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Abstract

Based on the proofs of the continuity of the conditional entropy by Alicki, Fannes, and Winter, we introduce in this work the almost locally affine (ALAFF) method. This method allows us to prove a great variety of continuity bounds for the derived entropic quantities. First, we apply the ALAFF method to the Umegaki relative entropy. This way, we recover known almost tight bounds, but also some new continuity bounds for the relative entropy. Subsequently, we apply our method to the Belavkin-Staszewski relative entropy (BS-entropy). This yields novel explicit bounds in particular for the BS-conditional entropy, the BS-mutual and BS-conditional mutual information. On the way, we prove almost concavity for the Umegaki relative entropy and the BS-entropy, which might be of independent interest. We conclude by showing some applications of these continuity bounds in various contexts within quantum information theory.
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1 Introduction

Entropic quantities have proven essential in characterizing the information processing capabilities both of classical and quantum systems. As real-world systems cannot be measured to infinite precision, such quantities need to be continuous to contain meaningful information about physical systems. Often, however, we do not only want to know whether an entropic quantity is continuous but also to quantify this continuity. That means we are interested in estimating for an entropic quantity $f$

$$\sup\{|f(\rho) - f(\sigma)| : \rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}, d(\rho, \sigma) \leq \varepsilon\}.$$  

for some subset of $\mathcal{S}$, the quantum states, and some appropriate distance measure $d$ such as the trace distance, for example.

Already in 1973, Fannes [30] proved that the von Neumann entropy is uniformly continuous and gave a concrete dimension-dependent bound, which was later improved to a sharp version in [5, 61]. Another example of a concrete continuity estimate is the Alicki-Fannes inequality for the conditional entropy [1], which was subsequently improved to an almost tight version by Winter [86]. Applications of this kind of continuity bounds include, but are not limited to, entanglement measures [57] and the capacities of quantum channels [49, 67]. We refer the reader to textbooks such as [85] for more continuity bounds and their applications.

The importance of the Alicki-Fannes result [1] goes beyond its quantification of the continuity of the conditional entropy, but their method and its improved versions [56, 77, 86] work quite generally for entropic quantities. Most clearly, this has been realized by Shirokov, who has named this approach the Alicki-Fannes-Winter method [70, 71]. We continue this line of work by generalising the Alicki-Fannes-Winter method further to what we call the almost locally affine (ALAFF) method.

The aim of this generalization is to apply it to entropic quantities beyond those derived from the Umegaki relative entropy [81], such as the conditional entropy. In particular, we are interested in the Belavkin-Staszewski relative entropy (BS-entropy) [14] and its derived entropic quantities. As the Umegaki relative entropy, it generalizes the Kullback-Leibler relative entropy of classical systems [48], but it is less well studied (see [17, 19, 40, 53, 54] for some recent results). The BS-entropy and the related family of geometric Rényi divergences have recently found an application for estimating channel capacities [29]. Moreover, generalizations of the mutual information and other entropic quantities based on the BS-entropy have been defined [66, 87]. The BS-mutual information has been instrumental in proving that the mutual information in one-dimensional quantum Gibbs states of finite-range, translation-invariant Hamiltonians decays exponentially fast [18] and that Davies generators in one dimension which converge to those Gibbs states, in the commuting case, satisfy a positive modified logarithmic Sobolev inequality at every temperature, and thus rapid mixing [10, 11].

The paper is structured as follows: In Section 2, we present our main results. In Section 3, we introduce our notation, some basic concepts, and review some previous results regarding the continuity of entropic quantities. The main part of the paper is then split into two parts. In the first part, Section 4, we present the method that allows us to prove uniform continuity and that gives explicit continuity bounds for derived entropic quantities. The approach only uses convexity
and almost concavity of the divergence (either the Umegaki relative entropy or the BS-entropy) and the ALAFF method. We will then demonstrate the power of this approach using the example of the relative entropy in Section 5, recovering known almost tight results, but also obtaining some new bounds. The second part revolves around applying the approach to the BS-entropy in Section 6 and thus obtaining explicit bounds on its derived entropic quantities such as the BS-mutual information. In Section 7, we give a number of applications which showcase the usefulness of our continuity bounds, before we conclude with an outlook in Section 8.

2 Main results

This section summarizes the main results of this article. The focus of this work is not so much on the continuity bounds themselves, but more on the introduction of the method which allows deriving all of them in a systematic way. Our approach is summarized in Fig. 1. For a given divergence, in this paper either the Umegaki relative entropy [81] or the BS-entropy [14], we need to prove two properties: its (joint) convexity and its almost (joint) concavity. Both of these properties, under certain conditions on the remainder function, then directly translate into almost local affinity (Definition 4.5) of the entropic quantities derived from the divergence at hand. Serving as input to the ALAFF method, the remainder estimates get translated into continuity bounds for said quantities. These entropic quantities include, for example, versions of the conditional entropy and the (conditional) mutual information, as defined in Fig. 1. It is important to note that the ALAFF method yields uniform continuity bounds on a subset $S_0$ of the quantum states $S(\mathcal{H})$. Since the Umegaki relative entropy, for example, is known to not be uniformly continuous on the set of all pairs of states $(\rho, \sigma)$, we have to be careful how to choose $S_0$. To this end, we define $s$-perturbed $\Delta$-invariant convex subsets of $S(\mathcal{H})$ (Definition 4.3) for which we can show that the ALAFF method works and which are general enough to capture all situations of interest. The following theorem is an informal version of the ALAFF method. See Theorem 4.6 for the formal statement.

Theorem 2.1 (Almost locally affine (ALAFF) method, informal)

Let $s \in [0, 1)$ and let $S_0 \subseteq S(\mathcal{H})$ be a $s$-perturbed $\Delta$-invariant convex subset of $S(\mathcal{H})$ with more than one element. Let further $f$ be an ALAFF function. We then find that $f$ is uniformly continuous if,

$$C_f^s := \sup_{\rho, \sigma \in S_0} \frac{1}{\|\rho - \sigma\|_1} \|f(\rho) - f(\sigma)\| < +\infty.$$ 

In that case, we find that for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$,

$$\sup_{\rho, \sigma \in S_0} \frac{1}{\|\rho - \sigma\|_1} \|f(\rho) - f(\sigma)\| \leq C_f^s \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - s} + B(s, \varepsilon),$$

where the function $B(s, \varepsilon)$ consists of the ALAFF bounds (that make $f$ an ALAFF function) and vanishes when $\varepsilon$ goes to zero.

Thus, we are left with proving convexity and almost concavity for the divergences we are interested in. For the convexity, we can rely on well-known results from the literature both for the Umegaki relative entropy [52] and the BS-entropy [40, 53]. For the Umegaki relative entropy, given by

$$D(\rho\|\sigma) := \text{tr} [\rho (\log \rho - \log \sigma)] \quad \text{if} \quad \ker \sigma \subseteq \ker \rho,$$

or $+\infty$ otherwise, we prove almost concavity in Theorem 5.1 and find that it is tight. Informally, the statement is the following:
Theorem 2.2 (Almost concavity of the relative entropy, informal)

Let \((\rho_1, \sigma_1), (\rho_2, \sigma_2) \in \mathcal{S}_\ker\) with

\[
\mathcal{S}_\ker := \{(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \times \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) : \ker \sigma \subseteq \ker \rho\}
\]

and \(p \in [0, 1]\). Then, for \(\rho = p\rho_1 + (1-p)\rho_2\) and \(\sigma = p\sigma_1 + (1-p)\sigma_2\),

\[
D(\rho \| \sigma) \geq p D(\rho_1 \| \sigma_1) + (1-p) D(\rho_2 \| \sigma_2) - h(p) \frac{1}{2}\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1 - f_{c_1,c_2}(p).
\]

Here, \(h\) is the binary entropy and \(f\) a function that depends on the numbers \(c_1, c_2\), which are weighted averages of the states \(\rho_1, \rho_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2\) in some sense, and that vanishes when \(p\) goes to zero or one.

The application of the ALAFF method then allows us to recover the almost tight results for the conditional entropy [86] and the mutual and conditional mutual information (which can be derived from the conditional entropy [85]), but also to derive new versions of what we call divergence bounds [8, 9, 21, 84], i.e. bounds on \(D(\rho \| \sigma)\) in terms of \(\frac{1}{2}\|\rho - \sigma\|_1\). Furthermore, our technique produces a new result, which is the uniform continuity of the relative entropy itself (in both arguments, on a suitable set \(\mathcal{S}_0\)), as well as an explicit continuity bound.

For the BS-entropy, given by

\[
\hat{D}(\rho \| \sigma) := \text{tr} \left[ \rho \log \left( \rho^{1/2} \sigma^{-1} \rho^{1/2} \right) \right]
\]

if \(\ker \sigma \subseteq \ker \rho\),

or \(+\infty\) otherwise, we prove the almost concavity in Theorem 6.3. Informally, the statement we show is:
Let \((\rho_1, \sigma_1), (\rho_2, \sigma_2) \in S_{\ker,+}\) with
\[
S_{\ker,+} := \{(\rho, \sigma) \in S(\mathcal{H}) \times S(\mathcal{H}) : \sigma \in S_+(\mathcal{H})\}
\]
and \(p \in [0, 1]\). Then, for \(\rho = p\rho_1 + (1-p)\rho_2, \sigma = p\sigma_1 + (1-p)\sigma_2\), we have
\[
\tilde{D}(\rho\|\sigma) \geq p\tilde{D}(\rho_1\|\sigma_1) + (1-p)\tilde{D}(\rho_2\|\sigma_2) - \hat{c}_0(1-\delta_{\rho_1,\rho_2})h(p) - f_{\hat{c}_1,\hat{c}_2}(p),
\]
where \(\delta_{\rho_1,\rho_2}\) is 1 if \(\rho_1 = \rho_2\) and 0 otherwise. Moreover, \(h\) is the binary entropy, \(\hat{c}_0\) depends on the minimal eigenvalues of \(\sigma_1, \sigma_2\) and \(f\) is a function that depends on the numbers \(\hat{c}_1, \hat{c}_2\), which are weighted averages of the states \(\rho_1, \rho_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2\) in some sense, and that vanishes when \(p\) goes to zero or one.

The ALAFF method yields novel explicit bounds in particular for the BS-conditional entropy, the BS-mutual and BS-conditional mutual information. We expect these new continuity bounds, as well as those provided for quantities derived from the relative entropy, to find applications in proving the continuity of various quantities in diverse fields related to quantum information theory. In particular, we provide here a number of applications of our continuity bounds in the context of quantum hypothesis testing (Section 7.1), to show that states that are hard to discriminate have almost the same performance in terms of hypothesis testing, as well as in quantum thermodynamics (Section 7.2), to show continuity of the distillable athermality. We also reprove that a state is an approximate quantum Markov chain iff it is close to being recovered by the Petz recovery map (Section 7.3), and use our most general continuity bounds for the relative entropy to obtain bounds for the difference between the relative entropy and the BS-entropy of two quantum states (Section 7.4). Additionally, we show a new result of weak quasi-factorization for the relative entropy, i.e. with an additive error term and no multiplicative error term (Section 7.5). Finally, we include continuity bounds for the relative entropy of entanglement as well as the analogously defined BS-entropy of entanglement (Section 7.6), and subsequently lift these results to show continuity of the Rains information induced by the relative entropy and the BS-entropy (Section 7.7).

### 3 Preliminaries

#### 3.1 Notation and basic concepts

We denote a Hilbert space by \(\mathcal{H}\). It should be noted that throughout this paper, all Hilbert spaces are assumed to be finite-dimensional. The dimension of such a Hilbert space will be called \(d\) and for its elements, we use \(|\varphi\rangle, |\psi\rangle\) and \(|i\rangle\) for \(i \in \mathbb{N}\), possibly with additional indices. If we are concerned with a bipartite or tripartite system, we will always use capital letters in the index to identify objects associated with the respective subsystems. If we have, for example, the bipartite space \(\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B\) and consider the dimension of \(\mathcal{H}_A\), we write \(d_A\).

The set of (bounded) linear operators on a Hilbert space \(\mathcal{H}\) is \(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\) and the subspace of positive semi-definite operators with trace one, i.e., the quantum states or density matrices, is denoted by \(S(\mathcal{H})\). If we want to restrict this set even further, we indicate this with a subindex. Thus, the set of positive definite quantum states becomes \(S_+(\mathcal{H})\), or if we want to restrict moreover to the set of quantum states that have minimal eigenvalue greater than \(m\), we write \(S_{\geq m}(\mathcal{H})\). On the set of quantum states as well as on the set of self-adjoint operators, the relation \(\leq\) is meant to be the partial order in the Löwner sense. That is, \(\rho \geq \sigma\) if and only if \(\rho - \sigma\) is positive semidefinite.

We use \(\text{tr}[\cdot]\) for the usual matrix trace and \(\|\cdot\|_1 = \text{tr}[\|\cdot\|]\) and \(\|\cdot\|_\infty\) to denote the trace norm and the spectral norm on \(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\), respectively. Quantum states in general are denoted by lower
Greek letters such as $\rho, \sigma$ and $\tau$, for example. For Hermitian operators on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ we usually use upper Latin letters such as $X,Y$. For any such $X$, we denote by $[X]_+$ and $[X]_-$ its positive and negative parts, respectively.

