} = \|b\|_{L_{2r}(\mathcal{N}, \tau_{\mathcal{N}})} = 1$. When $p = q$, the two definition are equivalent and $L_p^p(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}) \cong L_p(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}})$ isometrically.

For $x \geq 0$, it suffices to consider $a = b > 0$ in the above infimum (supremum). Then for $p \leq q$,

$$\|x\|_{L_p^q(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M})} = \inf_{\sigma \in D_+(\mathcal{N})} \|\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2r}} y \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2r}}\|_{L_q(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}})} ;$$

for $q \leq p$,

$$\|x\|_{L_p^q(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M})} = \sup_{\sigma \in D_+(\mathcal{N})} \|\sigma^{\frac{1}{2r}} x \sigma^{\frac{1}{2r}}\|_{L_p(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}})} ,$$

In particular, for $p = 1, q = \infty$ and $p = \infty, q = 1$ respectively, if $x \geq 0$,

$$\|x\|_{L_1^\infty(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M})} = \inf\{\lambda \mid x \leq \lambda \sigma \text{ for some } \sigma \in D(\mathcal{N})\} \tag{2.1}$$

$$\|x\|_{L_\infty^1(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M})} = \|E_N(x)\|_\infty \tag{2.2}$$

Here, $E_N : L_1(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow L_1(\mathcal{N})$ is the adjoint map of inclusion $\iota : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, defined as

$$\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(x\rho) = \tau_{\mathcal{N}}(xE_N(\rho)) , \text{ for } x \in \mathcal{N} , \rho \in L_1(\mathcal{M})$$

Because of finite dimensions, we simply write $E_N : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$. Junge and Parcet proved the following duality of amalgamated L_p space

$$L_p^q(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M})^* = L_{p'}^{q'}(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}) ,$$

where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$ and $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q'} = 1$. Also, amalgamated L_p -spaces satisfies complex interpolation relation: for $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$,

$$L_{p_\theta}^{q_\theta}(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}) = [L_{p_0}^{q_0}(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}), L_{p_1}^{q_1}(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M})]_\theta ,$$

where $1 \leq p_j \leq q_j \leq \infty$, $\frac{1}{p_\theta} = \frac{1-\theta}{p_0} + \frac{\theta}{p_1}$ and $\frac{1}{q_\theta} = \frac{1-\theta}{q_0} + \frac{\theta}{q_1}$. The next lemma shows the connection between amalgamated L_p -norms and entropy.

Lemma 2.3. *If $\rho : [1, 1 + \varepsilon) \in D(\mathcal{M})$ satisfies $\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \rho(p) = \rho$,*

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{1}{p-1} (\|\rho(p)\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M})} - 1) = H(E_N(\rho)) - H(\rho). \quad (2.3)$$

Proof. This is a modification of [10, Theorem 17]. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\tau_{\mathcal{N}}(e) \geq 1$ for any projections in \mathcal{N} . In fact, if for $\lambda, \mu > 0$,

$$\tilde{\tau}_{\mathcal{M}} = \lambda \tau_{\mathcal{M}}, \tilde{\tau}_{\mathcal{N}} = \mu \tau_{\mathcal{N}}, \tilde{\rho} = \lambda^{-1} \rho,$$

both the entropy and L_p -norm only differ by a global constant,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\tilde{\tau}}(\tilde{\rho}) &= H_{\tau}(\rho) - \log \lambda, H_{\tilde{\tau}_{\mathcal{N}}}(\tilde{E}_R(\tilde{\rho})) = H_{\tau_{\mathcal{N}}}(E_N(\rho)) - \log \mu \\ \|\tilde{\rho}\|_{L_p^q(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}, \tilde{\tau})} &= \mu^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \lambda^{\frac{1}{p}-1} \|\rho\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}, \tau)}, \end{aligned}$$

which match with (2.3). Note that $\|\rho(p)\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M})} = \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\rho(p)) = 1$, and

$$\|\rho(p)\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M})} = \inf_{\sigma \in D_+(\mathcal{N})} \|\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2p}} \rho(p) \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2p}}\|_p = \inf_{\sigma \in D_+(\mathcal{N})} \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}(p) \sigma^{-\frac{1}{p}} \rho^{\frac{1}{2}}(p)\|_p.$$

Denote

$$\rho(p, \sigma) = \rho(p)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{1}{p}} \rho(p)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \hat{\rho}(p, \sigma) = \frac{\rho(p, \sigma)}{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\rho(p, \sigma))} \in D(\mathcal{M}).$$

It was proved in [14] that there exists a unique σ attain the infimum in $\|\rho(p)\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M})}$, which we denote as σ_p . Namely,

$$\|\rho(p)\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M})} = \|\rho(p, \sigma_p)\|_p.$$

By assumption $\inf_{e \text{ projection}} \tau_{\mathcal{N}}(e) \geq 1$, we have $\sigma^{-1} \geq 1$, $\forall \sigma \in D_+(\mathcal{N})$. Then

$$\rho(p) \leq \rho(p, \sigma_p), \forall p > 1.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 = \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\rho(p)) &\leq \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\rho(p, \sigma_p)) \leq \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(1)^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \|\rho(p, \sigma_p)\|_p \\ &\leq \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(1)^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \|\rho(p, \frac{1}{\tau_{\mathcal{N}}(1)})\|_p \leq \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(1)^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \tau_{\mathcal{N}}(1)^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \|\rho(p)\|_p \rightarrow 1 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \rho(p, \sigma_p) = \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \hat{\rho}(p, \sigma_p) = \rho$ in L_1 -norm. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{1}{p-1} (\|\rho(p)\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M})} - 1) \\ &= \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\rho(p, \sigma_p)\|_p - 1}{p-1} \\ &= \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\rho(p, \sigma_p)\|_p - \|\rho(p, \sigma_p)\|_1}{p-1} + \frac{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\rho(p, \sigma_p)) - 1}{p-1} \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

$$\geq \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\rho(p, \sigma_p)) \frac{\|\hat{\rho}(p, \sigma_p)\|_p - 1}{p - 1} + \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \inf_{\sigma} \frac{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\sigma^{-\frac{1}{p'}} \rho(p)) - 1}{p - 1}. \quad (2.5)$$

Using Lemma 2.2 and $\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\rho(p, \sigma)) \rightarrow 1$, the first limit here converges to $-H(\rho)$. By Hölder inequality for $p < 1$, the infimum in the second limit can be calculated

$$\inf_{\sigma \in D_+(\mathcal{N})} \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\sigma^{-\frac{1}{p'}} \rho(p)) = \inf_{\sigma \in D_+(\mathcal{N})} \tau_{\mathcal{N}}(\sigma^{-\frac{1}{p'}} E_N(\rho(p))) = \|E_N(\rho(p))\|_{\frac{p}{2p-1}}.$$

Then by Lemma 2.2, and chain rule, the second part converges to $H(E_N(\rho))$ as $E_N(\rho(p)) \rightarrow E_N(\rho)$. Hence we have

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{1}{p - 1} (\|\rho(p)\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M})} - 1) \geq H(E_N(\rho)) - H(\rho). \quad (2.6)$$

For the other direction,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{1}{p - 1} (\|\rho\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M})} - 1) \\ & \leq \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\rho(p, E_N(\rho(p)))\|_p - 1}{p - 1} \\ & = \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\rho(p, E_N(\rho(p)))) \frac{\|\hat{\rho}(p, E_N(\rho(p)))\|_p - 1}{p - 1} + \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(E_N(\rho(p))^{-\frac{1}{p'}} \rho(p)) - 1}{p - 1} \end{aligned}$$

For the first limit, we note that by [29], there exists $C > 0$ such that $\rho \leq C E_N(\rho)$ for any $\rho \in \mathcal{M}_+$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(p) & \leq \rho(p, E_N(\rho(p))) = \rho(p)^{\frac{1}{2}} E_N(\rho(p))^{-\frac{1}{p'}} \rho(p)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C^{\frac{1}{p'}} \rho(p)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ 1 = \tau(\rho(p)) & \leq \tau(\rho(p, E_N(\rho(p)))) \leq C^{\frac{1}{p'}} \tau(\rho(p)^{\frac{1}{p}}) \rightarrow 1 \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\rho(p, E_N(\rho(p))) \rightarrow \rho$ in L_1 norm, which implies

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\rho(p, E_N(\rho(p)))) \frac{\|\hat{\rho}(p, E_N(\rho(p)))\|_p - 1}{p - 1} = -H(\rho).$$

For the second limit, we note that $\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \|E_N(\rho(p)) - E_N(\rho)\|_1 \leq \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \|\rho(p) - \rho\|_1 = 0$.

Then by Lemma 2.2 again and chain rule,

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(E_N(\rho(p))^{-\frac{1}{p'}} \rho(p)) - 1}{p - 1} = \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(E_N(\rho(p))^{\frac{1}{p}}) - 1}{p - 1} = -H(E_N(\rho)) \quad \blacksquare$$

Example 2.4. Consider the matrix algebra $(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}) = (\mathbb{B}(H_A \otimes H_B), \text{tr}_{AB})$, $(\mathcal{N}, \tau_{\mathcal{N}}) = (\mathbb{B}(H_B), \text{tr}_B)$, $\mathcal{N} \cong \mathbb{C}1 \otimes \mathbb{B}(H_B) \subset \mathbb{B}(H_A \otimes H_B)$, the L_1^p -norm for positive $X_{AB} \in \mathbb{B}(H_A \otimes H_B)_+$ is

$$\|X_{AB}\|_{S_1(H_B, S_p(H_A))} = \inf_{\sigma \in \mathbb{B}(H_B)} \text{tr}(|(1 \otimes \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}) \rho_{AB} (1 \otimes \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}})|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (2.7)$$

where the infimum is for all density operator $\sigma \in \mathbb{B}(H_B)$. This case was introduced by Pisier [30]. It was proved in [10, Theorem 17] that for density operator ρ_{AB} ,

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{1}{p-1} (\|\rho\|_{S_1(H_B, S_p(H_A))} - 1) = H(\rho_B) - H(\rho_{AB}) := -H(A|B)_\rho, \quad (2.8)$$

where $H(A|B)$ is called conditional entropy. Moreover,

$$H_p(A|B)_\rho := \frac{p}{p-1} \log \|\rho_{AB}\|_{S_1(H_B, S_p(H_A))}$$

is the sandwiched Rényi p -conditional entropy [25]. In particular, (2.8) implies

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} H_p(A|B)_\rho = -H(A|B)_\rho. \quad (2.9)$$

2.3. Kosaki L_p -norm and relative entropy. Given an invertible positive operator $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}_+$, Kosaki [22] introduced the following weighted L_p -space:

$$\|x\|_{\sigma, p} = \tau(|\sigma^{\frac{1}{2p}} x \sigma^{\frac{1}{2p}}|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

We denote $L_p(\mathcal{M}, \sigma)$ as the space for the above norm. It is known that Kosaki L_p -space also satisfies complex interpolation space: for $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$,

$$L_{p_\theta}(\mathcal{M}, \sigma) = [L_{p_0}(\mathcal{M}, \sigma), L_{p_1}(\mathcal{M}, \sigma)]_\theta,$$

where $1 \leq p_0 \leq q_1 \leq \infty$, and $\frac{1}{p_\theta} = \frac{1-\theta}{p_0} + \frac{\theta}{p_1}$.