As we later want to formally control the dependence on the states $\rho$ and $\sigma$ that are given as arguments to the divergences, we further introduce $\mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H}$ the cartesian product of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with itself. Moreover, on a bipartite system $\mathcal{H}_{AB} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, we set $\rho_A$ to be the state on $\mathcal{H}_A$ that $\rho \in \mathcal{H}_{AB}$ is mapped to under the partial trace with respect to the subsystem $B$ which is a completely positive trace-preserving (CPTP) map. Furthermore, we denote by $\mathbb{1}_A$ the identity matrix on $A$ and, in a slight abuse of notation, we denote by $\text{tr}_A[\cdot]$ both the partial trace with respect to $A$ as well as the complemented map on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$ by tensorizing with $\mathbb{1}_A$.

### 3.2 Entropies and derived quantities

The von Neumann entropy of $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ is given by

$$S(\rho) := -\text{tr}[\rho \log(\rho)].$$

For two quantum states $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, their (Umegaki) relative entropy [81] is defined as

$$D(\rho \| \sigma) := \begin{cases} \text{tr}[\rho \log \rho - \rho \log \sigma] & \text{if } \ker \sigma \subseteq \ker \rho, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

and their Belavkin-Staszewski (BS) entropy [14] by

$$\tilde{D}(\rho \| \sigma) := \begin{cases} \text{tr}[\rho \log \rho^{1/2} \sigma^{-1} \rho^{1/2}] & \text{if } \ker \sigma \subseteq \ker \rho, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

In the event of $\rho$ and $\sigma$ commuting, the two entropies coincide. Otherwise, the BS-entropy is strictly larger than the relative entropy [40]. We further note that both can also be defined in terms of positive semi-definite operators $A,B$ (without normalisation), by just replacing $\rho$ with $A$ and $\sigma$ with $B$. We make use of this alternative definition when we define the conditional entropy and the conditional BS-entropy, for example. Using this notation we can write the conditional entropy of $\rho$ as

$$H_\rho(A|B) := S(\rho_{AB}) - S(\rho_B) = -D(\rho_{AB} \| \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \rho_B),$$

with the last equality being a straightforward calculation. The subscript $AB$ in $\rho_{AB} = \rho$ just emphasises the fact that $\rho$ is from $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ and to distinguish it from its partial trace $\rho_B$, for example. It is noteworthy that the conditional entropy admits the following variational expression

$$H_\rho(A|B) = \max_{\sigma_B \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)} - D(\rho_{AB} \| \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B). \quad (1)$$

Furthermore, in a similar manner as for the conditional entropy, one obtains the representation of the mutual information in terms of the von Neumann entropy and the conditional entropy

$$I_\rho(A : B) := S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B) - S(\rho_{AB}) = S(\rho_A) - H_\rho(A|B).$$

Finally, on a tripartite system $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C$ the conditional mutual information of a state $\rho \in \mathcal{H}$ is given by

$$I_\rho(A : B|C) := S(\rho_{AC}) + S(\rho_{BC}) - S(\rho_C) - S(\rho_{ABC})$$

$$= H_\rho(A|C) - H_\rho(A|BC)$$

$$= I_\rho(A : BC) - I_\rho(A : C). \quad (2)$$
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The last equalities are again straightforward. One easily checks that both the mutual information and the conditional mutual information are symmetric under the exchange of the $A$ and $B$ system.

Let us proceed now to introduce the analogous quantities from the BS-entropy instead of the relative entropy. In this framework, we cannot construct them as sums and differences of von Neumann entropies, which, for every BS-entropic quantity, gives rise to several different definitions which could be interpreted as such a quantity. Some of them have already appeared before in [19, 66, 87]. For a bipartite state $\rho \in S(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$, inspired by the notion of conditional entropy, we define the conditional BS-entropy as

$$\hat{H}_\rho(A|B) := -\hat{D}(\rho_{AB}\|1_A \otimes \rho_B),$$

and building on the mutual information, we define the BS-mutual information as

$$\hat{I}_\rho(A:B) := \hat{D}(\rho_{AB}\|\rho_A \otimes \rho_B).$$

Finally, the analogue of the conditional mutual information in this setting is a more subtle matter. Indeed, two natural ways to construct such a quantity would be either as a difference of BS-conditional entropies or of BS-mutual information, as shown in Eq. (2), and both constructions lead to different definitions. Given $\rho_{ABC} \in S(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C)$:

- We define the (one-sided) BS-conditional mutual information (os BS-CMI in short) by

$$\hat{I}_{\rho}^{\text{os}}(A:B|C) := \hat{H}_\rho(A|C) - \hat{H}_\rho(A|BC) = \hat{D}(\rho_{ABC}\|1_A \otimes \rho_{BC}) - \hat{D}(\rho_{AC}\|1_A \otimes \rho_{C}).$$

- We define the (two-sided) BS-conditional mutual information (ts BS-CMI in short) by

$$\hat{I}_{\rho}^{\text{ts}}(A:B|C) := \hat{I}_\rho(A:BC) - \hat{I}_\rho(A:C) = \hat{D}(\rho_{ABC}\|\rho_A \otimes \rho_{BC}) - \hat{D}(\rho_{AC}\|\rho_A \otimes \rho_{C}).$$

Note that both notions are clearly non-negative, as a consequence of the data processing inequality for the BS-entropy. In this project, we focus for simplicity on the first definition, i.e. the one-sided one. We will therefore drop the “os” notation, as there is no possible confusion.

Let us emphasize at this stage that the difference between the aforementioned two definitions of BS-conditional mutual information is partly related to the pathological behaviour of the BS-entropy with respect to continuity in general, and more specifically to the fact that the BS-conditional entropy is discontinuous on the set of positive semi-definite quantum states (cf. Proposition 6.7). We suspect that as a consequence thereof, the variational definition of the BS-conditional entropy (generalizing Eq. (1)) does not agree with the one we have given in Eq. (3), namely

$$\hat{H}_\rho(A|B) \leq \sup_{\sigma_B \in S(\mathcal{H}_B)} -\hat{D}(\rho_{AB}\|1_A \otimes \sigma_B).$$

We have numerical results that suggest that the inequality in the Eq. (5) is strict, at least in some cases. A plot of those numerics can be found in Appendix A.

3.3 Previous continuity bounds for entropic quantities

In this section, we want to collect some previous results in the literature concerning continuity bounds, as well as results on almost concavity/convexity, for various entropic quantities. By no means do we intend to present a complete review on the topic, but rather a brief historic approach to the results we develop in our current paper, many of which we will show reduce to prior ones.
In [30], Fannes proved the following continuity estimate for the von Neumann entropy. Given a finite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and $\rho, \sigma \in S(\mathcal{H})$, let us denote
$$T \equiv T(\rho, \sigma) := \frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1.$$ Then, the following inequality holds:
$$|S(\rho) - S(\sigma)| \leq 2T \log(d) - 2T \log(2T),$$ where $d$ is the dimension of the Hilbert space. This was subsequently improved by Audenaert in [5] to
$$|S(\rho) - S(\sigma)| \leq T \log(d - 1) + h(T), \quad (6)$$ where $h$ is the binary entropy, given in general for $\{p_i\}$ by
$$h(\{p_i\}) = -\sum p_i \log p_i.$$ On a different note, the von Neumann entropy is concave (a direct consequence of the fact that the map $x \mapsto x \log x$ is convex). Additionally, some results on the almost concavity for this entropy which are worth mentioning are the following. First, Kim proved in [47] the following concavity estimate for the von Neumann entropy:
$$S(c\rho + (1-c)\sigma) - cS(\rho) - (1-c)S(\sigma) \geq \frac{1}{2} c(1-c) \|\rho - \sigma\|_1^2$$ for every $c \in [0,1]$. This in particular reduces to Pinsker’s inequality [62] $$\frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1^2 \leq D(\rho\|\sigma),$$ just by dividing by $c$ and taking limit $c \to 0$. In [26], Carlen and Lieb proved a quantitative version of the property of subadditivity for the von Neumann entropy that can be interpreted as another concavity estimate for the von Neumann entropy. Given $\rho_{AB} \in S(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$, they showed:
$$S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B) - S(\rho_{AB}) \geq -2 \log \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left[ \sqrt{\rho_{AB}} - \sqrt{\rho_A \otimes \rho_B} \right]^2 \right),$$ which can be translated to the convexity setting as shown in [46] by Kim and Ruskai in the following form: Let us consider $\rho, \sigma \in S(\mathcal{H})$, fix $c \in [0,1]$ and denote
$$\eta_{Av} := c\rho + (1-c)\sigma \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_{Rev} := c\sigma + (1-c)\rho.$$ Using the canonical identification $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbb{C}^2 \equiv \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}$, let us further consider the state
$$P_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} c\rho & 0 \\ 0 & (1-c)\sigma \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad P_A = \eta_{Av} \quad \text{and} \quad P_B = \begin{pmatrix} c & 0 \\ 0 & (1-c) \end{pmatrix}.$$ Then, Carlen-Lieb’s result translates to
$$S(\eta_{Av}) - cS(\rho) - (1-c)S(\sigma) \geq -2 \log \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left[ \sqrt{P_{AB}} - \sqrt{P_A \otimes P_B} \right]^2 \right) \geq -2 \log \text{tr} \left[ \eta_{Av} \right] = 0.$$
Additionally, the following upper bound on the concavity of the von Neumann entropy is also known [46]:
\[ S(\eta_{AV}) - cS(\rho) - (1 - c)S(\sigma) \leq h(c). \]  
(7)

Moreover, in [6], Audenaert also proved:
\[ S(\eta_{AV}) - cS(\rho) - (1 - c)S(\sigma) \leq Th(c). \]

Let us move now to the case of the conditional entropy. In the celebrated paper [1], Alicki and Fannes proved the following continuity bound for this quantity:
\[ |H_\rho(A|B) - H_\sigma(A|B)| \leq 4\tilde{T}\log d_A + 2h(\tilde{T}) \]
for \( \tilde{T} := \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq 1 \) and \( d_A \) the dimension of the space \( \mathcal{H}_A \). In [86], Winter improved this bound to
\[ |H_\rho(A|B) - H_\sigma(A|B)| \leq 2T \log d_A + (1 + T)h\left(\frac{T}{1 + T}\right). \]  
(8)

Concerning the case of the mutual information, it is straightforward to derive a continuity bound for such a quantity just by combining the bounds of Eq. (6) and Eq. (8). Indeed,
\[ |I_\rho(A : B) - I_\sigma(A : B)| \leq 3T \min\{\log d_A, \log d_B\} + 2(1 + T)h\left(\frac{T}{1 + T}\right). \]

The multiplicative factor in the first term of the right-hand side was subsequently improved to \( 2\sqrt{2} \) in [68] and to 2 in [70]. In a similar manner, we can provide a continuity bound for the conditional mutual information of two tripartite states \( \rho_{ABC}, \sigma_{ABC} \in S(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C) \) from Eq. (8), by regarding the latter quantity as a difference of conditional entropies:
\[ |I_\rho(A : B|C) - I_\sigma(A : B|C)| \leq 4T \min\{\log d_A, \log d_B\} + 2(1 + T)h\left(\frac{T}{1 + T}\right). \]

This bound has appeared explicitly in several texts, such as [75]. It appears in an improved form, with a factor of 2 in the first term of the right-hand side, in [69].

The literature concerning continuity bounds for entropic quantities is much broader than the results collected here. For Rényi and Tsallis entropies, many results concerning their continuity can be derived from other techniques, such as majorization flows, and can be found in texts such as [36, 37]. Since this is beyond the scope of this paper, we omit the specific results here and refer the interested reader on the topic to [35] and references therein.

Some of the results mentioned above for the von Neumann entropy, Rényi and Tsallis entropies, as well as their classical counterparts, can be extended to energy-constrained systems in infinite dimensions, as shown in [13] (see also the recent [72]). We leave for future work the possibility of extending the results presented here to a similar framework.

Let us conclude this section by discussing the previous work in the line of one of our main results in the current paper, namely the almost concavity for the relative entropy. In Theorem 5.1, given \( (\rho_1, \sigma_1) \) and \( (\rho_2, \sigma_2) \) with \( \ker \sigma_i \subseteq \ker \rho_i \) and \( p \in [0, 1] \) we find a “well-behaved” real-valued function \( f(p) \), vanishing with \( p = 0, 1 \), such that, for \( \rho = p\rho_1 + (1 - p)\rho_2 \) and \( \sigma = p\sigma_1 + (1 - p)\sigma_2 \), the following holds:
\[ D(\rho||\sigma) \geq pD(\rho_1||\sigma_1) + (1 - p)D(\rho_2||\sigma_2) - f(p). \]  
(9)
Moreover, we show that this $f(p)$ is tight, as there are pairs of states which saturate the equality. However, there are some other previous results in the literature concerning this property for particular cases of $\rho$ and $\sigma$. For example, in [20], Brandão et al. proved the following inequality:

$$D(\rho\|\sigma) \geq pD(\rho_1\|\sigma) + (1-p)D(\rho_2\|\sigma) - h(p).$$

(10)

This is a direct consequence of Eq. (7). As we will show in point 1 of Proposition 5.2, our inequality Eq. (9) reduces to the latter one when taking $\sigma = \sigma_1 = \sigma_2$.

4 From almost convexity to continuity bounds

As it is depicted in Fig. 1, our approach is based on the convexity and almost concavity of a divergence. More precisely, it is based on its joint convexity and almost joint concavity, but for readability, we will just speak of convexity and almost concavity.

It is immediately clear what is meant by convexity and this property is often even a defining property of a divergence [41] or a direct consequence thereof\(^1\) [79, Proposition 4.2]. The almost (joint) concavity, however, needs yet to be defined.

**Definition 4.1 (Almost (joint) concavity of a divergence)**

A divergence $\mathbb{D}(\cdot\|\cdot)$ is called almost (jointly) concave on a convex set $S_0 \subseteq S(\mathcal{H}) \times S(\mathcal{H})$ if, for $(\rho_1, \sigma_1), (\rho_2, \sigma_2) \in S_0$, there exists a continuous function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $f(0) = f(1) = 0$ such that, for all $p \in [0, 1]$,

$$\mathbb{D}(\rho\|\sigma) \geq p \mathbb{D}(\rho_1\|\sigma_1) + (1-p) \mathbb{D}(\rho_2\|\sigma_2) - f(p)$$

(11)

holds. Here, $\rho = p\rho_1 + (1-p)\rho_2$ and $\sigma = p\sigma_1 + (1-p)\sigma_2$. It is important to emphasise that $f$ in general depends on the states involved.

**Remark 4.2** We note that the definition of almost concavity presented above is not itself a very strong property. For example, one could just choose $f$ to be the remainders that give equality in Eq. (11). It is the behaviour of the remainder functions that is pivotal, i.e., it becomes independent of $\rho_i, \sigma_i$, $i = 1, 2$ under certain restrictions on the states, e.g. requiring that $\sigma_i$ is a marginal of $\rho_i$.

Our approach, therefore, does not only need joint convexity but a well-behaved remainder function. If we find such a function and combine it with the boundedness of the divergence (or underlying entropic quantity), ALAFF directly gives uniform continuity through explicit continuity bounds.

In its earliest form, it was developed and used by Alicki and Fannes [1], as well as Winter [86], to prove uniform continuity and give an explicit continuity bound for the conditional entropy. Shirokov noticed its potential beyond this specific application and moulded it into a method that can be applied to functions defined on convex and $\Delta$-invariant subsets of $S(\mathcal{H})$ [70, 71]. In short, $\Delta$-invariance means that for two elements their normalised positive and negative part again lies in the set (see also Definition 4.3). This definition of $\Delta$-invariance will, however, turn out to be a limitation when trying to prove the uniform continuity of the relative entropy, while in the case of the BS-entropy, it is unfitting even from the beginning, i.e., even for the conditional BS-entropy. The problem is due to $\Delta$-invariance being a rather strong property that sets like $S_{\geq m}(\mathcal{H})$

\(^1\)Some authors define divergences as functions on two density operators fulfilling a data processing inequality; however, note that convexity for a divergence implies a data processing inequality and follows from it together with additional properties, as shown in [41, Corollary 4.7].
or \( \{(\rho, \sigma) : \ker \sigma \subseteq \ker \rho\} \) do not have. Yet, those sets, or modified versions thereof, are the relevant sets for the relative and, in particular, the BS-entropy.

In light of those problems and in an effort to make our approach as general as possible, we propose the almost locally affine (ALAFF) method, a generalisation of the Alicki-Fannes-Winter-Shirokov method that reduces to one implication of the former in a special case. First of all, we define a perturbed version of the \( \Delta \)-invariant subset, with the perturbation controlled by a parameter \( s \).

**Definition 4.3 (Perturbed \( \Delta \)-invariant subset)**

Let \( s \in [0, 1] \). A subset \( S_0 \subseteq S(H) \) is called \( s \)-perturbed \( \Delta \)-invariant, if for \( \rho, \sigma \in S_0 \) with \( \rho \neq \sigma \) there exists \( \tau \in S(H) \) such that the two states

\[
\Delta^\pm(\rho, \sigma, \tau) = s\tau + (1-s)\varepsilon^{-1}[\rho - \sigma]_\pm
\]  

(12)

lie again in \( S_0 \). Here \( \varepsilon := \frac{1}{2}\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \) and \([A]_\pm \) denotes the negative and positive part of a self-adjoint operator, respectively. For \( s = 0 \), we recover the definition of \( \Delta \)-invariant subset used in [71].

We want to give the reader some intuition about those \( s \)-perturbed \( \Delta \)-invariant sets.

**Remark 4.4**

1. Let \( S_0 \subseteq S(H) \) \( s \)-perturbed \( \Delta \)-invariant. Then for \( t \in [s, 1] \) it is \( t \)-perturbed \( \Delta \)-invariant as well. In particular, being 0-perturbed is the strongest condition.

2. If \( S_0 \subseteq S(H) \) has non-empty interior with respect to the 1-norm, then it is \( s \)-perturbed for some \( s \in [0, 1] \).

3. If \( S_0 \subseteq S(H) \) is \( s \)-perturbed \( \Delta \)-invariant containing more than one state, then there exist \( \rho, \sigma \in S_0 \) with \( \frac{1}{2}\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 = 1 - s \). This follows directly from the definition.

It has already been mentioned that almost concavity is not enough but we need a well-behaved remainder function that becomes uniform in case the states fulfil certain structural requirements (e.g. one being a marginal of the other). This structural restrictions lead to functions that now only take one state as an argument while still being convex and almost concave. However, due to the uniformity of the remainder function the almost concavity constitutes a stronger property. Namely “almost local affinity”.

**Definition 4.5 (Almost locally affine (ALAFF) function)**

Let \( f \) be a real-valued function on the convex set \( S_0 \subseteq S(H) \), fulfilling

\[
-a_f(p) \leq f(\rho p + (1-p)\sigma) - pf(\rho) - (1-p)f(\sigma) \leq b_f(p)
\]  

(13)

for all \( p \in [0, 1] \) and \( \rho, \sigma \in S_0 \). The functions \( a_f : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R} \) and \( b_f : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R} \) are required to vanish as \( p \to 0^+ \), to be non-decreasing on \([0, \frac{1}{2}]\), continuous in \( p \) and uniform for all \( \rho, \sigma \in S_0 \). We then call \( f \) an almost locally affine (ALAFF) function.

The notion of almost locally affine functions as above has appeared previously in the literature, also under the name “approximate affinity” (see e.g. [20]). We can now formulate the following theorem, whose proof is inspired by Shirokov [70].

**Theorem 4.6 (Almost locally affine (ALAFF) method)**

Let \( s \in [0, 1] \) and \( S_0 \subseteq S(H) \) be a \( s \)-perturbed \( \Delta \)-invariant convex subset of \( S(H) \) containing more than one element. Let further \( f \) be an ALAFF function. We then find that \( f \) is uniformly continuous if

\[
C^s_f := \sup_{\rho, \sigma \in S_0 \atop \frac{1}{2}\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 = 1 - s} |f(\rho) - f(\sigma)| < +\infty.
\]
In this case, we have for \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1] \)

\[
\sup_{\rho, \sigma \in S_0} \left| f(\rho) - f(\sigma) \right| \leq C_f^s \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - s} + \frac{1 - s + \varepsilon}{1 - s} E_f^{\max} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - s + \varepsilon} \right),
\]

with

\( E_f^{\max} : [0, 1) \to \mathbb{R}, \quad p \mapsto E_f^{\max}(p) = (1 - p) \max \left\{ \frac{E_f(t)}{1 - t} : 0 \leq t \leq p \right\} \),

where \( E_f = a_f + b_f \). Note that on \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1 - s] \) \( E_f \) and \( E_f^{\max} \) coincide.

**Proof.** Let \( s \in [0, 1) \) and \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1] \). Let further \( \rho, \sigma \in S_0 \) with \( \frac{1}{2} \| \rho - \sigma \|_1 = \varepsilon \). Then by the property of \( s \)-perturbed \( \Delta \)-invariance there exists \( \tau \in S(\mathcal{H}) \) such that \( \gamma_\pm = \Delta^\pm(\rho, \sigma, \tau) \in S_0 \) defined as in Eq. (12). For every such \( \gamma_\pm \) with a representation in terms of \( \rho, \sigma \in S_0 \) and a \( \tau \in S(\mathcal{H}) \) we have that

\[
\frac{1 - s}{1 - s + \varepsilon} \rho + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - s + \varepsilon} \gamma_- = \omega^* = \frac{1 - s}{1 - s + \varepsilon} \sigma + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - s + \varepsilon} \gamma_+, \n\]

which can be easily checked by inserting the explicit form of \( \gamma_\pm \) and using that \( [\rho - \sigma]_+ - [\rho - \sigma]_- = \rho - \sigma \). Now \( \omega^* \in S_0 \) as \( S_0 \) is convex, which allows us to evaluate \( f \) at \( \omega^* \) and use Eq. (13) for both of the representations we have for the state in question. This gives us

\[
-a_f(p) \leq f(\omega^*) - (1 - p)f(\rho) - pf(\gamma_-) \leq b_f(p), \\
-a_f(p) \leq f(\omega^*) - (1 - p)f(\sigma) - pf(\gamma_+) \leq b_f(p),
\]

where we set \( p = \frac{e - e^*}{1 - e + e^*} \) for better readability. Note that \( p \in (0, \frac{1}{2 + \varepsilon}] \subseteq [0, 1) \) as \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1] \) and \( s \in [0, 1) \) and further that \( p(\varepsilon) \) is monotone with respect to \( \varepsilon \). We recombine the above to get

\[
(1 - p)(f(\rho) - f(\sigma)) \leq p(f(\gamma_+ - f(\gamma_-)) + a_f(p) + b_f(p), \\
(1 - p)(f(\sigma) - f(\rho)) \leq p(f(\gamma_- - f(\gamma_+)) + a_f(p) + b_f(p).
\]

Those two inequalities immediately give us that

\[
(1 - p)|f(\rho) - f(\sigma)| \leq p|f(\gamma_+ - f(\gamma_-)| + (a_f + b_f)(p).
\]

If we now insert \( E_f = a_f + b_f \), we obtain

\[
|f(\rho) - f(\sigma)| \leq p|f(\gamma_+ - f(\gamma_-)| + \frac{1}{1 - p} E_f(p).
\]

In the case that \( C_f^s \) is finite, we can take the supremum over all \( \rho, \sigma \in S_0 \) with \( \frac{1}{2} \| \rho - \sigma \|_1 = \varepsilon \) of the last equation and even extend to \( \frac{1}{2} \| \rho - \sigma \|_1 \leq \varepsilon \) in two steps. The first step is upper bounding \( \frac{1}{1 - p} E_f(p) \) with \( \frac{1}{1 - p} E_f^{\max}(p) \) and then using that \( \frac{1}{1 - p} E_f^{\max}(p) \) is engineered to be non-decreasing on \( [0, 1) \) and thereby for the specific \( p = \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - s + \varepsilon} \in [0, \frac{1}{2 + \varepsilon}] \subseteq [0, 1), \) is non-decreasing in \( \varepsilon \) as well. Since the \( \gamma_+ \) and \( \gamma_- \) created from \( \rho \) and \( \sigma \) obviously fulfill \( \gamma_\pm \in S_0 \) and \( \frac{1}{2} \| \gamma_+ - \gamma_- \|_1 = 1 - s \), we immediately get the upper bound in Eq. (14). The reduction of \( E_f^{\max} \) to \( E_f \) on \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1 - s] \) \( E_f^{\max} \) is due to \( E_f \) being non-decreasing on \( [0, \frac{1}{2}] \). This means, however, that \( E_f^{\max} \) inherits the vanishing property as \( p \to +0 \), which translates to \( E_f^{\max}(p(\varepsilon)) \to 0 \) if \( \varepsilon \to +0 \). Thus we conclude uniform continuity.

The method presented in Theorem 4.6 is named “ALAFF method” to highlight the required property for the function in order for this technique to be applicable. We will refer to this theorem by that name in subsequent sections.
Remark 4.7 We have restricted to $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ as the maximal one norm distance of two quantum states is bounded by 2, hence there is no need to cover the case $\varepsilon > 1$.

Remark 4.8 For $s = 0$, one recovers on implication of the method by Shirokov, i.e., the definitions for perturbed $\Delta$-invariance and $\Delta$-invariance coincide, $E_f^{\text{max}}$ reduces to $E_f$ on the relevant domain $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$, and Eq. (14) becomes

$$
\sup_{\rho, \sigma \in S_0, \frac{1}{2}\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \varepsilon} |f(\rho) - f(\sigma)| \leq C_f^\perp \varepsilon + (1 + \varepsilon) E_f\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon}\right)
$$

with

$$
C_f^0 = \sup_{\frac{1}{2}\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 = 1} |f(\rho) - f(\sigma)| = \sup_{\rho, \sigma \in S_0, \text{tr}[\rho \sigma] = 0} |f(\rho) - f(\sigma)| =: C_f^\perp,
$$

as states with maximal trace distance have orthogonal support.