Given a density operator $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M})$, the relative entropy with respect to σ is defined as

$$D(\rho|\sigma) = \tau(\rho \log \rho - \rho \log \sigma).$$

Note that the above definition is independent of trace τ , only depends on the state ρ and σ . The relation to Kosaki L_p -norm is as follows.

Lemma 2.5. *Given $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}_+$, for $\rho \in D(\mathcal{M})$, we have uniform convergence*

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \frac{\|\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\sigma, p}^p - 1}{p-1} = \lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \frac{\|\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\sigma, p} - 1}{p-1} = D(\rho|\sigma)$$

If $\rho : [1, 1 + \varepsilon) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{M})$ satisfies $\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \rho(p) = \rho$, then

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \frac{\|\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho(p) \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\sigma, p} - 1}{p-1} = D(\rho|\sigma)$$

Proof. Fix $p' = \frac{p}{p-1}$. We denote

$$\rho_p = \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}, \hat{\rho}_p = \frac{\rho_p}{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\rho_p)} \in D(\mathcal{M}).$$

Because σ is invertible, $\rho(p)$ is continuous with respect to p and $\rho(1) = \hat{\rho}(1) = \rho$. By Lemma 2.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{1}{p-1} (\|\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\sigma,p}^p - 1) \\
 &= \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\rho_p\|_p^p - 1}{p-1} \\
 &= \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\rho_p\|_p^p - \|\rho_p\|_1}{p-1} + \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\rho_p\|_1 - 1}{p-1} \\
 &= \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \tau(\sigma^{-\frac{1}{p}} \rho) \frac{\|\hat{\rho}_p\|_p - 1}{p-1} + \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\tau(\sigma^{-\frac{1}{p}} \rho) - 1}{p-1} \\
 &= \tau(\rho \log \rho) - \tau(\rho \log \sigma) \\
 &= D(\rho|\sigma),
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

where both limit in the above calculation are uniform. The second assertion follows from the uniform continuity of $\rho \mapsto D(\rho|\sigma)$ (σ is invertible and fixed). \blacksquare

Remark 2.6. $D_p(\rho|\sigma) = \frac{p}{p-1} \log \|\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\sigma,p}$ is called Sandwiched Rényi relative entropy [25, 36]. The above argument shows

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} D_p(\rho|\sigma) = D(\rho|\sigma)$$

We will also need weighted amalgamated L_p -space. Let $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$ be a subalgebra. Recall that a map $E_N^\dagger : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is called a conditional expectation if E_N^\dagger is complete positive map satisfying $E_N^\dagger \circ E_N^\dagger = E_N^\dagger$. Given a conditional expectation E_N^\dagger , \mathcal{N} admits a canonical trace $\tau_{\mathcal{N}} = \tau_{\mathcal{M}}|_{\mathcal{N}}$, whose density operator w.r.t $\tau_{\mathcal{M}}$ is $\sigma_{\text{tr}} = E_N(1)$, where E_N is the adjoint of E_N^\dagger . ($\sigma_{\text{tr}} \in \mathcal{N}'$, see [1, 15]). We have

$$E_N(\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2}} x \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2}} E_N^*(x) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and the chain rule for relative entropy [18],

$$D(\rho|E_N(\rho)) = D(\rho|\sigma) - D(E_N(\rho)|\sigma), \tag{2.11}$$

which holds for any σ satisfying $E_N(\sigma) = \sigma$.

For $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$, we define the norm

$$\|x\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}, \sigma_{\text{tr}})} := \inf_{x=ayb} \|a\|_{L_{2p'}(\mathcal{N}, \sigma_{\text{tr}})} \|y\|_{L_p(\mathcal{M}, \sigma_{\text{tr}})} \|b\|_{L_{2p'}(\mathcal{N}, \sigma_{\text{tr}})}.$$

where the infimum is over all factorization $x = ayb$ satisfying $a, b \in \mathcal{N}$. This space also satisfies complex interpolation: for $\theta \in [0, 1]$,

$$L_1^{p\theta}(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}, \sigma_{\text{tr}}) = [L_1^{p_0}(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}, \sigma_{\text{tr}}), L_1^{p_1}(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}, \sigma_{\text{tr}})]$$

where $\frac{1}{p_\theta} = \frac{1-\theta}{p_0} + \frac{\theta}{p_1}$, $1 \leq p_0 \leq p_1 \leq \infty$.

Lemma 2.7. *If $\rho : [1, 1 + \varepsilon) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{M})$, $p \mapsto \rho(p)$ satisfies $\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \rho(p) = \rho$, then*

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \frac{\|\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho(p) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}, \sigma_{\text{tr}})} - 1}{p - 1} = D(\rho \| \sigma_{\text{tr}}) - D(E_N(\rho) \| \sigma_{\text{tr}}).$$

Proof. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{N}_+$ such that $\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma \sigma_{\text{tr}}) = \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma) = 1$. Denote

$$\rho(p, \gamma) = \rho(p)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \gamma^{-\frac{1}{p'}} \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \rho(p)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \hat{\rho}(p, \gamma) = \frac{\rho(p, \gamma)}{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\rho(p, \gamma))}$$

By definition

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho(p) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M})} &= \inf_{\gamma} \|\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho(p) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \gamma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}\|_{L_p(\mathcal{M}, \sigma_{\text{tr}})} \\ &= \inf_{\gamma} \|\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \rho(p) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \gamma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}\|_p \\ &= \inf_{\gamma} \|\rho(p, \gamma)\|_p = \|\rho(p, \gamma_p)\|_p \end{aligned}$$

Since in finite dimensions, we can assume the infimum is attained by some $\gamma_p \in D(\mathcal{N})$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 2.3, we can assume $\inf_{e \text{ projection}} \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(e) \geq 1$. Then for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{N}_+$ satisfying $\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma \sigma_{\text{tr}}) = \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma) = 1$, we have $\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-1} \gamma^{-1} \geq 1, \gamma^{-1} \geq 1$ (σ_{tr} and σ commute). Then

$$\rho(p) \leq \rho(p)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{p'}} \rho(p)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \rho(p, \gamma_p), \quad \forall p > 1.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 = \tau(\rho(p)) &\leq \tau(\rho(p, \gamma_p)) \leq \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(1)^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \|\rho(p, \gamma_p)\|_p \\ &\leq \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(1)^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \|\rho(p, \frac{1}{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(1)})\|_p \leq \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(1)^{2-\frac{2}{p}} \|\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \rho(p) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}\|_p \rightarrow 1 \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \rho(p, \gamma_p) = \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \hat{\rho}(p, \gamma_p) = \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{p'}} \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} = \rho$$

in L_1 -norm. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}(p) \gamma_p^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} - \rho^{1/2}(p)\|_2 &\leq \|\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2p'}}\|_{\infty} \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}(p) \gamma_p^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} - \rho^{1/2}(p) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2p'}}\|_{\infty} \tau(\rho(p) \gamma_p^{-\frac{1}{p'}} \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{p'}} - 2\rho(p) \gamma_p^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} + \rho(p) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{p'}}) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \gamma_p^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \rho(p) \gamma_p^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} = \rho(p)$. Denote

$$\rho_p(\gamma) = \gamma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \rho(\rho) \gamma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}, \quad \tilde{\rho}_p(\gamma) = \frac{\rho_p(\gamma)}{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\rho_p(\gamma))}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{1}{p-1} (\|\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho(p) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}, \sigma_{\text{tr}})} - 1) \\
 &= \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_p(\gamma_p) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{p, \sigma_{\text{tr}}} - 1}{p-1} \\
 &= \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_p(\gamma_p) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_p - \|\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_p(\gamma_p) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{1, \sigma_{\text{tr}}}}{p-1} + \frac{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\rho_p(\gamma_p)) - 1}{p-1} \\
 &\geq \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\rho_p(\gamma_p)) \frac{\|\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_p(\gamma_p) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_p - 1}{p-1} + \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \inf_{\gamma} \frac{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma^{-\frac{1}{p'}} \rho(p)) - 1}{p-1}. \tag{2.12}
 \end{aligned}$$

Here, the first limit converges to $D(\rho|\sigma_{\text{tr}})$ by Lemma 2.5. The infimum in the second limit can be calculated

$$\begin{aligned}
 \inf_{\gamma} \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma^{-\frac{1}{p'}} \rho(p)) &= \inf_{\gamma} \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma^{-\frac{1}{p'}} E_N(\rho(p))) \\
 &= \inf_{\gamma} \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma^{-\frac{1}{p'}} \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2}} E_N^*(\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho(p) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\
 &= \inf_{\gamma} \sigma_{\text{tr}}(\gamma^{-\frac{1}{p'}} E_N^*(\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho(p) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}})) = \|\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} E_N(\rho(p)) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\frac{p}{2p-1}, \sigma_{\text{tr}}}
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that σ_{tr} is a trace on \mathcal{N} , and $\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} E_N(\rho(p)) = E_N(\rho)$. Then by Lemma 2.5

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} E_N(\rho(p)) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\frac{p}{2p-1}, \sigma_{\text{tr}}} - 1}{p-1} = -\sigma_{\text{tr}}(E_N(\rho) \log E_N(\rho)) = -D(E_N(\rho)|\sigma_{\text{tr}}),$$

where we use the fact $D(\rho|\sigma)$ is independent of trace. For the other direction, we denote

$$\rho_N(p) = E_N(\rho(p)) \text{ and take } \hat{\gamma}_p = \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} E_N(\rho(p)) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \rho_p = \frac{\hat{\gamma}_p^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \rho(p) \hat{\gamma}_p^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}}{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\hat{\gamma}_p^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \rho(p) \hat{\gamma}_p^{-\frac{1}{2p'}})},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{1}{p-1} (\|\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho(p) \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}, \sigma_{\text{tr}})} - 1) \\
 &\leq \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\gamma}_p^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \rho(p) \hat{\gamma}_p^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{p, \sigma_{\text{tr}}} - 1}{p-1} \\
 &= \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\hat{\gamma}_p^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \rho(p) \hat{\gamma}_p^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}) \frac{\|\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_p \sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{p, \sigma_{\text{tr}}} - 1}{p-1} + \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\hat{\gamma}_p^{-\frac{1}{p'}} \rho(p)) - 1}{p-1} \\
 &= D(\rho|\sigma_{\text{tr}}) - D(E_N(\rho)|\sigma_{\text{tr}}) \tag{2.13}
 \end{aligned}$$