In the next sections, we will use Theorem 4.6 together with the almost concavity of the relative entropy and the BS-entropy, respectively, to derive a plethora of results of uniform continuity and continuity bounds for entropic quantities defined from them. Depending on the case, we will sometimes have to employ the whole machinery devised in Theorem 4.6, whereas at other times the simplification provided in Remark 4.8 will be enough.

5 Almost concavity and continuity bounds for the Umegaki relative entropy

In this section, we apply the ALAFF method introduced in Section 4 for the particular case of the relative entropy, as well as some other entropic quantities derived from it. Since the relative entropy is in particular a divergence, it is (jointly) convex. Thus it remains to show that this quantity satisfies proper almost concavity. The proof of that feature, as well as the tightness of the result obtained, is presented in Section 5.1.

The ALAFF method then yields a plethora of results of uniform continuity for entropic quantities derived from the relative entropy. These are all presented in Section 5.2. In particular, we recover the well-known (and almost tight) continuity bound for the conditional entropy by Winter [86].

All the results provided in this section are summarized in Fig. 2.

5.1 Almost concavity for the relative entropy

The (joint) convexity of the relative entropy is a well-established result with proofs found for example in [85]. In this section, we complement this result with almost concavity and further prove that the bound we obtain is tight.

Theorem 5.1 (Almost concavity of the relative entropy)
Let $(\rho_1, \sigma_1), (\rho_2, \sigma_2) \in S_{\text{ker}}$ with

$$
S_{\text{ker}} := \{ (\rho, \sigma) \in S(\mathcal{H}) \times S(\mathcal{H}) : \ker \sigma \subseteq \ker \rho \}
$$

and $p \in [0, 1]$. Then, for $\rho = pp_1 + (1 - p)\rho_2$ and $\sigma = ps_1 + (1 - p)\sigma_2$,

$$
D(\rho\|\sigma) \geq pD(\rho_1\|\sigma_1) + (1 - p)D(\rho_2\|\sigma_2) - h(p)\frac{1}{2}\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1 - f_{e_1, e_2}(p).
$$

(15)
Here,

\[ h(p) = -p \log(p) - (1-p) \log(1-p), \]

\[ f_{c_1,c_2}(p) = p \log(p + (1-p)c_1) + (1-p) \log((1-p) + pc_2), \]

with the first one being the binary entropy. The constants in \( f_{c_1,c_2} \) are non-negative real numbers and are given by

\[ c_1 := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \beta_0(t) \left\{ \rho_1 \sigma_1^{-t} \sigma_2 \sigma_1^{-t} \right\} < \infty, \]

\[ c_2 := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \beta_0(t) \left\{ \rho_2 \sigma_2^{-t} \sigma_1 \sigma_2^{-t} \right\} < \infty. \]

Here, \( \beta_0 \) is a probability density on \( \mathbb{R} \) (see Eq. (18) for a concrete expression). It is noteworthy that \( f_{1,1}(\cdot) = 0 \) and \( f_{c_1,c_2}(0) = f_{c_1,c_2}(1) = 0. \)

Proof. Here, we only prove this result for full-rank density matrices \( \rho_1, \rho_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2. \) For the general
case in which none of them is necessarily full rank, the proof follows along the same lines but is much more involved. For readability, we defer it to Appendix B.

It is clear that $S_{\text{ker}}$ is a convex set and that the bound holds trivially for $p = 0$ and $p = 1$. Hence let $p \in (0, 1)$ in the following. We find that
\[
pD(\rho_1 || \sigma_1) + (1 - p)D(\rho_2 || \sigma_2) - D(\rho || \sigma) = -pS(\rho_1) - (1 - p)S(\rho_2) + S(p)
+ (1 - p) \text{tr}[\rho_2(\log \sigma - \log \sigma_2)]
+ p \text{tr}[\rho_1(\log \sigma - \log \sigma_1)]
\leq h(p) \frac{1}{2} \|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1 + f_{c_1,c_2}(p),
\]
where we split the relative entropies and used that the von Neumann entropy fulfills [6, Theorem 14]
\[
S(\rho) \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1 h(p) + pS(\rho_1) + (1 - p)S(\rho_2).
\]
Furthermore, we upper bound the remaining terms by $f_{c_1,c_2}(p)$, estimating the two separately. We will only demonstrate the derivation for the second term, as it is completely analogous to the first one. We have
\[
p \text{tr}[\rho_1(\log(\sigma) - \log(\sigma_1))] = p \text{tr}[(\exp(\log(\rho_1)))(\log(\sigma) - \log(\sigma_1))]
\leq p \log \text{tr}[(\exp(\log(\rho_1) + \log(\sigma) - \log(\sigma_1))]
\leq p \log \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \beta_0(t) \text{ tr} \left[ \rho_1 \frac{\mu_1}{\sigma_1^2} \frac{\nu_1}{\sigma_1^2} \right].
\]
The first estimate follows immediately using the well-known Peierls-Bogolubov inequality [3]. The second one involves a generalisation of the Araki-Lieb-Thirring inequality [4, 51] by Sutter et al. [74, Corollary 3.3] with
\[
\beta_0(t) = \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{1}{\cosh(\pi t) + 1}
\]
a probability density on $\mathbb{R}$. As mentioned before, in the steps above we relied on $\rho_1, \sigma_1$ and $\sigma$ to be full rank. If this is not the case one obtains the same result, however, the procedure is more involved. A thorough discussion can be found in Appendix B. Note here that in the most general case $c^{-1}_1$ in the RHS of Eq. (17) is the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse. The trace in the integral can now be estimated for each $t$ by
\[
\text{tr} \left[ \rho_1 \frac{\mu_1}{\sigma_1^2} \frac{\nu_1}{\sigma_1^2} \right] = p + (1 - p) \text{ tr} \left[ \rho_1 \frac{\mu_1}{\sigma_1^2} \frac{\nu_1}{\sigma_1^2} \right].
\]
Here, we just split $\sigma$ and used the cyclicity of the trace to get rid of the unitary. To see that $c_1 < \infty$, we upper bound $\sigma_2$ by $1$ and $\sigma_1^{-1}$ by $\bar{m}_{\sigma_1}$ where $\bar{m}_{\sigma_1}$ is the smallest non-zero eigenvalue of $\sigma_1$. This can be done, since $\ker \sigma_1 \subseteq \ker \rho_1$. We end up with $c_1 \leq \bar{m}_{\sigma_1}^{-1} < \infty$. Inserting Eq. (19) into Eq. (17), we obtain the first part of $f_{c_1,c_2}(p)$ and repeating the steps for $(1 - p) \text{tr}[\rho_2(\log(\sigma) - \log(\sigma_2))]$ the second one as well. This concludes the proof.

We remark that Eq. (15) provides a result of almost concavity for the relative entropy in the sense of Definition 4.1. Indeed, the additive “correction” term obtained for such an inequality to hold behaves well enough, in the sense that it reduces to the previously known bounds for quantities derived from the relative entropy, e.g. the von Neumann entropy or the conditional entropy, and it is almost tight in general. To illustrate that, we provide now two propositions that put the almost concavity of the relative entropy into perspective.
Proposition 5.2 (Almost concavity estimate of the relative entropy is well behaved)

The function \( f_{c_1,c_2} + h \frac{1}{2} \| \rho_1 - \rho_2 \|_1 \) obtained in Theorem 5.1 is well behaved in the following sense:

Let \( j = 1, 2 \) and \( (\rho_j, \sigma_j) \in S_{\text{ker}} \). We have the following:

1. If \( \sigma_1 = \sigma_2 \), then \( c_1 = c_2 = 1 \), resulting in \( f_{c_1,c_2} + \frac{1}{2} \| \rho_1 - \rho_2 \|_1 h \leq h \).

2. If each \( \sigma_j \), has a minimal non-zero eigenvalue that is bounded from below by some \( \tilde{m} > 0 \), then \( f_{c_1,c_2} + h \frac{1}{2} \| \rho_1 - \rho_2 \|_1 \leq f_{\tilde{m}^{-1}, \tilde{m}^{-1}} + h \).

3. If \( \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \) is a bipartite space and furthermore \( \sigma_j = d_A^{-1} I_A \otimes \rho_{j,B} \), then \( f_{c_1,c_2} + h \frac{1}{2} \| \rho_1 - \rho_2 \|_1 \leq h \).

4. For \( m_1, m_2 \geq 1 \) we find that both \( p \mapsto \frac{1}{1-p} f_{m_1,m_2}(p) \) and \( p \mapsto \frac{1}{1-p} h(p) \) are non-decreasing on \([0, 1)\).

We hence find that in the cases listed above the bound becomes independent of the states and further that the remainder functions have a desirable non-decreasing property. The proof is straightforward and can be found in Appendix C.

Remark 5.3  The different cases discussed in Proposition 5.2 are used in the following to find almost concavity results with a function that does not depend on the specifics of the states involved, as necessary for applying the ALAFF method.

• If \( \sigma_1 = \sigma_2 \), we are reducing Eq. (15) to a result of almost concavity only in the first input. This case was addressed in Eq. (10) and the bound we obtain in this case is lower bounding theirs. Moreover, this case will yield a continuity bound for the relative entropy with fixed second input as shown in Corollary 5.8.

• Point 3 of Proposition 5.2 can be interpreted as a result on almost convexity for the conditional entropy. Moreover, it will yield a continuity bound for the conditional entropy in Corollary 5.5, which will coincide with that of Eq. (8). Since the latter result is almost tight, this shows the good behaviour of the bound obtained in Theorem 5.1.

• Point 2 of Proposition 5.2 is the most general setting for full-rank states \( \sigma_j \), with \( j = 1, 2 \), and will be essential for deriving the most general continuity bounds for the relative entropy in Theorem 5.14.

Finally, before using these results of almost concavity for the relative entropy jointly with the ALAFF method to provide some continuity bounds for the relative entropy and derived quantities, we conclude this subsection with some discussion of our almost concave bound. In Proposition 5.2, we have shown that our almost concave bound is well behaved in the sense that, in some specific cases, it is independent of the states. However, we can additionally show that it is tight, as there are some examples of states for which equality holds in the inequality for almost concavity for the relative entropy.

Proposition 5.4 (Almost concavity estimate of the relative entropy is tight)

The bound presented in Theorem 5.1 is tight. More specifically, there are some density operators \( \rho_1, \rho_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \) on \( S(\mathcal{H}) \) which saturate the inequality in Eq. (15).
Proof. We can assume that the dimension of the underlying Hilbert space is \( d_H \geq 2 \). We then find two orthonormal states \( |0\rangle, |1\rangle \in H \) that we use to create

\[
\rho_1 := |0\rangle\langle 0|, \\
\rho_2 := |1\rangle\langle 1|, \\
\sigma_1 := t |0\rangle\langle 0| + (1 - t) |1\rangle\langle 1|, \\
\sigma_2 := (1 - t) |0\rangle\langle 0| + t |1\rangle\langle 1|,
\]

for \( t \in (0, 1) \). We find, as of the orthonormality, that for \( p \in [0, 1] \) and

\[
\rho := p\rho_1 + (1 - p)\rho_2, \\
\sigma := p\sigma_1 + (1 - p)\sigma_2,
\]

the relative entropy between the states given by the convex combinations takes the value

\[
D(\rho \| \sigma) = \text{tr}[\rho \log(\rho) - \rho \log(\sigma)] \\
= -h(p) - p \log(pt + (1 - p)(1 - t)) - (1 - p) \log((1 - p)t + p(1 - t)),
\]

and

\[
D(\rho_1 \| \sigma_1) = -\log(t), \\
D(\rho_2 \| \sigma_2) = -\log(t).
\]

This gives us

\[
pD(\rho_1 \| \sigma_1) + (1 - p)D(\rho_2 \| \sigma_2) - D(\rho \| \sigma) \\
= h(p) + p \log \left( p + (1 - p) \frac{1 - t}{t} \right) + (1 - p) \log \left( (1 - p) + p \frac{1 - t}{t} \right). \tag{20}
\]

As \([\rho_i, \sigma_j] = 0\) for \( i, j = 1, 2 \) and further \([\rho_i \sigma_j, \sigma_i] = 0\) we find that the constants in Theorem 5.1 are given by

\[
c_i = \text{tr}[\rho_i \sigma_j^{-1} \sigma_j] = \frac{1 - t}{t}.
\]

for \( i, j = 1, 2 \) and \( i \neq j \) and since \( \rho_1 \) and \( \rho_2 \) orthogonal we immediately get \( \frac{1}{2} \| \rho_1 - \rho_2 \|_1 = 1 \). We hence obtain the RHS of Eq. (20) from the almost concavity estimate in Eq. (15). This concludes the claim. \( \square \)

5.2 Continuity bounds for the relative entropy

In this section, we will prove a number of corollaries that are direct consequences of the results of almost concavity in Theorem 5.1 and Proposition 5.2 in combination with the results concerning the ALAFF method of Theorem 4.6 and Remark 4.8. All of them concern quantities which are derived from the relative entropy.

5.2.1 Uniform continuity for the conditional entropy

Let us first consider a bipartite space and the conditional entropy of a density matrix with respect to one of the subsystems. Note that, in this case, we are able to prove a result of uniform continuity for any positive semidefinite matrix (with trace one), but we do not require positive definiteness. This should be compared to the findings of the next section for the BS-entropy and derived quantities, where discontinuities appear with vanishing eigenvalues.
Corollary 5.5 (Uniform continuity of the conditional entropy)
The conditional entropy over the bipartite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ is uniformly continuous on $S_0 = S(\mathcal{H})$ and for $\rho, \sigma \in S_0$ with $\frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$, it holds that
\[
|H_\rho(A|B) - H_\sigma(A|B)| \leq 2\varepsilon \log d_A + (1 + \varepsilon) h\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon}\right).
\]
Proof. First of all, $S_0$ is clearly 0-perturbed $\Delta$-invariant. Setting $f(\cdot) = H(A|B)$, we find that it is ALAFF with $a_f = 0$ as $H(A|B)$ is concave, and $b_f = h$ since the result in Theorem 5.1 becomes independent of the states as we go to $H(A|B)$ using point 3 of Proposition 5.2. Finally, we find that
\[
C_f^\perp = \sup_{\rho, \sigma \in S_0, \text{tr}[\rho\sigma] = 0} |H_\rho(A|B) - H_\sigma(A|B)| \leq 2\log d_A,
\]
where we used $-\log d_X \leq H(X|Y) \leq \log d_X$ shown, for example, in [85]. Using Theorem 4.6 in the form of Remark 4.8, we can infer the claimed continuity bound. \hfill $\Box$

As we have already mentioned, this coincides with the result of Winter [86] stated in Eq. (8), which he proved to be almost tight. The aforementioned result constituted an improvement to the earlier derived Alicki-Fannes bound for the conditional entropy [1].

5.2.2 Uniform continuity for the mutual information
The previous result can now be easily adapted to the mutual information. Indeed, as the mutual information can be obtained from a conditional entropy and a von Neumann entropy, a continuity bound for the former in terms of those for the latter quantities is a direct consequence.

Corollary 5.6 (Continuity bound for the mutual information)
The mutual information on a bipartite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ is uniformly continuous on $S_0 = S(\mathcal{H})$ and for $\rho, \sigma \in S_0$ with $\frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$, we find that
\[
|I_\rho(A : B) - I_\sigma(A : B)| \leq 2\varepsilon \min\{\log d_A, \log d_B\} + 2(1 + \varepsilon) h\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon}\right).
\]
Proof. First of all, $S_0$ is clearly 0-perturbed $\Delta$-invariant. With $f(\cdot) = I(A : B) = S(\cdot A) - H(A|B)$ one can immediately conclude almost local affinity of $I(A : B)$ as $S(\cdot A)$ is concave and fulfills Eq. (16) and $-H(A|B)$ is almost locally affine with $a_{-H(A|B)} = 0$ and $b_{-H(A|B)} = h$. Combined we get for $f(\cdot) = I(A : B)$, $a_f = h$ and $b_f = h$. We further have that
\[
C_f^\perp = \sup_{\rho, \sigma \in S_0, \text{tr}[\rho\sigma] = 0} |I_\rho(A : B) - I_\sigma(A : B)| \leq \sup_{\rho \in S_0} I_\rho(A : B) \leq 2\min\{\log d_A, \log d_B\},
\]
where we used that $0 \leq I(A : B)$ and $I(A : B) \leq 2\min\{\log d_A, \log d_B\}$ [85]. Applying Theorem 4.6 in the form of Remark 4.8, we can conclude the claim and obtain the given continuity bound. \hfill $\Box$

Corollary 5.6 coincides with the tightest previously-known continuity bound for the mutual information (see e.g. [70]).
5.2.3 Uniform continuity for the conditional mutual information

Next, we use again a similar approach to derive the result for the conditional mutual information. Note that this can be done by viewing the conditional mutual information as the difference between two mutual informations.

**Corollary 5.7 (Uniform continuity of the conditional mutual information)**

The conditional mutual information with respect to $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C$ is uniformly continuous on $\mathcal{S}_0 = \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ and for $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_0$ with $\frac{1}{2}\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$, we find that

$$|I_\rho(A : B|C) - I_\sigma(A : B|C)| \leq 2\varepsilon \min\{\log d_A, \log d_B\} + 2(1 + \varepsilon)h\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon}\right),$$

**Proof.** The procedure is now familiar. We first note that $\mathcal{S}_0$ is 0-perturbed $\Delta$-invariant. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $d_A \leq d_B$ and rewrite $f(\cdot) = I(A : B|C) = H(A|BC) - H(A|C)$. With this representation, we can immediately conclude that $I(A : B|C)$ is ALAFF with $a_f = h$ and $b_f = h$. Finally, we have that

$$C_f^+ = \sup_{\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_0} |I_\rho(A : B|C) - I_\sigma(A : B|C)|$$

$$\leq \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}_0} I_\rho(A : B|C)$$

$$= \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}_0} H_\rho(A|BC) - H_\rho(A|C)$$

$$\leq 2\log d_A = 2\min\{\log d_A, \log d_B\},$$

as the conditional mutual information is non-negative and again $-\log d_X \leq H(X|Y) \leq \log d_X$. Using Theorem 4.6 in the form of Remark 4.8, we can conclude the claim and obtain the given continuity bound.

This continuity bound for the conditional mutual information also coincides with the best previously-known continuity bound for such a quantity (see e.g. [69, Lemma 4]).

5.2.4 Divergence bounds for the relative entropy

In this section, we prove an upper bound on the relative entropy $D(\rho||\sigma)$ which involves the trace norm distance of $\rho$ and $\sigma$. The literature calls these bounds upper continuity bounds [7, 65, 84]; however, we consider this name to be a bit misleading since the bound involves $\rho$ and $\sigma$. For a continuity bound, we would expect an upper bound of $|D(\rho_1||\sigma_1) - D(\rho_2||\sigma_2)|$ in terms of the norm distance of $\rho_1$ and $\rho_2$, and $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$, respectively. We hence propose the name “divergence bound” for this kind of bound, to prevent confusion with the result in Section 5.2.5. This name is fitting, since we are relating the strength of divergence (between $\rho$ and $\sigma$) to a fixed norm distance (the one norm).

We now give the divergence bound we obtain when using the convexity and almost concavity of $D(\rho||\sigma)$ together with Theorem 4.6 by going through uniform continuity of the relative entropy in its first argument.

**Corollary 5.8 (Uniform continuity of the relative entropy in the first argument)**

Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ be fixed. Then $D(\cdot||\sigma)$ is uniformly continuous on $\mathcal{S}_0 = \{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) : \ker \sigma \subseteq \ker \rho\}$ and, for $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{S}_0$ with $\frac{1}{2}\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$, it holds that

$$|D(\rho_1||\sigma) - D(\rho_2||\sigma)| \leq \varepsilon \log \bar{m}_\sigma^{-1} + (1 + \varepsilon)h\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon}\right),$$
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with \( \tilde{m}_\sigma \) the minimal non-zero eigenvalue of \( \sigma \).

**Proof.** \( S_0 \) is clearly convex and 0-perturbed \( \Delta \)-invariant as for two operators \( A, B \), \( \ker A \cap \ker B \subseteq \ker (A - B) \) and \( [A - B]_\pm \) are orthogonal. We set \( f(\cdot) = D(\cdot \| \sigma) \). Using Theorem 5.1 and point 1 of Proposition 5.2, we find that \( D(\cdot \| \sigma) \) is ALAFF with \( a_f = h \) and \( b_f = 0 \). At last, we have that

\[
C_f = \sup_{\rho_1, \rho_2 \in S_0, \|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1 = 0} |D(\rho_1 \| \sigma) - D(\rho_2 \| \sigma)| \leq \sup_{\rho \in S(\mathcal{H})} D(\rho \| \sigma) \leq \log \tilde{m}_\sigma^{-1}.
\]

In the first inequality, we used that \( D(\rho \| \sigma) \geq 0 \), and in the second one that \( \tilde{m}_\sigma \rho \leq \sigma \) hence \( D(\rho \| \sigma) \leq \log \tilde{m}_\sigma^{-1} \). Using Theorem 4.6 in the form of Remark 4.8 concludes the claim.

We can subsequently use the Corollary 5.8 to prove a divergence bound for the relative entropy.

**Corollary 5.9 (Divergence bound for the relative entropy)**

Let \( \rho, \sigma \in S(\mathcal{H}) \) with \( \ker \sigma \subseteq \ker \rho \) and \( \frac{1}{2} \| \rho - \sigma \|_1 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1 \), we have

\[
D(\rho \| \sigma) \leq \varepsilon \log \tilde{m}_\sigma^{-1} + (1 + \varepsilon) h \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \right),
\]

with \( \tilde{m}_\sigma \) the minimal non-zero eigenvalue of \( \sigma \).

**Proof.** In the context of Corollary 5.8, we just set \( \rho_1 = \rho \) and \( \rho_2 = \sigma \), giving us that \( \frac{1}{2} \| \rho_1 - \rho_2 \|_1 = \frac{1}{2} \| \rho - \sigma \|_1 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1 \). Furthermore, \( D(\rho_2 \| \sigma) = D(\sigma \| \sigma) = 0 \) and \( |D(\rho_1 \| \sigma)| \) loses the absolute value, as \( D(\cdot \| \cdot) \geq 0 \). The bound follows immediately.

**Remark 5.10** For a better understanding of the dependence of the previous divergence bound in terms of \( \varepsilon \), we can use the following inequality:\(^2\)

\[
(1 + \varepsilon) h \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \right) \leq \sqrt{2\varepsilon},
\]

jointly with the fact that \( \varepsilon \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon} \) for any \( \varepsilon \in [0, 1] \). Therefore, we obtain

\[
D(\rho \| \sigma) \leq \left( 1 + \frac{\log \tilde{m}_\sigma^{-1}}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \| \rho - \sigma \|_1^{1/2}.
\]

\(^2\)This bound can be easily proven to hold for any \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \) (the extremal cases \( \varepsilon = 0, 1 \) are trivial). Indeed, define the function \( f : (0, 1) \to \mathbb{R} \) given by

\[
f(\varepsilon) := \sqrt{2\varepsilon} - \log(1 + \varepsilon) - \varepsilon \log \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + 1 \right).
\]

The derivative of such a function with respect to \( \varepsilon \) is given by

\[
f'(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\varepsilon}} - \log \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + 1 \right),
\]

and such derivative vanishes only for two values of \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \), namely \( \varepsilon_1 \approx 0.062 \) and \( \varepsilon_2 \approx 0.911 \). If now we compute the second derivative of \( f \) with respect to \( \varepsilon \) and evaluate it in \( \varepsilon_1 \) and \( \varepsilon_2 \), we get

\[
f''(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\varepsilon^{3/2}}} \ , \quad f''(\varepsilon_1) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad f''(\varepsilon_2) > 0.
\]

This means that the infimum of the function on \( (0, 1) \) is attained either in \( f(\varepsilon_2) \), \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to \varepsilon^+} f(\varepsilon) \) or \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to \varepsilon^-} f(\varepsilon) \). We check the values of the function in these three cases and in all of them it is positive. Therefore, \( f(\varepsilon) > 0 \) for every \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \) and the bound presented above is valid in this interval.
(a) The magnitude of the different bounds plotted over the relative entropy. We sampled thousand different pairs of qubits and controlled the minimal eigenvalue of $\sigma$ in a range from $10^{-4}$ to $10^{-8}$. The explicit bounds can be found in Table 1.

(b) The difference between the bound from Corollary 5.9 and the one of Audenaert & Eisert [9, Theorem 1]. On the x-axis we plot the minimal eigenvalue of $\sigma$ and on the y-axis $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}\|\rho - \sigma\|_1$. The minimal eigenvalue of $\rho$ is set to the minimal eigenvalue of sigma, thereby strengthening the bound of Audenaert & Eisert. Both were varied between $10^{-20}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$.

Figure 3: Two plots comparing the divergence bounds from Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Corollary 5.9</th>
<th>Audenaert &amp; Eisert [9, Theorem 1]</th>
<th>Vershynina [84]</th>
<th>Bratteli &amp; Robinson [21]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$ not full rank</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma$ not full rank</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D(\rho|\sigma) \leq \varepsilon \log \tilde{m}<em>\sigma^{-1} + (1 + \varepsilon) b \left( \frac{m</em>\sigma}{m_\rho} \right) - m_\rho \log \left( \frac{m_\rho + \varepsilon}{m_\rho} \right) - 2\varepsilon \lambda_\rho \log \frac{m_\rho - 1}{m_\rho - m_\sigma} - \log \frac{m_\sigma}{m_\rho} - \log \frac{m_\rho - m_\sigma}{m_\rho} - \frac{m_\rho - 1}{m_\rho} \left( |\rho - \sigma|_\infty \right)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: A comparison of different divergence bounds. Here $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}\|\rho - \sigma\|_1$ and $m.$ and $\tilde{m}.$ are the minimal and the minimal non-zero eigenvalue of the quantum state in the index, respectively. Further $\lambda_\rho$ is the maximal eigenvalue of $\rho$. The bound of Audenaert & Eisert in the case $m_\rho = 0$ has to be understood as the limit $m_\rho \to +0$.