Here, for the first limit follows from Lemma 2.5 and

$$\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}(p) \hat{\gamma}_p^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} - \rho^{\frac{1}{2}}(p)\|_2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \|\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2p'}}\|_{\infty} \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}(p)\hat{\gamma}_p^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} - \rho^{\frac{1}{2}}(p)\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}\|_2 \\
&\leq \|\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2p'}}\|_{\infty} \tau(\rho(p)\hat{\gamma}_p^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{p'}} - 2\rho(p)\hat{\gamma}_p^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{p'}} + \rho(p)\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{p'}}) \\
&= \|\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2p'}}\|_{\infty} \tau(\rho(p)E_N(\rho(p))^{-\frac{1}{p'}} - 2\rho(p)E_N(\rho(p))^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} + \rho(p)\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{p'}}) \rightarrow 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact $\rho(p) \leq CE_N(\rho(p))$ for some finite C (see [15]). For the second limit, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau(\hat{\gamma}_p^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\rho) &= \tau(\hat{\gamma}_p^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho(p)\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}})\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\
&= \tau(\hat{\gamma}_p^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2}}E_N(\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho(p)\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}})\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\
&= \tau(\hat{\gamma}_p^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2}}E_N(\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho(p)\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}})\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\
&= \tau(\hat{\gamma}_p^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\hat{\gamma}_p\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\
&= \sigma_{\text{tr}}(\hat{\gamma}_p^{\frac{1}{p}}) = \|\hat{\gamma}_p\|_{\frac{1}{p}, \sigma_{\text{tr}}}^{1/p}, \\
\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\hat{\gamma}_p^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\rho(p)) - 1}{p - 1} &= \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{\frac{1}{2}}E_N(\rho(p))\sigma_{\text{tr}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\frac{1}{p}, \sigma_{\text{tr}}}^{\frac{1}{p}} - 1}{p - 1} \\
&= -\sigma_{\text{tr}}(\hat{\gamma}_p \log \hat{\gamma}_p) = -D(E_N(\rho) \|\sigma_{\text{tr}})
\end{aligned}$$

where we used again Lemma 2.5 and $E_N(\rho(p)) \rightarrow E_N(\rho)$ as $p \rightarrow 1$. ■

3. GENERALIZED STRONG SUB-ADDITIVITY OF QUANTUM CHANNELS

Let $(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}})$ and $(\mathcal{N}, \tau_{\mathcal{N}})$ be two finite dimensional von Neumann algebras. We say a linear map $\Phi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is positive if $\Phi(\mathcal{M}_+) \subset \mathcal{N}_+$; completely positive, if for any matrix algebra \mathbb{M}_n , $\Phi \otimes \text{id}_{\mathbb{M}_n}$ is positive; Φ is trace preserving, if for any $\rho \in \mathcal{M}$, $\tau_{\mathcal{N}}(\Phi(\rho)) = \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\rho)$. A completely positive trace preserving (CPTP) map is called a quantum channel, which send density operators to density operators. The adjoint map $\Phi^\dagger : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is completely positive and unital $\Phi^\dagger(1) = 1$ (UCP). A special case is when $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$ is a subalgebra, the embedding map $\iota_{\mathcal{N}} : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is clearly a UCP map. Its adjoint map $E_{\mathcal{N}} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is a quantum channel. For example, $\mathbb{B}(H_B) \cong \mathbb{C}1 \otimes \mathbb{B}(H_B) \subset \mathbb{B}(H_B \otimes H_A)$, the partial trace map $\text{tr}_A = \text{tr} \otimes \text{id}_B : \mathbb{B}(H_B \otimes H_A) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(H_B)$ is CPTP.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{M}$ and \mathcal{R} be finite dimensional von Neumann algebras with traces denoted as $\tau_{\mathcal{A}}, \tau_{\mathcal{B}}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\tau_{\mathcal{R}}$ respectively. Assume that $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A}$ is a subalgebra, and denote $E_{\mathcal{R}}$ as the adjoint map of the embedding. Given two quantum channel map*

$\Phi_A : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ and $\Phi_B : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, for any density operator $\rho \in \mathcal{M}$, we have

$$H(\Phi_A(\rho)) + H(\Phi_B(\rho)) \geq H(\rho) + H(E_R \circ \Phi_A(\rho)) + \log \frac{1}{c}, \quad (3.1)$$

where the constant c is

$$c = \sup\{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\Phi_A^\dagger(a)\Phi_B^\dagger(b)) \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_+, E_R(a) = 1, b \in D(\mathcal{B})\},$$

Proof. Fix a density operator $b \in D(\mathcal{B})$. For $0 \leq \Re(z) \leq 1$, we define an analytic family of map $T_z : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$

$$T_z(\rho) = \Phi_A\left(\Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1-z}{2}}\rho\Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1-z}{2}}\right).$$

For $z = it$, by the duality $L_1^\infty(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A})^* = L_\infty^1(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A})$

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_{it} : L_\infty(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow L_1^\infty(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A})\| &= \sup_{\|\rho\|_\infty=1} \sup_{\|a\|_{L_\infty^1(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A})}=1} |\tau_{\mathcal{M}}\left(a\Phi_A\left(\Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1-it}{2}}\rho\Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1-it}{2}}\right)\right)| \\ &= \sup_{\|\rho\|_\infty=1} \sup_{\|a\|_{L_\infty^1}=1} |\tau_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho\Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Phi_A^\dagger(a)\right)| \\ &= \sup_{\|a\|_{L_\infty^1}=1} \|\Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Phi_A^\dagger(a)\Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L_1(\mathcal{M})} \\ &= \sup_{a \geq 0, E_R(a) \leq 1} \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Phi_A^\dagger(a)\Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\ &= \sup_{a \geq 0, E_R(a) \leq 1} \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\Phi_B^\dagger(b)\Phi_A^\dagger(a)\right) := c(b). \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Here, equality (3.2) uses the fact that

$$S : L_\infty^1(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow L_1(\mathcal{M}), a \mapsto \Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Phi_A^\dagger(a)\Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

is completely positive, then the map norm can be attained by positive elements [10, Theorem 13]. By definition, $c = \sup_{b \in D(\mathcal{B})} c(b)$. For $z = 1 + it$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_{1+it} : L_1(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow L_1(\mathcal{A})\| &= \sup_{\|\rho\|_1=1} \|\Phi_A(\Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{-it}{2}}\rho\Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{-it}{2}})\|_{L_1(\mathcal{A})} \\ &\leq \sup_{\|\rho\|_1=1} \|\Phi_A(\rho)\|_{L_1(\mathcal{A})} \\ &= \|\Phi_A : L_1(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow L_1(\mathcal{A})\| = 1, \end{aligned}$$

because Φ_A is positive and trace preserving. By interpolation (see [3]), we know for any $b \in D(\mathcal{B})$,

$$\|T_p : L_p(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow L_p(\mathcal{A})\| \leq c(b)^{1-\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Then for any $\rho \in D(\mathcal{M})$

$$\|\Phi_A(\Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1}{2p'}}\rho\Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1}{2p'}})\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A})} \leq \|\rho\|_{L_p(\mathcal{M})} c(b)^{1-\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (3.3)$$

Denote

$$\omega(p) = \Phi_A \left(\Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1}{2p'}} \rho \Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1}{2p'}} \right), \quad \hat{\omega}(p) = \frac{\omega(p)}{\tau_A(\omega(p))}$$

Thus, we have $\omega(1) = \hat{\omega}(1) = \Phi_A(\rho)$ and

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\omega(p)\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A})} - 1}{p - 1} \leq \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\rho\|_{L_p(\mathcal{M})} c(b)^{1 - \frac{1}{p}} - 1}{p - 1}. \quad (3.4)$$

Since Φ_A is trace preserving, $\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\rho) = \tau_{\mathcal{A}}(\Phi_A(\rho)) = 1$. We apply Lemma 2.2 for the right hand side of (3.4),

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\rho\|_{L_p(\mathcal{M})} c(b)^{1 - \frac{1}{p}} - 1}{p - 1} \quad (3.5)$$

$$= \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \|\rho\|_{L_p(\mathcal{M})} \frac{(c(b)^{1 - \frac{1}{p}} - 1)}{p - 1} + \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\rho\|_{L_p(\mathcal{M})} - 1}{p - 1} = \ln c(b) - H(\rho). \quad (3.6)$$

For the left hand side of (3.4),

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\omega(p)\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A})} - 1}{p - 1} \\ &= \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\tau_A(\omega(p)) \|\hat{\omega}(p)\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A})} - 1}{p - 1} \\ &= \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \tau_A(\omega(p)) \frac{\|\hat{\omega}(p)\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A})} - 1}{p - 1} + \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\tau_A(\omega(p)) - 1}{p - 1} \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.3, the first term is

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \tau_A(\omega(p)) \frac{\|\hat{\omega}(p)\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A})} - 1}{p - 1} = -H(\Phi_A(\rho)) + H(E_R \circ \Phi_A(\rho)).$$

For the second term, because again Φ_A is trace preserving, we have

$$\tau_A \left(\Phi_A \left(\Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1}{2p'}} \rho \Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1}{2p'}} \right) \right) = \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \rho) \geq \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\Phi_B^\dagger(b)^{\frac{1}{p'}}) \rho = \tau_{\mathcal{B}}(b^{\frac{1}{p'}} \Phi_B(\rho)). \quad (3.7)$$

Here we use the operator convexity of $f(x) = x^{\frac{1}{p'}}$. Take $b = \Phi_B(\rho)$,

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\tau_A(\omega(p)) - 1}{p - 1} \geq \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\tau_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi_B(\rho)^{2 - \frac{1}{p}}) - 1}{p - 1} = -H(\Phi_B(\rho)). \quad (3.8)$$

Combining all the steps above, we have

$$\log c - H(\rho) \geq -H(\Phi_B(\rho)) + H(E_R \circ \Phi_A(\rho)) - H(\Phi_A(\rho)). \quad \blacksquare$$

Remark 3.2. In fact, we proved

$$H(\Phi_A(\rho)) + H(\Phi_B(\rho)) \geq H(\rho) + H(E_{\mathcal{R}} \circ \Phi_A(\rho)) + \log \frac{1}{c(\rho)}, \quad (3.9)$$

where $c(\rho)$ is a local constant depending on ρ

$$\begin{aligned} c(\rho) &= \sup \{ \tau_{\mathcal{M}} \left(\Phi_B^\dagger(\Phi_B(\rho)) \Phi_A^\dagger(a) \right) \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_+, E_R(a) \leq 1 \} \\ &= \|\Phi_A \circ \Phi_B^\dagger \circ \Phi_B(\rho)\|_{L_1^\infty(\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{R})} \end{aligned}$$

while the global constant c in above theorem is

$$c = \|\Phi_A \circ \Phi_B^\dagger : L_1(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow L_1^\infty(\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{R})\| \geq c(\rho).$$

Example 3.3. Consider a simple case : $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{C}1$ is trivial subalgebra, Theorem 3.1 becomes

$$H(\Phi_A(\rho)) + H(\Phi_B(\rho)) \geq H(\rho) + \log \frac{1}{c}$$

where the constant

$$c = \sup_{a \in D(\mathcal{A}), b \in D(\mathcal{B})} \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\Phi_A^\dagger(a) \Phi_B^\dagger(b)).$$

This constant is a noncommutative analog of maximum overlap of two measurements in Frank-Lieb uncertainty relation [12]. This case can also be derived from quantum Brascamp-Lieb duality by Berta, Sutter and Walter [5]. Actually, they obtained a stronger constant

$$c_{BSW} = \sup_{a,b} \tau_{\mathcal{M}} \left(\exp \left(\ln \Phi_A^\dagger(a) + \ln \Phi_B^\dagger(b) \right) \right).$$

which satisfies $c_{BSW} \leq c$ by Golden-Thompson inequality.

Another special case is when $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{M}$ are sub-algebras with induced traces $\tau_{\mathcal{A}} = \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}, \tau_{\mathcal{B}} = \tau|_{\mathcal{B}}$, and $\tau_{\mathcal{R}} = \tau|_{\mathcal{R}}$. Then E_A, E_B and E_R are trace preserving conditional expectation. Petz [26] proved that if $E_A(\mathcal{B}) \subset \mathcal{R}$ then

$$H(E_A(\rho)) + H(E_B(\rho)) \geq H(\rho) + H(E_{\mathcal{R}}(\rho)). \quad (3.10)$$

Theorem 3.1 gives a generalization of the above algebraic SSA inequality

Corollary 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{M}$ be finite dimensional von Neumann subalgebra with induced traces. Then for any $\rho \in D(\mathcal{M})$,*

$$H(E_A(\rho)) + H(E_B(\rho)) \geq H(\rho) + H(E_{\mathcal{R}}(\rho)) + \log \frac{1}{c}, \quad (3.11)$$

where the constant c is

$$c = \sup \{ \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(ab) \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_+, b \in \mathcal{B}_+, E_{\mathcal{R}}(a) = 1, \tau_{\mathcal{B}}(b) = 1 \},$$

In particular, constant $c = 1$ if and only if $E_A E_B = E_A E_B = E_R$.

Proof. The inequality is proved in Theorem 3.1. Here we discuss the equivalence about $c = 1$. Without loss of generality, we can assume $\tau(1) = 1$. If $c = 1$, then for any $b \in D(\mathcal{B})$, $\|E_A(b)\|_{L_1^\infty(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A})} \leq 1$. This implies that there exists $\sigma \in D(\mathcal{R})$ such that $E_A(b) \leq \sigma$. Note that $\tau(E_A(b)) = \tau(\sigma) = 1$. Thus, $E_A(b) = \sigma \in \mathcal{R}$. Hence, we have $E_A(\mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{R}$, because $\mathcal{R} = E_A(\mathcal{R}) \subset E_A(\mathcal{B})$. Now we prove $E_B(\mathcal{A}) \subset \mathcal{R}$. By the definition of c , we have for any $a \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\tau(ab) = \tau(aE_A(b)) = \tau(E_R(a)E_A(b)) = \tau(E_R(a)b)$$

Then for any $b \in \mathcal{B}$, $\tau((a - E_R(a))b) = 0$. This implies $E_B(a) = E_B \circ E_R(a) = E_R(a) \in \mathcal{R}$. Therefore, $E_B(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{R}$. Finally, by the uniqueness of trace preserving conditional expectation we obtained $E_A E_B = E_R = E_A E_B$. \blacksquare

Example 3.5. Recall the Maassan-Uffink uncertainty relation (1.4): let H be a d dimensional Hilbert space, $\mathcal{X} = \{|x_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^d$ and $\{|z_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^d$ be two orthonormal bases on Hilbert spaces. Consider $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{B}(H)$, and \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z} are the commutative subalgebra generated by the two basis respectively. The measurement gives the following conditional expectation

$$E_X(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^d \langle x_i | \rho | x_i \rangle |x_i\rangle \langle x_i|, \quad E_Z(\rho) = \sum_{j=1}^d \langle z_j | \rho | z_j \rangle |z_j\rangle \langle z_j|$$

Berta *et al* [4] proved that

$$H(E_X(\rho)) + H(E_Z(\rho)) \geq H(\rho) + \log \frac{1}{c}.$$

where $c = \max_{i,j} |\langle x_i | z_j \rangle|^2 = \max_{i,j} \text{tr}(E_X^\dagger(e_i)E_Z^\dagger(e_j))$. The minimal c can be $\frac{1}{d}$, and in this case $|\langle x_i | z_j \rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{d}$, $\forall 1 \leq i, j \leq d$, for which \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Z} are called mutually unbiased bases. In particular, they satisfies commuting square condition

$$E_X E_Z = E_Z E_X = E_C.$$

Example 3.6. Consider $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{M}_{d^2}$, and $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \cong \mathbb{M}_d$ are two subalgebras of $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{M}_{d^2}$. If $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$, we have sub-additivity

$$H(\rho_A) + H(\rho_B) \geq H(\rho_{AB}),$$

where $\rho_A = E_A(\rho)$, $\rho_B = E_B(\rho)$. In general, Corollary 3.4 implies

$$H(\rho_A) + H(\rho_B) \geq H(\rho) + \log \frac{1}{c}, \quad c = \sup_{a \in D(\mathcal{A}), b \in D(\mathcal{B})} \text{tr}(ab).$$

Moreover, $c = 1$ if and only if $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$. This answer a question of Petz in [28].

4. UNCERTAINTY RELATION FOR QUANTUM CHANNELS

In this section, we apply Theorem 3.1 to derive the entropic uncertainty relation under presence of quantum memory. For that, we need to discuss the operator space structure of noncommutative L_p -spaces. For simplicity, we consider only matrix algebras $\mathbb{B}(H) \cong \mathbb{M}_n$ equipped with matrix trace tr , whose L_p space is Schatten p -class $S_p(H) := S_p^n$. Given an operator space E , we define the following norm

$$\|x\|_{S_p^n(E)} = \inf_{x=a \cdot y \cdot b} \|a\|_{S_{2p}^n} \|y\|_{\mathbb{M}_n(E)} \|b\|_{S_{2p}^n}, \quad x \in \mathbb{M}_n(E),$$

where the infimum is over all factorization $x = (x_{ij}) = (\sum_{k,l} a_{ik} y_{kl} b_{lj})_{ij}$, $y \in \mathbb{M}_n(E)$, $a, b \in \mathbb{M}_n$. This is the vector-valued noncommutative L_p -norm introduced by Pisier [30]. By [30, Lemma 1.7], the completely bounded norm can be characterized by vector-valued noncommutative L_p -space. Namely, for any $1 \leq p \leq \infty$,

$$\|T : E \rightarrow F\|_{cb} = \sup_n \|\text{id}_n \otimes T : S_p^n(E) \rightarrow S_p^n(F)\| . \quad (4.1)$$

Here $S_\infty^n(E) := \mathbb{M}_n(E)$ is the standard operator space structure of E . When E is $L_q(\mathcal{M})$, this is a special case of amalgamated L_p -space,

$$S_q(K, S_p(H)) := L_q^p(\mathbb{B}(K) \subset \mathbb{B}(K) \otimes \mathbb{B}(H)) .$$

Given a density operator $\rho_{MC} \in \mathbb{B}(H_M \otimes H_C)$ on the tensor product Hilbert space $H_M \otimes H_C$, the conditional entropy w.r.t C system is defined

$$H(M|C)_\rho = H(\rho_{MC}) - H(\rho_C),$$

where $H(\cdot)$ is the von Neumann entropy for matrix trace, $\rho_C = \text{tr}_M \otimes \text{id}_C(\rho_{MC})$ is the reduced density operator on H_C .

Theorem 4.1. *Let H_A , H_B and H_M be finite dimensional Hilbert space. Let $\Phi_A : \mathbb{B}(H_M) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(H_A)$ and $\Phi_B : \mathbb{B}(H_M) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(H_B)$ be two quantum channels. Then for any Hilbert space H_C and any joint state ρ_{MC} on $H_M \otimes H_C$,*

$$H(A|C)_{\Phi_A(\rho)} + H(B|C)_{\Phi_B(\rho)} \geq H(M|C)_\rho + \log \frac{1}{c} . \quad (4.2)$$

where c is the completely bounded norm

$$c = \|\Phi_B \circ \Phi_A^\dagger : S_1(H_A) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(H_B)\|_{cb}, \quad (4.3)$$

Proof. Note that (4.2) is equivalent to

$$H(\Phi_A(\rho)) + H(\Phi_B(\rho)) \geq H(\rho_{MC}) + H(\rho_C) + \log \frac{1}{c}$$

Choosing $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{B}(H_M \otimes H_C)$, $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{B}(H_A \otimes H_C)$, $\mathcal{B} = \mathbb{B}(H_B \otimes H_C)$ and $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{B}(H_C)$ in Theorem 3.1, we obtain (4.2) for the constant c

$$c = \|\text{id}_C \otimes \Phi_B \circ \Phi_A^\dagger : S_\infty(H_C, S_1(H_A)) \rightarrow S_\infty(H_C \otimes H_B)\|$$

This yields the completely bounded norm by taking supremum of H_C for all dimensions. ■

Remark 4.2. It is known [11, 7] that,

$$\|\Phi_B \circ \Phi_A^\dagger : S_1(H_A) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(H_B)\|_{cb} = \|C_{\Phi_B \circ \Phi_A^\dagger}\|_{\mathbb{B}(H_A \otimes H_B)},$$

where

$$C_{\Phi_B \circ \Phi_A^\dagger} = \sum_{i,j} e_{ij} \otimes \Phi_B \circ \Phi_A^\dagger(e_{ij}) \in \mathbb{B}(H_A \otimes H_B)$$

is the Choi matrix of $\Phi_B \circ \Phi_A^\dagger$. Indeed, by Remark 3.2, we know the constant c can be improved to the state dependent one

$$c(\rho) = \|\text{id}_C \otimes \Phi_B \circ \Phi_A^\dagger \circ \Phi_A(\rho)\|_{S_1(H_C, \mathbb{B}(H_B))}.$$

Example 4.3. Our result recovers the uncertainty relation of Frank and Lieb [12]. Given two positive operator valued measurements $\{E_x\}$ and $\{F_z\}$, define the quantum to classical channel for the measurement

$$\Phi_A(\rho) = \sum_x \text{tr}(\rho E_x) |x\rangle\langle x|, \quad \Phi_B(\rho) = \sum_z \text{tr}(\rho F_z) |z\rangle\langle z|,$$

Then

$$\Phi_B \circ \Phi_A^\dagger(\rho) = \sum_x \text{tr}(E_x F_z) \langle x|\rho|x\rangle |z\rangle\langle z|,$$

is a classical channel $N(z|x) = \text{tr}(E_x F_z)$ from the commutative system \mathbb{C}^X to \mathbb{C}^Z with transition matrix as $N(z|x) = \text{tr}(E_x F_z)$. By Smith's lemma [34]

$$c = \|\Phi_B \circ \Phi_A^\dagger : \ell_1(X) \rightarrow \ell_\infty(Z)\|_{cb} = \|\Phi_B \circ \Phi_A^\dagger : \ell_1(X) \rightarrow \ell_\infty(Z)\| = \max_{x,z} \text{tr}(E_x F_z),$$

which recovers the maximal overlap of measurement.