Some bounds for the relative entropy between two density operators in a similar direction as ours have previously appeared in the literature. In particular, in [8, 84], the authors present some linear bounds for the relative entropy in terms of the trace norm difference between those states, with some multiplicative factors depending on the eigenvalues of the states involved, whereas in [21] a similar bound is provided in terms of the operator norm of the difference between the states. One of the bounds in [8] is further generalised in [9] and is closely related to our bound as both of them are non-linear in the trace norm (resp. operator norm) difference between the involved states, and show a dependence on the inverse of the minimal eigenvalue of $\sigma$ only logarithmically. This is partly an advantage over the bounds in [21, 84]. In Table 1 and Fig. 3 we compare the aforementioned bounds from [9, 21, 84]. From Fig. 3a it is clear that our bound, in the majority
of the cases, outperforms the bound by Vershynina and the one by Bratteli & Robinson. This is because of the logarithmic scaling with the inverse minimal eigenvalue of \( \sigma \) of our bound versus the linear scaling with the inverse minimal eigenvalue of \( \sigma \) of theirs. We hence reduce the discussion to a comparison between Audenaert & Eisert’s and our bound. From the first Fig. 3a and second plot Fig. 3b we conclude a slight advantage of theirs. The numerical experiments suggest, however, that the difference between both bounds is bounded by two, hence as the minimal eigenvalue decreases both bounds should converge asymptotically. Furthermore, our bound has the advantage that it does not need \( \sigma \) nor \( \rho \) to be full rank. This fact and its simple representation might give some advantages in applications.

5.2.5 Continuity bounds for the relative entropy

We conclude our section on continuity bounds with the most involved continuity bound until now. It concerns the relative entropy and regards it in all its power as a function of two variables, i.e., it constitutes a continuity bound both for the first and the second input of the relative entropy simultaneously. This presents some challenges that need to be dealt with, as the relative entropy presents problems of discontinuity whenever the kernel of the second input is not contained in that of the first one. To overcome these issues, we need to employ the ALAFF method in its full generality.

In the first step, we fix the first input of the relative entropy and provide a continuity bound for the first variable. To overcome these issues, we need to employ the ALAFF method in its full generality.

**Corollary 5.11 (Uniform continuity of the relative entropy in the second argument)**

Let \( \rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \) be fixed and \( 1 > \tilde{m} > 0 \). Then, \( D(\rho\|\cdot) \) is uniformly continuous on

\[
\mathcal{S}_0 := \{ \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) : \ker \sigma \subseteq \ker \rho, \tilde{m}\rho \leq \sigma \}.
\]

We further get that, for \( \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathcal{S}_0 \) with \( \frac{1}{2}\|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2\|_1 \leq \epsilon \),

\[
|D(\rho\|\sigma_1) - D(\rho\|\sigma_2)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{l_{\tilde{m}}} \log(\tilde{m}^{-1}) + \frac{l_{\tilde{m}} + \epsilon}{l_{\tilde{m}}} f_{\tilde{m}^{-1},\tilde{m}^{-1}}(\frac{\epsilon}{l_{\tilde{m}} + \epsilon}), \tag{21}
\]

where \( l_{\tilde{m}} = 1 - \tilde{m} \).

**Proof.** We have that \( \mathcal{S}_0 \) is clearly convex as, for \( \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathcal{S}_0 \) and \( \lambda \in [0, 1] \),

\[
\lambda \sigma_1 + (1 - \lambda) \sigma_2 \geq \lambda \tilde{m}\rho + (1 - \lambda)\tilde{m}\rho = \tilde{m}\rho,
\]

giving the kernel inclusion as well as the condition for the smallest eigenvalue on the support of \( \rho \). Furthermore, \( \mathcal{S}_0 \) is \( s \)-perturbed \( \Delta \)-invariant with \( s = \tilde{m} \). This is because one can just perturb with \( \tau = \rho \) and get the kernel inclusion as well as the minorization by \( \tilde{m}\rho \). Employing point 2 of Proposition 5.2 we further get that \( f(\cdot) = D(\rho\|\cdot) \) satisfies Eq. (13) with \( b_f = 0 \) and \( a_f = f_{\tilde{m}^{-1},\tilde{m}^{-1}}, \) hence \( E_f = f_{\tilde{m}^{-1},\tilde{m}^{-1}} \), and using again Proposition 5.2 (point 4, since \( \tilde{m} \leq 1 \)) we find \( E_f^{\max} = f_{\tilde{m}^{-1},\tilde{m}^{-1}} \). At last, we have that

\[
C_f^{\tilde{m}} = \sup_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathcal{S}_0, \frac{1}{2}\|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2\|_1 = 1 - \tilde{m}} |D(\rho\|\sigma_1) - D(\rho\|\sigma_2)|
\]

\[
\leq \sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_0} D(\rho\|\sigma)
\]

\[
\leq \log(\tilde{m}^{-1}),
\]

where we used that \( D(\rho\|\cdot) \geq 0 \) and for the last inequality that \( \tilde{m}\rho \leq \sigma \) for all \( \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_0 \). Employing now Theorem 4.6 we obtain uniform continuity and the claimed continuity bound. 

\( \square \)
Remark 5.12 The continuity bound obtained in the previous corollary for the relative entropy in the second argument is relatively involved. For a better understanding of its behaviour, let us remark that we can bound the last term of Eq. (21) in the following form:

\[
\frac{l_{\tilde{m}} + \varepsilon}{l_{\tilde{m}}} f_{\tilde{m}^{-1}, m^{-1}} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{l_{\tilde{m}} + \varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{2 \log^2 \tilde{m}^{-1}}{l_{\tilde{m}}} \sqrt{\varepsilon}.
\]

Noticing now that \( \varepsilon \leq \sqrt{\tilde{m}} \) for any \( \varepsilon \in [0, 1] \), and replacing \( l_{\tilde{m}} = 1 - \tilde{m} \), we obtain the following modified continuity bound for the relative entropy in the second argument:

\[
|D(\rho\|\sigma_1) - D(\rho\|\sigma_2)| \leq \frac{3 \log^2 \tilde{m}^{-1}}{1 - \tilde{m}} \sqrt{\varepsilon}.
\]

In the above corollary, two choices need some more justification. The first choice is \( 1 > \tilde{m} \) and the second one \( s = \tilde{m} \). We want to put them into context by the following proposition, demonstrating that these assumptions are necessary to obtain a non-trivial \( \mathcal{S}_0 \).

Lemma 5.13
Let \( \rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \) with rank \( \rho \geq 2 \), further \( \tilde{m} \in (0, \infty) \) and

\[
\mathcal{S}_0 := \{ \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) : \ker \sigma \subseteq \ker \rho, \tilde{m}\rho \leq \sigma \}.
\]

Then, the following is true:

1. If \( 1 > \tilde{m} \), then \( \mathcal{S}_0 \) is \( s \)-perturbed \( \Delta \)-invariant if and only if \( s \geq \tilde{m} \).
2. If \( 1 = \tilde{m} \), then \( \mathcal{S}_0 = \{ \rho \} \).
3. If \( 1 < \tilde{m} \), \( \mathcal{S}_0 = \emptyset \).

We will only give proof for the first one in Appendix D and leave the last two for the reader. Next, we proceed to state and prove the main result of this subsection on continuity bounds, namely the uniform continuity bound for the relative entropy in a certain subspace of the set of pairs of density matrices for both the first and second inputs simultaneously. Since we have already explored the cases in which we either fix the second (Corollary 5.8) or first (Corollary 5.11) density operator, we now combine both results in the proof of the next theorem.

Theorem 5.14 (Uniform continuity of the relative entropy)
Let \( 1 > 2\tilde{m} > 0 \) and

\[
\mathcal{S}_0 = \{ (\rho, \sigma) : \rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}), \ker \sigma \subseteq \ker \rho, 2\tilde{m} \leq \tilde{m}_\sigma \},
\]

with \( \tilde{m}_\sigma \) the minimal non-zero eigenvalue of \( \sigma \). Then, \( D(\cdot\|\cdot) \) is uniformly continuous on \( \mathcal{S}_0 \) and we find that for \( (\rho_1, \sigma_1), (\rho_2, \sigma_2) \in \mathcal{S}_0 \) with \( \frac{1}{2} \| \rho_1 - \rho_2 \| \leq \varepsilon \leq 1 \) and \( \frac{1}{2} \| \sigma_1 - \sigma_2 \| \leq \delta \leq 1 \)

\[
|D(\rho_1\|\sigma_1) - D(\rho_2\|\sigma_2)| \leq \left( \varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{l_{\tilde{m}}} \right) \log(\tilde{m}^{-1}) + (1 + \varepsilon) h \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \right) + 2 \frac{l_{\tilde{m}} + \delta}{l_{\tilde{m}}} f_{\tilde{m}^{-1}, m^{-1}} \left( \frac{\delta}{l_{\tilde{m}} + \delta} \right),
\]

with \( l_{\tilde{m}} = 1 - \tilde{m} \).

---

\(^4\)This bound can be easily checked by noticing that the function \( g : (0, 1) \times (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) given by

\[
g(m, \varepsilon) := 2 \log^2 m^{-1} \sqrt{\varepsilon} - \varepsilon \log \left( \varepsilon + \frac{1 - m}{m} \right) - (1 - m) \log \left( 1 - m + \frac{\varepsilon}{m} \right) + (1 - m + \varepsilon) \log(1 - m + \varepsilon)
\]

is monotonically increasing in \( \varepsilon \) and decreasing in \( m \). As we are interested in \( m < 1/2 \) it is enough to study the case \( g(1/2, \varepsilon) \), for \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \). It is not difficult to check that \( \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} g(1/2, \varepsilon) \geq 0 \).
Proof. We will prove the uniform continuity by proving that the bound Eq. (22) holds. Therefore, let \((\rho_1, \sigma_1), (\rho_2, \sigma_2) \in \mathcal{S}_0\) with \(\frac{1}{2}\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\| \leq \varepsilon \leq 1\) and \(\frac{1}{2}\|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2\| \leq \delta \leq 1\). We define
\[
\tilde{\sigma} = \frac{1}{2}\sigma_1 + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_2,
\] (23)
and obtain
\[
\frac{1}{2}\|\tilde{\sigma} - \sigma_1\|_1 = \frac{1}{4}\|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2\|_1 \leq \delta \leq 1,
\]
\[
\frac{1}{2}\|\tilde{\sigma} - \sigma_2\|_1 = \frac{1}{4}\|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2\|_1 \leq \delta \leq 1.
\]
Using this, we get
\[
|D(\rho_1\|\sigma_1) - D(\rho_2\|\sigma_2)| \leq |D(\rho_1\|\sigma_1) - D(\rho_1\|\sigma)| + |D(\rho_1\|\sigma) - D(\rho_2\|\sigma)| + |D(\rho_2\|\sigma) - D(\rho_2\|\sigma_2)|.
\]
The middle term can be bounded using Corollary 5.8 and the fact that
\[
\log \tilde{m}_{\tilde{\sigma}}^{-1} \leq \max\{\log(2\tilde{m}_{\sigma_1}^{-1}), \log(2\tilde{m}_{\sigma_2}^{-1})\} \leq \log \tilde{m}^{-1}.
\]
One obtains
\[
|D(\rho_1\|\sigma) - D(\rho_2\|\sigma)| \leq \varepsilon \log \tilde{m}^{-1} + (1 + \varepsilon)h\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon}\right).
\]
The other two terms are bound using Corollary 5.11 and the fact that \(\tilde{m}\rho_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}\sigma_1 \leq \sigma\) and \(\tilde{m}\rho_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\sigma_2 \leq \tilde{\sigma}\) by construction of \(\mathcal{S}_0\) and the definition of \(\tilde{\sigma}\), respectively. We therefore obtain
\[
|D(\rho_1\|\sigma_1) - D(\rho_1\|\sigma)| \leq \frac{\delta}{2\tilde{m}} \log(\tilde{m})^{-1} + \frac{l_{\tilde{m}} + 2^{-1}\delta}{l_{\tilde{m}}} f_{\tilde{m}^{-1}, \tilde{m}^{-1}}\left(\frac{2^{-1}\delta}{l_{\tilde{m}} + 2^{-1}\delta}\right),
\]
\[
|D(\rho_1\|\sigma) - D(\rho_2\|\sigma_2)| \leq \frac{\delta}{2l_{\tilde{m}}} \log(\tilde{m})^{-1} + \frac{l_{\tilde{m}} + 2^{-1}\delta}{l_{\tilde{m}}} f_{\tilde{m}^{-1}, \tilde{m}^{-1}}\left(\frac{2^{-1}\delta}{l_{\tilde{m}} + 2^{-1}\delta}\right).
\]
Combining the bounds and point 2 of Proposition 5.2, as \(\tilde{m} \leq 1\) and further using that
\[
\frac{l_{\tilde{m}} + 2^{-1}\delta}{l_{\tilde{m}}} f_{\tilde{m}^{-1}, \tilde{m}^{-1}}\left(\frac{2^{-1}\delta}{l_{\tilde{m}} + 2^{-1}\delta}\right) \leq \frac{l_{\tilde{m}} + \delta}{l_{\tilde{m}}} f_{\tilde{m}^{-1}, \tilde{m}^{-1}}\left(\frac{\delta}{l_{\tilde{m}} + \delta}\right),
\]
we obtain the claimed bound, and thereby also uniform continuity. \(\Box\)

Similarly to the discussion of Remark 5.12, we can further simplify the latter continuity bound as we show below.