Example 4.4. Consider $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{B}(H_A \otimes H_B)$, $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{B}(H_A)$ and $\mathcal{B} = \mathbb{B}(H_B)$ with the partial trace channel $\text{tr}_A : \mathbb{B}(H_A \otimes H_B) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(H_A)$ and $\text{tr}_B : \mathbb{B}(H_A \otimes H_B) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(H_B)$. One have the map

$$\text{tr}_B \circ (\text{tr}_A)^\dagger(X) = \text{tr}_B(X \otimes I_B) = I_B,$$

whose Choi matrix is $\chi = I_A \otimes I_B$. Hence, $c = 1$ and this recovers the strong sub-additivity

$$H(A|C) + H(B|C) \geq H(AB|C).$$

Motivated by the examples above, we study the minimum uncertainty under the presence of quantum memory. Let $\Phi_A : \mathbb{B}(H_M) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(H_A)$ and $\Phi_B : \mathbb{B}(H_M) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(H_B)$ be two quantum channels. For a quantum state $\rho_{MC} \in \mathbb{B}(H_M \otimes H_C)$, we define the generalized conditional mutual information

$$I(\Phi_A, \Phi_B|C)_\rho := H(A|C)_{\Phi_A \otimes \text{id}_C(\rho)} + H(B|C)_{\Phi_B \otimes \text{id}_C(\rho)} - H(M|C)_\rho. \quad (4.4)$$

and the minimal uncertainty Φ_A and Φ_B ,

$$I(\Phi_A, \Phi_B|C) := \inf_{\rho_{MC}} I(\Phi_A, \Phi_B|C)_\rho, \quad (4.5)$$

$$I^{sq}(\Phi_A, \Phi_B) := \inf_{H_C} I(\Phi_A, \Phi_B|C)_\rho, \quad (4.6)$$

where the infimum runs all density operator $\rho_{MC} \in \mathbb{B}(H_M \otimes H_C)$, and second infimum is over Hilbert space H_C of all dimensions. The notation I^{sq} is motivated by the squashed entanglement introduced in [8]. Consider the Stinespring dilation of Φ_A as follows,

$$\Phi_A(\rho) = \text{id}_A \otimes \text{tr}_E(V\rho V^*)$$

where H_E is a Hilbert space, and $V : H_M \rightarrow H_A \otimes H_E$ is an isometry satisfies $V^*V = 1$. As a technical tool we introduce the map

$$\hat{\Phi}_B : \mathbb{B}(H_A \otimes H_E) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(H_B), \quad \hat{\Phi}_B(\rho_{AE}) = \Phi_B(V^*\rho_{AE}V).$$

$\hat{\Phi}_B$ is a completely positive and trace non-increasing map, which can be viewed as an extension of Φ_B by regarding the isometry V as a subspace inclusion. Let $e = VV^*$ be the projection onto the range of V . It is clear that $\text{tr}(\hat{\Phi}(\rho)) = \text{tr}(\rho)$ if and only if ρ is supported on e , i.e. $e\rho e = \rho$. This means the restriction of $\hat{\Phi}_B$ on $\mathbb{B}(e(H_A \otimes H_E))$ is exactly Φ_B , hence trace preserving. We see in the next lemma that the map $\hat{\Phi}_B$ determines $I(\Phi_A, \Phi_B|C)$ and $I^{sq}(\Phi_A, \Phi_B)$.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Let H_C be a Hilbert space. Then*

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\| \text{id}_C \otimes \hat{\Phi}_B : S_1(H_A \otimes H_C, S_p(H_E)) \rightarrow S_1(H_C, S_p(H_B)) \| - 1}{p - 1} = -I(\Phi_A, \Phi_B|C)$$

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\| \hat{\Phi}_B : S_1(H_A, S_p(H_E)) \rightarrow S_p(H_B) \|_{cb} - 1}{p - 1} = -I^{sq}(\Phi_A, \Phi_B)$$

Proof. We define two functions on $[1, \infty] \times \mathbb{B}(H_{CAE})$,

$$f(p, \rho) = \| \text{id}_C \otimes \hat{\Phi}_B(\rho) \|_{S_1(H_C, S_p(H_B))},$$

$$g(p, \rho) = \| \rho \|_{S_1(H_A \otimes H_C, S_p(H_E))}.$$

Denote

$$h(p) = \| \text{id}_C \otimes \hat{\Phi}_B : S_1(H_A \otimes H_C, S_p(H_E)) \rightarrow S_1(H_C, S_p(H_B)) \|.$$

Since $\hat{\Phi}_B$ is completely positive, by [10, Theorem 12] it suffices to consider its norm for density operators,

$$h(p) = \sup_{\rho} \frac{f(p, \rho)}{g(p, \rho)}.$$

Let $p_n \rightarrow 1$ be a sequence such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(p_n) - 1}{p_n - 1} = \limsup_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{h(p) - 1}{p - 1}.$$

Suppose ρ_n is a sequence such that attains $h(p_n)$ for each p_n . Without loss of generality, we can assume $\rho_n \rightarrow \rho$ converges. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{h(p) - 1}{p - 1} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(p_n) - 1}{p_n - 1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(p_n, \rho_n) - 1}{p_n - 1} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{g(p_n, \rho_n)} \left(\frac{f(p_n, \rho_n) - 1}{p - 1} - \frac{g(p_n, \rho_n) - 1}{p - 1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that we should have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(p_n, \rho_n) = f(1, \rho) = 1,$$

otherwise the above limit equals $-\infty$. Note that by complex interpolation, $h(p) \leq h(1)^{\frac{1}{p}} h(\infty)^{(1-\frac{1}{p})} = h(\infty)^{(1-\frac{1}{p})}$ and

$$\limsup_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{h(p) - 1}{p - 1} \leq \limsup_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{h(\infty)^{(1-\frac{1}{p})} - 1}{p - 1} = \ln h(\infty) < \infty,$$

which leads to a contradiction. Thus we have $\text{tr}(\text{id}_C \otimes \hat{\Phi}_B(\rho_1)) = 1$, which means ρ is supported on $eH_{AE} \cong H_M$. By Lemma 2.3

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(p_n, \rho_{p_n}) - 1}{p_n - 1} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\text{id}_C \otimes \hat{\Phi}_B(\rho_n)\|_{S_1(H_C, S_{p_n}(H_B))} - 1}{p_n - 1} = H(\text{id}_C \otimes \hat{\Phi}_B(\rho)) - H(\rho_C) \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g(p_n, \rho_{p_n}) - 1}{p_n - 1} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\rho_n\|_{S_1(H_A \otimes H_C, S_{p_n}(H_E))} - 1}{p_n - 1} = H(\rho_{CM}) - H(\Phi_A(\rho_{MC})) \\ &= H(\rho_{CM}) - H(\rho_{AC}) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{h(p) - 1}{p - 1} &= -H(\text{id}_C \otimes \hat{\Phi}_B(\rho)) + H(\rho_C) + H(\rho_{CM}) - H(\Phi_A(\rho_{MC})) \\ &= -H(A|C)_{\Phi_A(\rho)} - H(B|C)_{\Phi_B(\rho)} + H(M|C)_{\rho} = -I(\Phi_A, \Phi_B|C)_{\rho} \\ &\leq -\inf_{\rho} I(\Phi_A, \Phi_B|C)_{\rho} = -I(\Phi_A, \Phi_B|C). \end{aligned}$$

For the other direction, we assume that $I(\Phi_A, \Phi_B|C)$ is attained by ω_{MC} . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 -I(\Phi_A, \Phi_B|C) &= -I(\Phi_A, \Phi_B|C)_\omega \\
 &= -H(\text{id}_C \otimes \hat{\Phi}_B(\omega)) + H(\omega_C) + H(\omega_{CM}) - H(\Phi_A(\omega_{MC})) \\
 &= \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\frac{f(p, \omega)}{g(p, \omega)} - 1}{p - 1} \\
 &\leq \liminf_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\sup_\rho \frac{f(p, \omega)}{g(p, \omega)} - 1}{p - 1} \\
 &= \liminf_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{h(p) - 1}{p - 1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

The second asserted equality follows from taking supremum over all H_C . ■

In the following, we use the short notation $H_{AB} := H_A \otimes H_B$.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\hat{\Phi}_j : \mathbb{B}(H_{A_j E_j}) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(H_{B_j}), j = 1, 2$ be two linear maps respectively. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\|\hat{\Phi}_1 \otimes \hat{\Phi}_2 : S_1(H_{A_1 A_2}, S_p(H_{E_1 E_2})) \rightarrow S_p(H_{B_1 B_2})\|_{cb} \\
 &= \|\hat{\Phi}_1 : S_1(H_{A_1}, S_p(H_{E_1})) \rightarrow S_p(H_{B_1})\|_{cb} \|\hat{\Phi}_2 : S_1(H_{A_2}, S_p(H_{E_2})) \rightarrow S_p(H_{B_2})\|_{cb}. \quad (4.7)
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We will repeatedly use the noncommutative version of the Minkowski's inequality [30, Corollary 1.10] that for any operator space E , the identity map

$$\text{id} : S_p(H_A; S_q(H_B; E)) \rightarrow S_q(H_B; S_p(H_A; E)) \quad (4.8)$$

is a complete contraction provided that $q \geq p$. We write

$$\hat{\Phi}_1 \otimes \hat{\Phi}_2 : S_1(H_{A_1 A_2}, S_p(H_{E_1 E_2})) \rightarrow S_p(H_{B_1 B_2})$$

as the composition of the following four maps,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &S_1(H_{A_1 A_2}, S_p(H_{E_1 E_2})) \\
 &\xrightarrow{\text{id}} S_1(H_{A_1}, S_p(H_{E_1}, S_1(H_{A_2}, S_p(H_{E_2})))) \\
 &\xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \hat{\Phi}_2} S_1(H_{A_1}, S_p(H_{E_1}, S_p(H_{B_2}))) \\
 &\xrightarrow{\text{id}} S_p(H_{B_2}, S_1(H_{A_1}, S_p(H_{E_1}))) \\
 &\xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \hat{\Phi}_1} S_p(H_{B_1 B_2})
 \end{aligned}$$

The first map and third map are complete contractions by (4.8). Let us recall the Pisier lemma 4.1 that for any linear map $T : E \rightarrow F$ and $1 \leq p, q \leq \infty$

$$\|\text{id}_H \otimes T : S_p(H, E) \rightarrow S_p(H, F)\| = \|\text{id}_H \otimes T : S_q(H, E) \rightarrow S_q(H, F)\|.$$

Applying this property twice, we have for the second map

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\text{id}_{A_1 E_1} \otimes \Phi_2 : S_1(H_{A_1}, S_p(H_{E_1}, S_1(H_{A_2}, S_p(H_{E_2})))) \rightarrow S_1(H_{A_1}, S_p(H_{E_1}, S_p(H_{B_2})))\|_{cb} \\ & \leq \|\Phi_2 : S_1(H_{A_2}, S_p(H_{E_2})) \rightarrow S_p(H_{B_2})\| \end{aligned}$$

and the fourth map

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\text{id}_{B_2} \otimes \Phi_1 : S_p(H_{B_2}, S_1(H_{A_1}, S_p(H_{E_1}))) \rightarrow S_p(H_{B_1 B_2})\|_{cb} \\ & \leq \|\Phi_1 : S_1(H_{A_1}, S_p(H_{E_1})) \rightarrow S_p(H_{B_1})\| \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we show the “ \leq ” direction in the desired equality (4.7). The other direction follows from tensor product elements. \blacksquare

We obtain the following additivity result.