**Remark 5.15** The continuity bound for the relative entropy from Theorem 5.14 can be simplified by bounding the terms involved in it. On the one side, we have
\[
2\frac{l_{\tilde{m}} + \delta}{l_{\tilde{m}}} f_{\tilde{m}^{-1}, \tilde{m}^{-1}}\left(\frac{\delta}{l_{\tilde{m}} + \delta}\right) \leq \frac{4\log^2 \tilde{m}^{-1}}{l_{\tilde{m}}}
\]
whereas, on the other side, we can bound the binary entropy term using
\[
(1 + \varepsilon)h\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon}\right) \leq \sqrt{2}\varepsilon.
\]
Using these inequalities, jointly with the fact that \(\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1]\), and thus \(\varepsilon \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}\) and \(\delta \leq \sqrt{\delta}\), as well as replacing \(l_{\tilde{m}} = 1 - \tilde{m}\), we obtain the following simplified continuity bound for the relative entropy:
\[
|D(\rho_1\|\sigma_1) - D(\rho_2\|\sigma_2)| \leq \left(1 + \frac{\log \tilde{m}^{-1}}{\sqrt{2}}\right)\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1^{1/2} + \frac{5\log^2 \tilde{m}^{-1}}{\sqrt{2}(1 - \tilde{m})}\|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2\|_1^{1/2}.
\] (24)
Let us conclude this section by emphasizing that there might be some room for improvement in the previous result. For instance, it might be possible to improve the interpolation between $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$ considered in Eq. (23) by optimizing over some probabilities $p$ and $1 - p$ associated to $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$, respectively, instead of just assigning both probability $1/2$. However, we believe this would not change the appearance of the bound drastically and thus the reason for not performing this optimization.

6 Almost concavity and continuity bounds for the Belavkin-Staszewski entropy

Following the same lines as in the previous section, now we apply the ALAFF method introduced in Section 4 for the particular case of the BS-entropy between two density operators. For that, we need to prove a result of almost concavity for the BS-entropy, which we do in Section 6.1. However, in contrast to the case of the relative entropy, our result for the BS-entropy is not tight. We leave the discussion on the almost concavity bound and the difficulties that appear in the BS-entropy case to the next subsection.

Subsequently, we combine our result of almost concavity for the BS-entropy with the ALAFF method to provide certain results of uniform continuity and explicit continuity bounds for entropic quantities derived from the BS-entropy in Section 6.2. All the results provided in this section are summarized in Fig. 4.

6.1 Almost concavity for the BS-entropy

In this section we prove the almost concavity of the BS-entropy and thereby complement the established result of convexity [53, Theorem 4.4], [41, Corollary 4.7]. We first need to give some auxiliary results in order to prove the almost concavity. The first of these auxiliary results concerns an operator inequality for the term inside the trace in the definition of the BS-entropy.

**Lemma 6.1**

Let $A_1, A_2 \in B(H)$ positive semi-definite, $p \in [0, 1]$ and


Then

$$-A \log(A) \leq -pA_1 \log(A_1) - (1 - p)A_2 \log(A_2) + h_{A_1, A_2}(p)1,$$

with $h_{A_1, A_2}(p) = -p \log(p) \text{tr}[A_1] - (1 - p) \log(1 - p) \text{tr}[A_2]$ the distorted binary entropy.

**Proof.** It holds that

$$-A \log(A) + pA_1 \log(A_1) + (1 - p)A_2 \log(A_2) \leq \| -A \log(A) + pA_1 \log(A_1) + (1 - p)A_2 \log(A_2) \|_1 1. \quad (25)$$

Now, since $x \mapsto -x \log(x)$ is operator concave [25, Theorem 2.6], we have

$$-A \log(A) \geq -pA_1 \log(A_1) - (1 - p)A_2 \log(A_2),$$

giving us that

$$-A \log(A) + pA_1 \log(A_1) + (1 - p)A_2 \log(A_2) \geq 0,$$
Figure 4: In this flow chart we collect the main results from this section, starting with the almost concavity for the BS-entropy, which together with the ALAFF method outputs a plethora of bounds for entropic quantities derived from the BS-entropy. For the convexity and almost concavity of the BS-entropy we are setting \( \rho = pp_1 + (1-p)p_2 \) and \( \sigma = p\sigma_1 + (1-p)\sigma_2 \), with \( p \in [0,1] \). We denote by \( m_\sigma \) the minimal eigenvalue of \( \sigma \). In the almost concavity bound, \( \hat{c}_0 \) is the maximum of \( \|\sigma^{-1}\|_\infty \) and \( \|\sigma^{-2}\|_\infty \). Additionally, we assume in all the continuity bounds that \( m \leq \|\eta^{-1}\|_\infty \), for \( \eta = \sigma, \rho \).

and hence

\[
\| -A \log(A) + pA_1 \log(A_1) + (1-p)A_2 \log(A_2) \|_1
= \text{tr}[-A \log(A) + pA_1 \log(A_1) + (1-p)A_2 \log(A_2)].
\]  

(26)

We now use operator monotonicity of the logarithm to find

\[
-\text{tr}[A \log(A)] = -p \text{tr}[A_1 \log(A_1)] - (1-p) \text{tr}[A_2 \log(A)] \\
\leq -p \text{tr}[A_1 \log(pA_1)] - (1-p) \text{tr}[A_2 \log((1-p)A_2)] \\
= -p \text{tr}[A_1 \log(A_1)] - (1-p) \text{tr}[A_2 \log(A_2)] + h_{A_1, A_2}(p)
\]

Inserting this into Eq. (26) and then into Eq. (25) yields the claimed result.

The next auxiliary result concerns an equivalent formulation for the BS-entropy constructed from the function \( x \mapsto x \log x \), and has already appeared in the literature (see e.g. [59, Eq. (7.35)]).

We include here a short proof of this result for completeness.
Lemma 6.2
Let $\rho \in S(\mathcal{H})$ and $\sigma \in S_+(\mathcal{H})$, then

$$\hat{D}(\rho\|\sigma) = \text{tr}\left[\sigma(\sigma^{-1/2}\rho\sigma^{-1/2})\log\left(\sigma^{-1/2}\rho\sigma^{-1/2}\right)\right]$$

Proof.

$$\hat{D}(\rho\|\sigma) = \text{tr}\left[\rho \log\left(\rho^{1/2}\sigma^{-1/2}\rho^{1/2}\right)\right] = \text{tr}\left[\log\left(\rho^{1/2}\sigma^{-1/2}\rho^{1/2}\right)\rho^{1/2}\sigma^{-1/2}\rho^{1/2}\right]$$

$$= \text{tr}\left[\rho^{1/2}\sigma^{-1/2}\log\left(\sigma^{-1/2}\rho\sigma^{-1/2}\right)\sigma^{1/2}\rho^{1/2}\right]$$

$$= \text{tr}\left[\sigma(\sigma^{-1/2}\rho\sigma^{-1/2})\log\left(\sigma^{-1/2}\rho\sigma^{-1/2}\right)\right]$$

We used the cyclicity of the trace several times, and the fact that we have $f(L^*L)L^* = L^*f(LL^*)$ in case the spectrum of $L^*L$ and $LL^*$ lie in the domain of $f$ \cite[Lemma 61.]{4}.

Building on the previous results from this section, we proceed to prove now the main result, namely the almost concavity for the BS-entropy, in the line of results of almost concavity discussed in Definition 4.1.

Theorem 6.3 (Almost concavity of the BS-entropy)
Let $(\rho_1, \sigma_1), (\rho_2, \sigma_2) \in S_{\ker} \in S_+(\mathcal{H})$ with

$$S_{\ker} := \{(\rho, \sigma) \in S(\mathcal{H}) \times S(\mathcal{H}) : \sigma \in S_+(\mathcal{H})\}$$

and $p \in [0,1]$. Then, for $\rho = p\rho_1 + (1-p)\rho_2$, $\sigma = p\sigma_1 + (1-p)\sigma_2$, we have

$$\hat{D}(\rho\|\sigma) \geq p\hat{D}(\rho_1\|\sigma_1) + (1-p)\hat{D}(\rho_2\|\sigma_2) - \hat{c}_0(1 - \delta_{\rho_1,\rho_2})h(p) - f_{\hat{c}_1,\hat{c}_2}(p),$$

with

$$h(p) = -p\log(p) - (1-p)\log(1-p),$$

$$f_{\hat{c}_1,\hat{c}_2}(p) = p\log(p + \hat{c}_1(1-p)) + (1-p)\log((1-p) + \hat{c}_2p),$$

$$\delta_{\rho_1,\rho_2} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \rho_1 = \rho_2 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

and the constants

$$\hat{c}_0 := \max\{\|\sigma_1^{-1}\|_{\infty}, \|\sigma_2^{-1}\|_{\infty}\},$$

$$\hat{c}_1 := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt\beta_0(t) \text{tr}\left[p_1(\rho_1^{1/2}\sigma_1^{-1}\rho_1^{1/2})^{\frac{\nu+1}{2}}\rho_1^{-1/2}\sigma_2\rho_1^{-1/2}(\rho_1^{1/2}\sigma_1^{-1}\rho_1^{1/2})^{-\frac{\nu+1}{2}}\right],$$

$$\hat{c}_2 := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt\beta_0(t) \text{tr}\left[p_2(\rho_2^{1/2}\sigma_2^{-1}\rho_2^{1/2})^{\frac{\nu+1}{2}}\rho_2^{-1/2}\sigma_1\rho_2^{-1/2}(\rho_2^{1/2}\sigma_2^{-1}\rho_2^{1/2})^{-\frac{\nu+1}{2}}\right],$$

with the probability density $\beta_0$ defined as in Eq. (18).

Proof. The formula for $p = 0,1$ is trivial, hence let $p \in (0,1)$. We find that

$$p\hat{D}(\rho_1\|\sigma_1) + (1-p)\hat{D}(\rho_2\|\sigma_2) - \hat{D}(\rho\|\sigma)$$

$$\leq p(\hat{D}(\rho_1\|\sigma_1) - \hat{D}(\rho_1\|\sigma)) + (1-p)(\hat{D}(\rho_2\|\sigma_2) - \hat{D}(\rho_2\|\sigma)) + \hat{c}_0h(p).$$
Indeed, as of Lemma 6.2 and then Lemma 6.1 with $A_1 = \sigma^{-1/2} \rho_1 \sigma^{-1/2}$, $A_2 = \sigma^{-1/2} \rho_2 \sigma^{-1/2}$ respectively, we can prove

\[ -\tilde{D}(\rho||\sigma) = \text{tr}\left[\sigma \left(-\sigma^{-1/2} \rho \sigma^{-1/2} \log(\sigma^{-1/2} \rho \sigma^{-1/2})\right)\right] \leq p \text{tr}\left[\sigma \left(-\sigma^{-1/2} \rho_1 \sigma^{-1/2} \log(\sigma^{-1/2} \rho_1 \sigma^{-1/2})\right)\right] + (1-p) \text{tr}\left[\sigma \left(-\sigma^{-1/2} \rho_2 \sigma^{-1/2} \log(\sigma^{-1/2} \rho_2 \sigma^{-1/2})\right)\right] + h_{A_1,A_2}(p) = -p\tilde{D}(\rho_1||\sigma) - (1-p)\tilde{D}(\rho_2||\sigma) + h_{A_1,A_2}(p). \]

At last we can estimate $\text{tr}[A_j] = \text{tr}[\sigma^{-1} \rho_j] \leq \|\sigma^{-1}\|_{\infty} \leq \tilde{c}_0$ for $j = 1, 2$ using Hölder’s inequality, giving us $h_{A_1,A_2}(p) \leq \tilde{c}_0 h(p)$.