Theorem 4.7. *I^{sq} is additive. That is, for two pairs of quantum channels (Φ_A, Φ_B) and (Ψ_A, Ψ_B) ,*

$$I^{sq}(\Phi_A \otimes \Psi_A, \Phi_B \otimes \Psi_B) = I^{sq}(\Phi_A, \Phi_B) + I^{sq}(\Psi_A, \Psi_B).$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.6,

$$\begin{aligned} & - I^{sq}(\Phi_A \otimes \Psi_A, \Phi_B \otimes \Psi_B) \\ &= \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\hat{\Phi}_B \otimes \hat{\Psi}_B : S_1(A_1 A_2, S_p(E_1 E_2)) \rightarrow S_p(B_1 B_2)\|_{cb} - 1}{p - 1} \\ &= \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\hat{\Phi}_B : S_1(A_1, S_p(E_1)) \rightarrow S_p(B_1)\|_{cb} \|\hat{\Psi}_B : S_1(A_2, S_p(E_2)) \rightarrow S_p(B_2)\|_{cb} - 1}{p - 1} \\ &= \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \|\hat{\Psi}_B : S_1(A_2, S_p(E_2)) \rightarrow S_p(B_2)\|_{cb} \frac{\|\hat{\Phi}_B : S_1(A_1, S_p(E_1)) \rightarrow S_p(B_1)\|_{cb} - 1}{p - 1} \\ & \quad + \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\hat{\Psi}_B : S_1(A_2, S_p(E_2)) \rightarrow S_p(B_2)\|_{cb} - 1}{p - 1} \\ &= - I^{sq}(\Phi_A, \Phi_B) - I^{sq}(\Psi_A, \Psi_B) \end{aligned} \quad \blacksquare$$

Remark 4.8. The above additivity results can be extended to minimal uncertainty with parameters

$$I_\alpha^{sq}(\Phi_A, \Phi_B | C) := \inf_{\rho^{MC}} \alpha_A H(A|C) + \alpha_B H(B|C) - \alpha_M H(M|C),$$

where $\alpha = (\alpha_A, \alpha_B, \alpha_M)$ are non-negative parameters satisfying $0 \leq \alpha_A \leq \alpha_M \leq \alpha_B$. Indeed, similar to Example 2.4 and Lemma 4.5, we have

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{1}{p - 1} (\|\rho^{CA}\|_{S_{q_1}(H_C, S_{q_2}(H_A))} - 1) = (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1)H(C) - \alpha_2 H(CA),$$

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{1}{p-1} (\|id_C \otimes \hat{\Phi}_B : S_{q_1}(H_{CA}, S_{q_2}(H_E)) \rightarrow S_{q_1}(H_C, S_{q_3}(H_B))\| - 1) = -I_\alpha(\Phi_A, \Phi_B|C)$$

where q_1, q_2, q_3 are functions of p satisfying following relations

$$1 - \frac{1}{q_j(p)} = \alpha_j \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right), \quad j = 1, 2, 3.$$

The additivity of $I_\alpha^{sq}(\Phi_A, \Phi_B|C)$ follows similarly via the multiplicativity of CB-norm in Lemma 4.6. The reader are referred to [13] for the details.

5. STRONG SUB-ADDITIVITY OF RELATIVE ENTROPY

In this section, we discuss a generalized strong sub-additivity for relative entropy. Our motivation is the following result of Petz. Recall that for two density operators $\rho \in D(\mathcal{M})$ and $\sigma \in D_+(\mathcal{M})$, the relative entropy is

$$D(\rho||\sigma) = \text{tr}(\rho \log \rho - \rho \log \sigma).$$

Theorem 5.1 (Petz [26]). *Let \mathcal{M} be a C^* -algebra, and $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{M}$ be a subalgebra. Let σ be a faithful state of \mathcal{M} and assume that there is a σ -preserving conditional expectation $E_A^\dagger : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$. If $E_A^\dagger(\mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{R}$ is a subalgebra, then for any state ρ ,*

$$D(\rho||\sigma) + D(\rho_R||\sigma_R) \geq D(\rho_A||\sigma_A) + D(\rho_B||\sigma_B),$$

where $\rho_A = \rho|_{\mathcal{A}}, \sigma_A = \sigma|_{\mathcal{A}}$ are the restriction state on \mathcal{A} and similarly for subalgebra \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{R} .

We now present a quantitative extension of above theorem.

Theorem 5.2. *Let \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{M} be finite dimensional von Neumann algebras equipped with trace $\tau_{\mathcal{A}}, \tau_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\tau_{\mathcal{M}}$. Let $\Phi_A : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ and $\Phi_B : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be two quantum channels. Suppose $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{B}$ is a subalgebra, and assume that $\sigma \in D_+(\mathcal{M})$ is a density operator such that there exists a conditional expectation $E_R^\dagger : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ preserving $\Phi_B(\sigma)$. Then for any $\rho \in D(\mathcal{M})$, we have*

$$D(\rho||\sigma) + D(E_R \circ \Phi_B(\rho)||\Phi_B(\sigma)) \geq D(\Phi_A(\rho)||\Phi_A(\sigma)) + D(\Phi_B(\rho)||\Phi_B(\sigma)) - \kappa$$

Here, the constant κ is

$$\kappa = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha(t) \log c(t) dt, \quad \alpha(t) = \frac{\pi}{2(\cosh(\pi t) + 1)},$$

$$c(t) = \sup_b \tau_{\mathcal{M}} \left(\Phi_B^\dagger(b) \Phi_A^\dagger(\Phi_A(\rho)^{\frac{1+it}{2}} \Phi_A(\sigma)^{\frac{-1-it}{2}}) \sigma \Phi_A^\dagger(\Phi_A(\rho)^{\frac{1-it}{2}} \Phi_A(\sigma)^{\frac{-1-it}{2}})^* \right),$$

where the supremum is for all $b \in \mathcal{B}_+$ such that $E_R^\dagger(b) = 1$.

The proof is divided into two steps. Given $\sigma \in D_+(\mathcal{M})$ and $\rho \in D(\mathcal{M})$, we define the parameter

$$\lambda(p) = \|\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{p,\sigma} = \|\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}\rho\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}\|_p$$

For $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, we denote

$$\rho_A = \Phi_A(\rho), \rho_B = \Phi_B(\rho), \rho_R = E_R \circ \Phi_B(\rho),$$

and similarly for σ_A, σ_B and σ_R . Recall that the condition expectation $E_R^\dagger : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ induce a natural weight $\sigma_{\text{tr}} = E_R(1) \in \mathcal{R}' \subset \mathcal{B}$.

Lemma 5.3. *For $p > 1$, define*

$$\Delta(p) := \lambda(p)^{-1} \|\sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Phi_B\left(\Phi_A^\dagger\left(\rho_A^{\frac{1}{2p'}}\sigma_A^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}\right)\rho\Phi_A^\dagger\left(\sigma_A^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}\rho_A^{\frac{1}{2p'}}\right)\right)\sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{B}, \sigma_{\text{tr}})}$$

We have

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\Delta(p) - 1}{p - 1} \geq D(\rho_A || \sigma_A) + D(\rho_B || \sigma_B) - D(\rho_R || \sigma_R) - D(\rho || \sigma).$$

Proof. First, $\lambda_1 = 1$ and by Lemma 2.5

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\lambda(p)^{-1} - 1}{p - 1} = \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\|\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}\rho\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}\|_p^{-1} - 1}{p - 1} = -D(\rho || \sigma).$$

Define

$$x_p = \Phi_A^\dagger\left(\rho_A^{\frac{1}{2p'}}\sigma_A^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}\right)\rho\Phi_A^\dagger\left(\sigma_A^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}\rho_A^{\frac{1}{2p'}}\right).$$

Denote $s(\rho)$ as the support of ρ . When $p \rightarrow 1$, $\frac{1}{p'} = \frac{p-1}{p} \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} x_p = \Phi_A^\dagger(s(\rho_A))\rho\Phi_A^\dagger(s(\rho_A)) = \rho$$

In fact, for any positive $0 \leq y \leq 1$, $\Phi_A(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}y\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \Phi_A(\rho) = \rho_A$, so $s(\Phi_A(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}y\rho^{\frac{1}{2}})) \leq s(\rho_A)$. Hence,

$$\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(y\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\Phi_A^\dagger(s(\rho_A))\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \tau_{\mathcal{A}}\left(\Phi_A(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}y\rho^{\frac{1}{2}})s(\rho_A)\right) = \tau_{\mathcal{A}}\left(\Phi_A(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}y\rho^{\frac{1}{2}})\right) = \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\rho y).$$

Therefore,

$$\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\Phi_A^\dagger(s(\rho_A))\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} = \rho, \Phi_A^\dagger(s(\rho_A))\rho\Phi_A^\dagger(s(\rho_A)) = \rho.$$

We split the desired limit as the following three parts

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\Delta(p) - 1}{p - 1} &= \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \|\sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Phi_B(x_p)\sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{B}, \sigma_{\text{tr}})} \frac{\lambda(p)^{-1} - 1}{p - 1} \\ &\quad + \frac{\|\sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Phi_B(x_p)\sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{B}, \sigma_{\text{tr}})} - \tau_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi_B(x_p))}{p - 1} + \frac{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(x_p) - 1}{p - 1} \\ &:= \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III} \end{aligned}$$

By $\|\sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Phi_B(x_p)\sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{R}\subset\mathcal{B},\sigma_{\text{tr}})} \rightarrow 1$, the first part is calculated. The limits for part II and III are as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \text{II}(p) &\geq D(\rho_B || \sigma_{\text{tr}}) - D(E_R(\rho_B) || \sigma_{\text{tr}}) = D(\rho_B || \sigma_B) - D(E_R(\rho_B) || \sigma_B), \\ \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \text{III}(p) &\geq D(\rho_A || \sigma_A) \end{aligned}$$

The part II follows from Lemma 2.7 and $\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \Phi_B(x_p) = \Phi_B(\rho)$. For part III, note that for a positive a

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} a^q = s(a), \quad \left. \frac{d}{dq} a^q \right|_{q=0} = s(a) \log a .$$

Because $s(\rho_A) \leq s(\sigma_A)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \text{III}(p) &= \lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \frac{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(x_p) - 1}{p - 1} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \tau_{\mathcal{M}} \left(\Phi_A^\dagger(s(\rho_A) \log(\sigma_A)) \rho \Phi_A^\dagger(s(\rho_A)) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \tau_{\mathcal{M}} \left(\Phi_A^\dagger(\log \rho_A) \rho \Phi_A^\dagger(\rho_A) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \tau_{\mathcal{M}} \left(\Phi_A^\dagger(s(\rho_A)) \rho \Phi_A^\dagger(\log \rho_A) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \tau_{\mathcal{M}} \left(\Phi_A^\dagger(s(\rho_A)) \rho \Phi_A^\dagger(\log \sigma_A s(\rho_A)) \right) \\ &= -\tau_{\mathcal{M}} \left(\rho_A \log(\sigma_A) s(\rho_A) \right) + \tau_{\mathcal{M}} \left(\rho_A \log(\rho_A) s(\rho_A) \right) \\ &= D(\rho_A || \sigma_A) . \end{aligned}$$

Combining the three parts above, we finish the proof. ■

Fix $1 < p < \infty$, define the analytic family of operator

$$\rho : \{0 \leq \Re(z) \leq 1\} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}, \quad \rho(z) = \lambda_p^{-pz} \sigma^{-\frac{z}{2}} |\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}|^{pz} \sigma^{-\frac{z}{2}}$$

Note that

$$\rho\left(\frac{1}{p}\right) = \frac{\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{\|\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{p,\sigma}} = \lambda_p^{-1} \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho(it)\|_\infty &= \|\sigma^{-\frac{it}{2}} |\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}|^{ipt} \sigma^{-\frac{it}{2}}\|_\infty \leq 1 \\ \|\rho(1+it)\|_{1,\sigma_{\text{tr}}} &= \lambda_p^{-p} \|\sigma^{-\frac{1-it}{2}} |\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}}|^{p+ipt} \sigma^{-\frac{1-it}{2}}\|_{1,\sigma} \leq 1 . \end{aligned}$$

For $\Delta(\rho, \gamma)$, we have the following estimate:

Lemma 5.4. *For any $1 < p < \infty$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{R}_+$,*

$$\lim_{p \leq 1^+} \frac{\Delta(p) - 1}{p - 1} \leq \kappa ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha(t) \log c(t) dt, \quad \alpha(t) = \frac{\pi}{2(\cosh(\pi t) + 1)} \\ c(t) &= \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\sigma_{tr}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Phi_B \left(\Phi_A^\dagger \left(\rho_A^{\frac{1+it}{2}} \sigma_A^{-\frac{1-it}{2}} \right) \sigma \Phi_A^\dagger \left(\sigma_A^{-\frac{1+it}{2}} \rho_A^{\frac{1-it}{2}} \right) \right) \sigma_{tr}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L_1^\infty(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{B}, \sigma_{tr})} \\ &= \sup_b \tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\Phi_B^\dagger(b) \Phi_A^\dagger \left(\rho_A^{\frac{1+it}{2}} \sigma_A^{-\frac{1-it}{2}} \right) \sigma \Phi_A^\dagger \left(\sigma_A^{-\frac{1+it}{2}} \rho_A^{\frac{1-it}{2}} \right))\end{aligned}$$

where the supremum is for all $b \in \mathcal{B}_+$ such that $E_R^\dagger(b) \leq 1$.

Proof. Fix $1 < p < \infty$, we consider the following analytic family of operators,

$$A(z) = \sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Phi_B \left(\Phi_A^\dagger \left(\rho_A^{\frac{1-z}{2}} \sigma_A^{\frac{z-1}{2}} \right) \rho(z) \Phi_A^\dagger \left(\sigma_A^{\frac{z-1}{2}} \rho_A^{\frac{1-z}{2}} \right) \right) \sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Note that

$$\|A(\frac{1}{p})\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{B}, \sigma_{tr})} = \Delta(p)$$

For $z = 1 + it$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|A(1 + it)\|_{1, \sigma_{tr}} &= \|\Phi_B \left(\Phi_A^\dagger \left(\rho_A^{\frac{it}{2}} \sigma_A^{-\frac{-it}{2}} \right) \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho(1 - it) \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \Phi_A^\dagger \left(\sigma_A^{-\frac{it}{2}} \rho_A^{\frac{it}{2}} \right) \right)\|_1 \\ &\leq \|\Phi_A^\dagger \left(\rho_A^{\frac{it}{2}} \sigma_A^{-\frac{-it}{2}} \right) \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho(1 - it) \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \Phi_A^\dagger \left(\sigma_A^{-\frac{it}{2}} \rho_A^{\frac{it}{2}} \right)\|_1 \\ &\leq \|\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho(1 - it) \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_1 \\ &\leq \lambda_p^{-p} \|\sigma^{it} | \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2p'}} |^{p-ipt} \sigma^{-it}\|_1 = 1\end{aligned}$$

For $z = it$,

$$\|A(it)\|_{L_1^\infty(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{B}, \sigma_{tr})} = \|\sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Phi_B \left(\Phi_A^\dagger \left(\rho_A^{\frac{1+it}{2}} \sigma_A^{-\frac{1-it}{2}} \right) \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho(it) \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \Phi_A^\dagger \left(\sigma_A^{-\frac{1-it}{2}} \rho_A^{\frac{1+it}{2}} \right) \right) \sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L_1^\infty(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{B}, \sigma_{tr})}$$

Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathcal{R}_+$ be two arbitrary positive elements in \mathcal{R} with $\|\gamma\|_{1, \sigma_{tr}} = 1$. Denote

$$X_1 = \gamma_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad X_2 = \gamma_2^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad Y(t) = \Phi_A^\dagger \left(\rho_A^{\frac{1+it}{2}} \sigma_A^{-\frac{1-it}{2}} \right).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\|A(it)\|_{L_1^\infty(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{B}, \sigma_{tr})} &= \|\sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Phi_B(Y(t) \sigma^{1/2} \rho(it) \sigma^{1/2} Y(-t)^*) \sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{L_1^\infty(\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{B}, \sigma_{tr})} \\ &= \inf_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2} \|\gamma_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Phi_B(Y(t) \sigma^{1/2} \rho(it) \sigma^{1/2} Y(-t)^*) \sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \gamma_2^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_\infty\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}&\begin{bmatrix} X_1 \Phi_B(Y(t) \sigma Y(t)^*) X_1^* & A(it) \\ A(-it) & X_2 \Phi_B(Y(-t) \sigma Y(-t)^*) X_2^* \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} X_1 & 0 \\ 0 & X_2 \end{bmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \Phi_B \left(\begin{bmatrix} Y(t) & 0 \\ 0 & Y(-t) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma^{1/2} \rho(it) \\ \sigma^{1/2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma^{1/2} \rho(it) \\ \sigma^{1/2} \end{bmatrix}^* \begin{bmatrix} Y(t)^* & 0 \\ 0 & Y(-t)^* \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
 & \cdot \begin{bmatrix} X_1^* & 0 \\ 0 & X_2^* \end{bmatrix} \\
 & \geq 0
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned}
 c(t) & := \|\Phi_B(Y(t)\sigma Y(t)^*)\|_{L_1^\infty(\mathcal{R}\subset\mathcal{B},\sigma_{\text{tr}})} \\
 & = \inf_{\gamma} \|\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}\gamma^{\frac{-1-it}{2}}\Phi_B\left(\Phi_A^\dagger\left(\rho_A^{\frac{1+it}{2}}\sigma_A^{\frac{-1-it}{2}}\right)\sigma\Phi_A^\dagger\left(\sigma_A^{\frac{-1+it}{2}}\rho_A^{\frac{1-it}{2}}\right)\right)\gamma^{\frac{-1+it}{2}}\sigma_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_\infty
 \end{aligned}$$

Then by (5.1) we have

$$\|A(it)\|_{L_1^\infty(\mathcal{R}\subset\mathcal{B},\sigma_{\text{tr}})} \leq \sqrt{c(t)c(-t)}$$

Now, by Hirschma interpolation theorem [17] (see also [20, Lemma 3.2]), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \log \|A\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{R}\subset\mathcal{B},\sigma_{\text{tr}})} & \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \beta_{\frac{1}{p}}(t) \log \|A(it)\|_{L_1^{\frac{1}{p},\sigma_{\text{tr}}}}^{\frac{1}{p}} + \alpha_{\frac{1}{p}}(t) \log \|A(1+it)\|_{L_1^\infty(\mathcal{R}\subset\mathcal{B},\sigma_{\text{tr}})}^{1-\frac{1}{p}} dt \\
 & \leq \frac{p-1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{\frac{1}{p}}(t) (\log c(t) + \log c(-t)) dt \\
 & = \frac{p-1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha_{\frac{1}{p}}(t) \log c(t) dt
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\alpha_{\frac{1}{p}}(t) = \frac{\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{p}\right)}{2\left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)(\cosh(\pi t) - \cos(\pi\theta))},$$

and

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \alpha_{\frac{1}{p}}(t) = \frac{\pi}{2(\cosh(\pi t) + 1)} := \alpha(t).$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\Delta(p) - 1}{p - 1} & = \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{\Delta(p)^p - 1}{p - 1} \\
 & = \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{p \log \Delta(p)}{p - 1} \\
 & = \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \frac{p \log \|A\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\|_{L_1^p(\mathcal{R}\subset\mathcal{B},\sigma_{\text{tr}})}}{p - 1} \\
 & \leq \lim_{p \rightarrow 1^+} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha_{\frac{1}{p}}(t) \log c(t) dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha(t) \log c(t) dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof ■

Theorem 5.2 now follows from Lemma 5.3 and Lemma 5.4. We discuss some special cases.

Example 5.5. If $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{R} = \mathbb{C}1$ are trivial subalgebras, we obtain data processing inequality

$$D(\rho||\sigma) \geq D(\Phi_B(\rho)||\Phi_B(\sigma))$$

as the constant are

$$\begin{aligned} c(t) &= \sup_{\|b\|_{\sigma_B,1}=1} \tau_M(\Phi_B^\dagger(b)\sigma) = \tau_B(b\Phi_B(\sigma)) = 1 \\ \kappa &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Example 5.6. If $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{R} = \mathbb{C}$ are trivial subalgebra, we have

$$D(\rho||\sigma) \geq D(\Phi_A(\rho)||\Phi_A(\sigma)) - \kappa.$$

and $\kappa \leq 0$. Because

$$\begin{aligned} c(t) &= \tau_M\left(\Phi_A^\dagger\left(\Phi_A(\rho)^{\frac{1+it}{2}}\Phi_A(\sigma)^{\frac{-1-it}{2}}\right)\sigma\Phi_A^\dagger\left(\Phi_A(\rho)^{\frac{1+it}{2}}\Phi_A(\sigma)^{\frac{-1-it}{2}}\right)^*\right) \\ &\leq \tau_M\left(\Phi_A^\dagger\left(\Phi_A(\sigma)^{\frac{-1+it}{2}}\Phi_A(\rho)^{\frac{1-it}{2}}\Phi_A(\rho)^{\frac{1+it}{2}}\Phi_A(\sigma)^{\frac{-1-it}{2}}\right)\sigma\right) \\ &= \tau_A\left(\Phi_A(\sigma)^{\frac{-1+it}{2}}\Phi_A(\rho)\Phi_A(\sigma)^{\frac{-1-it}{2}}\Phi_A(\sigma)\right) \\ &= \tau_A(\Phi_A(\rho)) \\ &= 1, \end{aligned}$$

Here, we used Kadison-Schwarz inequality $\Phi^\dagger(x^*)\Phi^\dagger(x) \leq \Phi^\dagger(x^*x)$. This gives an improvement for data processing inequality. Moreover, our constant κ is tight in the following sense: if $\kappa = 0$, because $\alpha(t)dt$ is a probability measure, we have

$$c(t) = 1, \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

This means

$$\Phi_A^\dagger\left(\Phi_A(\rho)^{\frac{1+it}{2}}\Phi_A(\sigma)^{\frac{-1-it}{2}}\right)^*\Phi_A^\dagger\left(\Phi_A(\rho)^{\frac{1+it}{2}}\Phi_A(\sigma)^{\frac{-1-it}{2}}\right) = \Phi_A^\dagger\left(\Phi_A(\sigma)^{\frac{-1-it}{2}}\Phi_A(\rho)\Phi_A(\sigma)^{\frac{-1-it}{2}}\right).$$

Hence for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\Phi_A(\rho)^{\frac{1+it}{2}}\Phi_A(\sigma)^{\frac{-1-it}{2}}$ is in the multiplicative domain of Φ_A^\dagger , which further extends to $\{\Phi_A(\rho)^z\Phi_A(\sigma)^{-z}, z \in \mathbb{C}\}$ by analytic extension. Note that, this condition is equivalent to

$$D(\rho||\sigma) = D(\Phi_A(\rho)||\Phi_A(\sigma))$$

and there exists a channel Ψ such that $\Psi \circ \Phi_A(\rho) = \rho$ and $\Psi \circ \Phi_A(\sigma) = \sigma$ (see [27]). Therefore, we have

$$\kappa = 0 \iff D(\rho||\sigma) = D(\Phi_A(\rho)||\Phi_A(\sigma)).$$

Example 5.7. Let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{M}$ be subalgebras and $\Phi_A = E_A, \Phi_B = E_B$ be the adjoint map of the inclusions. We have

$$D(\rho||\sigma) + D(E_R \circ E_B(\rho)||E_B(\sigma)) \geq D(E_A(\rho)||E_A(\sigma)) + D(E_B(\rho)||\sigma_B) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha(t) \log c(t) dt .$$

Here the constant is

$$c(t) = \sup_{b \in \mathcal{B}, E_R(b)=1} \tau_M \left(b E_A(\rho)^{\frac{1+it}{2}} E_A(\sigma)^{\frac{-1-it}{2}} \sigma E_A(\sigma)^{\frac{-1+it}{2}} E_A(\rho)^{\frac{1-it}{2}} \right)$$

Under the assumption of Theorem 5.1, $E_A(\sigma) = \sigma$ and $E_A^\dagger(\mathcal{B}) \subset \mathcal{R}$,

$$c(t) = \sup_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \tau_M(b E_A(\rho)) = \sup_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \tau_M(E_A^\dagger(b)\rho) = \sup_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \tau_M(E_R^\dagger(b)\rho) = 1$$

This recovers the assertion of Theorem 5.1

REFERENCES

- [1] Ivan Bardet. Estimating the decoherence time using non-commutative functional inequalities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.01039*, 2017.
- [2] William Beckner. Inequalities in fourier analysis. *Annals of Mathematics*, 102(1):159–182, 1975.
- [3] Jöran Bergh and Jörgen Löfström. *Interpolation spaces: an introduction*, volume 223. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [4] Mario Berta, Matthias Christandl, Roger Colbeck, Joseph M Renes, and Renato Renner. The uncertainty principle in the presence of quantum memory. *Nature Physics*, 6(9):659–662, 2010.
- [5] Mario Berta, David Sutter, and Michael Walter. Quantum brasamp-lieb dualities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.02383*, 2019.
- [6] Iwo Białynicki-Birula and Jerzy Mycielski. Uncertainty relations for information entropy in wave mechanics. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 44(2):129–132, 1975.
- [7] David P Blecher and Vern I Paulsen. Tensor products of operator spaces. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 99(2):262–292, 1991.
- [8] Matthias Christandl and Andreas Winter. “squashed entanglement”: an additive entanglement measure. *Journal of mathematical physics*, 45(3):829–840, 2004.
- [9] Patrick J Coles, Mario Berta, Marco Tomamichel, and Stephanie Wehner. Entropic uncertainty relations and their applications. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 89(1):015002, 2017.
- [10] Igor Devetak, Marius Junge, Christopher King, and Mary Beth Ruskai. Multiplicativity of completely bounded p-norms implies a new additivity result. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 266(1):37–63, 2006.
- [11] Edward G Effros and Zhong-Jin Ruan. On approximation properties for operator spaces. *International Journal of Mathematics*, 1(02):163–187, 1990.
- [12] Rupert L Frank and Elliott H Lieb. Extended quantum conditional entropy and quantum uncertainty inequalities. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 323(2):487–495, 2013.
- [13] Li Gao, Marius Junge, and Nicholas LaRacuente. Uncertainty principle for quantum channels. In *2018 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 996–1000. IEEE, 2018.
- [14] Li Gao, Marius Junge, and Nicholas LaRacuente. Relative entropy for von neumann subalgebras. *International Journal of Mathematics*, 31(06):2050046, 2020.

- [15] Li Gao and Cambyse Rouzé. Complete entropic inequalities for quantum markov chains. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, pages 1–56, 2022.
- [16] Isidore I Hirschman. A note on entropy. *American journal of mathematics*, 79(1):152–156, 1957.
- [17] Isidore Isaac Hirschman. A convexity theorem for certain groups of transformations. *Journal d'Analyse Mathématique*, 2(2):209–218, 1952.
- [18] Marius Junge, Nicholas LaRacunte, and Cambyse Rouzé. Stability of logarithmic sobolev inequalities under a noncommutative change of measure. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 190(2):1–25, 2023.
- [19] Marius Junge and Javier Parcet. *Mixed-Norm Inequalities and Operator Space L_p Embedding Theory*. American Mathematical Soc., 2010.
- [20] Marius Junge, Renato Renner, David Sutter, Mark M Wilde, and Andreas Winter. Universal recovery maps and approximate sufficiency of quantum relative entropy. In *Annales Henri Poincaré*, volume 19, pages 2955–2978. Springer, 2018.
- [21] Earle H Kennard. Zur quantenmechanik einfacher bewegungstypen. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 44(4):326–352, 1927.
- [22] Hideki Kosaki. Applications of the complex interpolation method to a von neumann algebra: non-commutative l_p -spaces. *Journal of functional analysis*, 56(1):29–78, 1984.
- [23] Elliott H Lieb and Mary Beth Ruskai. Proof of the strong subadditivity of quantum-mechanical entropy. *Les rencontres physiciens-mathématiciens de Strasbourg-RCP25*, 19:36–55, 1973.
- [24] Hans Maassen and Jos BM Uffink. Generalized entropic uncertainty relations. *Physical Review Letters*, 60(12):1103, 1988.
- [25] Martin Müller-Lennert, Frédéric Dupuis, Oleg Szehr, Serge Fehr, and Marco Tomamichel. On quantum rényi entropies: A new generalization and some properties. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 54(12):122203, 2013.
- [26] Dénes Petz. On certain properties of the relative entropy of states of operator algebras. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 206(1):351–361, 1991.
- [27] Dénes Petz. Monotonicity of quantum relative entropy revisited. *Reviews in Mathematical Physics*, 15(01):79–91, 2003.
- [28] Dénes Petz. Complementarity in quantum systems. *Reports on Mathematical Physics*, 59(2):209–224, 2007.
- [29] Mihai Pimsner and Sorin Popa. Entropy and index for subfactors. In *Annales scientifiques de l'Ecole normale supérieure*, volume 19, pages 57–106, 1986.
- [30] Gilles Pisier. *Non-commutative vector valued L_p -spaces and completely p -summing maps*. Société mathématique de France, 1998.
- [31] Gilles Pisier and Quanhua Xu. Non-commutative l_p -spaces. *Handbook of the geometry of Banach spaces*, 2:1459–1517, 2003.
- [32] Sorin Popa. Orthogonal pairs of * -subalgebras in finite von neumann algebras. *Journal of Operator Theory*, pages 253–268, 1983.
- [33] Howard Percy Robertson. The uncertainty principle. *Physical Review*, 34(1):163, 1929.
- [34] Roger R Smith. Completely bounded module maps and the haagerup tensor product. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 102(1):156–175, 1991.
- [35] Hermann Weyl. Gruppentheorie und quantenmechanik, hirzel, leipzig. *Theory of Groups and Quantum Mechanics, 2nd ed.(1931), transl. HP Robertson, Dover, NY (1950)*, pages 100–101, 1928.

ENTROPY UNCERTAINTY RELATIONS AND STRONG SUB-ADDITIVITY OF QUANTUM CHANNELS

- [36] Mark M Wilde, Andreas Winter, and Dong Yang. Strong converse for the classical capacity of entanglement-breaking and hadamard channels via a sandwiched rényi relative entropy. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 331(2):593–622, 2014.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
Email address, Li Gao: lgao12@uh.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, URBANA, IL 61801, USA
Email address, Marius Junge: mjunge@illinois.edu

CHICAGO QUANTUM EXCHANGE, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, CHICAGO, IL 60637, USA
Email address, Nicholas LaRacunte: nlaracunte@uchicago.edu