We now have to estimate terms of the form $\tilde{D}(\rho_j||\sigma_j) - \tilde{D}(\rho_j||\sigma)$ for $j = 1, 2$. This is done using the Peierls-Bogolubov inequality [3] and the multivariate trace inequalities of Sutter et al. [74]:

\[
\tilde{D}(\rho_j||\sigma_j) - \tilde{D}(\rho_j||\sigma) = \text{tr}\left[\rho_j \left(\log(\rho_j^{1/2} \sigma_j^{-1} \rho_j^{1/2}) - \log(\rho_j^{1/2} \sigma_j^{-1} \rho_j^{1/2})\right)\right] \\
\leq \text{tr}\left[\exp\left(\log(\rho_j) + \log(\rho_j^{1/2} \sigma_j^{-1} \rho_j^{1/2})\right) - \log(\rho_j^{1/2} \sigma_j^{-1} \rho_j^{1/2})\right] \\
\leq \text{tr}\left[\exp\left(\log(\rho_j) + \log(\rho_j^{1/2} \sigma_j^{-1} \rho_j^{1/2})\right) + \log(\rho_j^{-1/2} \sigma_j \rho_j^{-1/2})\right] \\
\leq \log\left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \beta_0(t) \text{tr}[\rho_j(\rho_j^{1/2} \sigma_j^{-1} \rho_j^{1/2})^{\frac{\mu+1}{2}} \rho_j^{-1/2} \sigma_j \rho_j^{-1/2}(\rho_j^{1/2} \sigma_j^{-1} \rho_j^{1/2})^{-\frac{\mu+1}{2}}]\right) \\
= \begin{cases} 
\log(p + (1-p)\tilde{c}_1) & j = 1 \\
\log((1-p) + p\tilde{c}_2) & j = 2 
\end{cases}. \tag{28}
\]

In the third line, we use that

\[-\log(\rho_j^{1/2} \sigma_j^{-1} \rho_j^{1/2}) \leq \log(\rho_j^{-1/2} \sigma_j^{-1} \rho_j^{-1/2}) \]

which is true since for $P_\rho$ the projection on the support of $\rho$, we have

\[P_\rho (P_\rho \sigma P_\rho)^{-1} P_\rho \leq P_\rho \sigma^{-1} P_\rho,\]
as $x \rightarrow x^{-1}$ is operator convex and hence fulfills the Sherman-Davis inequality [25, Theorem 4.19]. Note that $\sigma$ is invertible and that by $(P_\rho \sigma P_\rho)^{-1}$ we mean the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse. We find

\[-\log(\rho_j^{1/2} \sigma_j^{-1} \rho_j^{1/2}) = -\log(\rho_j^{1/2} P_\rho \sigma^{-1} P_\rho \rho_j^{1/2}) \leq -\log(\rho_j^{1/2} P_\rho (P_\rho \sigma P_\rho)^{-1} P_\rho \rho_j^{1/2}) = \log(\rho_j^{-1/2} P_\rho \sigma P_\rho \rho_j^{-1/2}) = \log(\rho_j^{-1/2} \sigma_j^{-1} \rho_j^{-1/2}).\]

The argument why the inequalities in Eq. (28) hold in the case of $\rho_j$ not being full rank is simpler than in the case of the corresponding inequality for the relative entropy (cf. Theorem 5.1 and Appendix B). For the BS-entropy, we can already restrict Eq. (28) to the support of $\rho_j$ as all operators involved, $\rho_j$, $\rho_j^{1/2} \sigma_j^{-1} \rho_j^{1/2}$ and $\rho_j^{1/2} \sigma_j^{-1} \rho_j^{-1/2}$, commute with the projection onto the support.
of $\rho_j$. In the last step we split $\sigma$ and evaluated the first term to $p$ in case $j = 1$ or the second term in case $j = 2$ to $(1 - p)$ and left the other one untouched, respectively. This concludes the proof.

Remark 6.4 We strongly suspect that Theorem 6.3 can be improved because of two arguments. The first one is that we would expect the results of almost concavity of the relative and the BS-entropy to coincide in the case that the involved states commute. The reason is that in this case, both quantities coincide with the classical relative entropy. A straightforward calculation shows that in that case $\hat{c}_1 = c_1$ and $\hat{c}_2 = c_2$, hence $f_{\hat{c}_1, \hat{c}_2} = f_{c_1, c_2}$, but $h \leq \hat{c}_0 h$ with equality if, and only if, $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$ are pure, which is generally not the case.

The other reason is given by the bounds we obtain for the BS-conditional entropy in Proposition 6.6, which show that there is no dependence on the minimal eigenvalue if the state $\sigma$ is full rank (The full rank requirement is necessary, however, as we will show in Proposition 6.7 that the BS-conditional entropy might be discontinuous in the presence of vanishing eigenvalues). Hence we would also suspect that an optimal bound would be eigenvalue independent in the case of the BS-conditional entropy.

As in the case of the relative entropy we provide an additional proposition to give context to the above result, i.e. to provide simpler expressions if some of the involved states satisfy some specific conditions.

Proposition 6.5 (Almost concavity estimate of the BS-entropy is well behaved)
The function $\hat{c}_0 h + f_{\hat{c}_1, \hat{c}_2}$ obtained in Theorem 6.3 is well behaved in the following sense: Let $j = 1, 2$ and $(\rho_j, \sigma_j) \in S_{\text{tor,}+}$. We have the following:

1. If $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$, then $\hat{c}_j = 1$, resulting in $f_{\hat{c}_1, \hat{c}_2} + \hat{c}_0 h = \hat{c}_0 h$.

2. If the $\sigma_j$ have a minimal eigenvalue that is bounded from below by $m > 0$ respectively, then $f_{\hat{c}_1, \hat{c}_2} + \hat{c}_0 h \leq f_{m^{-1}, m^{-1}} + m^{-1} h$.

3. If $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ is a bipartite space, $\rho_j$ has a minimal eigenvalue bounded from below by $m > 0$, and further $\sigma_j = d_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}1_A \otimes \rho_j, B$, then $f_{\hat{c}_1, \hat{c}_2} + \hat{c}_0 h \leq f_{m^{-1}, m^{-1}} + m^{-1} h$.

4. We find for $m_1, m_2 \geq 1$, $p \mapsto \frac{1}{1 - p} f_{m_1, m_2}(p)$ and $p \mapsto \frac{1}{1 - p} \hat{c}_0 h(p)$ are non-decreasing on $[0, 1)$.

This result should be compared to Proposition 5.2, its analogue for the relative entropy. The proof can be found in Appendix E. We will use the reductions from Proposition 6.5 to simplify the terms in Theorem 6.3 for the various applications presented in the next section.

6.2 Continuity bounds for the BS-entropy

In this section, we will use the almost concavity for the BS-entropy from Theorem 6.3 together with the ALAFF method in its full generality, Theorem 4.6, as well as the reduction of the correction terms from Proposition 6.5, to prove a collection of results of continuity bounds for entropic quantities derived from the BS-entropy. However, as we will show in the next pages, these bounds are generally more involved than in the analogous case for the relative entropy, both in their forms as well as in their proofs. In particular, all of them depend in one way or another on the minimal eigenvalue of the second input in the BS-entropy. The reason for this apparent caveat will become clear in the next few subsections, where we discuss the discontinuities present in the BS-entropy.

Beforehand, we need to collect some lower and upper estimates of certain entropic quantities derived from the BS-entropy (see Section 3.1 for the specific definitions).
Proposition 6.6 (Bound on the BS-entropic quantities)
For $\rho \in S(H_A \otimes H_B)$, we find:

1. For the BS-conditional entropy:
   \[ -\min\{\log d_A, \log d_B\} \leq \hat{H}_\rho(A|B) \leq \log d_A . \] (29)

2. For the BS-mutual information:
   \[ 0 \leq \hat{I}_\rho(A : B) \leq \min\{\log d_A, \log d_B\} + \min\{\log \|\rho_A^{-1}\|_\infty, \log \|\rho_B^{-1}\|_\infty\} , \] (30)

   with $^{-1}$ the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse.

3. For $\rho \in S(H_A \otimes H_B \otimes H_C)$, for the BS-conditional mutual information:
   \[ 0 \leq \hat{I}_\rho(A : B|C) \leq \min\{\log d_A^2, \log d_{ABC}\} . \]

The two first bounds are shown to be tight. For the third one, we expect that similar reasoning should also show its tightness.

The proof can be found in Appendix F. We further want to remark that the scaling of the bound with respect to the minimal non-zero eigenvalue of $\rho_A$ or $\rho_B$ is justified. The reasoning can be found in Appendix F as well.

6.2.1 Uniform continuity for the BS-conditional entropy
The case of the BS-conditional entropy is more involved than the one of the conditional entropy that we have covered in Proposition 5.2. This is because the almost concave bound of the BS-entropy depends on the minimal eigenvalue of the second argument (see Eq. (27)), hence we need to require the second argument to be full rank, which in the case of the BS-conditional entropy means we have to require the argument to be full rank as well. Although we think that the result of almost concavity for the BS-entropy can be improved, we know that there is no extension of uniform continuity nor continuity for the BS-conditional entropy to positive semi-definite states, as this quantity is not continuous on those. This is the content of the next proposition. We also refer the reader to [31, Remark 3.3] for a similar behaviour of the sharp quantum Rényi divergences.

Proposition 6.7 (Discontinuity of the BS-conditional entropy on positive semi-definite states)
The BS-conditional entropy is discontinuous on the set of positive semi-definite operators over $H_A \otimes H_B$ if $d_A, d_B \geq 2$.

Proof. Since $d_A \geq 2$ as well as $d_B \geq 2$, we find orthogonal $|i_A\rangle \in H_A$, $|i_B\rangle \in H_B$, $i = 0, 1$. For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ we then define
   \[ |\varepsilon_B\rangle = \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon} |0_B\rangle + \sqrt{\varepsilon} |1_B\rangle , \]
   which is clearly normalised. Furthermore,
   \[ \rho_0 := \frac{1}{2} (|0_A\rangle\langle 0_A| + |1_A\rangle\langle 1_A|) \otimes |0_B\rangle\langle 0_B| , \]
   \[ \rho_\varepsilon := \frac{1}{2} |0_A\rangle\langle 0_A| \otimes |0_B\rangle\langle 0_B| + \frac{1}{2} |1_A\rangle\langle 1_A| \otimes |\varepsilon_B\rangle\langle \varepsilon_B| , \]
The above are states and further fulfil
\[
\|\rho_0 - \rho_\epsilon\|_1 = \frac{1}{2} \| |A\rangle\langle A| \otimes (|0_B\rangle\langle 0_B| - |\epsilon_B\rangle\langle \epsilon_B|)\|_1 \\
= \frac{1}{2} \| |0_B\rangle\langle 0_B| - |\epsilon_B\rangle\langle \epsilon_B|\|_1 = \sqrt{\epsilon}.
\]

(31)

To see the last equality, we can identify the subspace spanned by \(|0_B\rangle\) and \(|1_B\rangle\) with \(\mathbb{C}^2\) and then get that
\[
|0_B\rangle|0_B\rangle \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad |\epsilon_B\rangle|\epsilon_B\rangle \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \epsilon \\ \sqrt{\epsilon}\sqrt{1-\epsilon} \end{pmatrix}.
\]

(32)

Calculating the eigenvalues of the difference and taking the sum of their absolute value gives \(2\sqrt{\epsilon}\) and thereby Eq. (31). Since clearly \([\rho_1, \mathbb{I} \otimes \text{tr}_A[\rho_1]] = 0\), the BS and conditional entropy coincide and we find
\[
\tilde{H}_{\rho_0}(A|B) = d_A \text{tr}[|0_B\rangle\langle 0_B| \log |0_B\rangle\langle 0_B|] \\
- \text{tr} \left[ \frac{1}{2} (|0_A\rangle\langle 0_A| + |A\rangle\langle A|) \otimes |0_B\rangle\langle 0_B| \log \frac{1}{2} (|0_A\rangle\langle 0_A| + |A\rangle\langle A|) \otimes |0_B\rangle\langle 0_B|) \right] \\
= 0 - \log \frac{1}{2} = \log 2.
\]

The result for \(\rho_\epsilon\) cannot be calculated so easily. We find that
\[
\tilde{H}_{\rho_\epsilon}(A|B) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}[|0_B\rangle\langle 0_B| \log\left(|0_B\rangle\langle 0_B|^{1/2} (|\epsilon_B\rangle\langle \epsilon_B| + |0_B\rangle\langle 0_B|^{-1} |0_B\rangle\langle 0_B|^{1/2})\right)] \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}[|\epsilon_B\rangle\langle \epsilon_B| \log\left(|\epsilon_B\rangle\langle \epsilon_B|^{1/2} (|\epsilon_B\rangle\langle \epsilon_B| + |0_B\rangle\langle 0_B|^{-1} |\epsilon_B\rangle\langle \epsilon_B|^{1/2})\right)] \\
= \frac{1}{2} \log \text{tr}[|0_B\rangle\langle 0_B| (|\epsilon_B\rangle\langle \epsilon_B| + |0_B\rangle\langle 0_B|^{-1})] \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \log \text{tr}[|\epsilon_B\rangle\langle \epsilon_B| (|\epsilon_B\rangle\langle \epsilon_B| + |0_B\rangle\langle 0_B|^{-1})],
\]

(33)

where in the first equality we used that \(|0_B\rangle\langle 0_B| |1_B\rangle\langle 1_B| = |1_B\rangle\langle 1_B| |0_B\rangle\langle 0_B| = 0\) and in the second equality that \(|\epsilon_B\rangle\langle \epsilon_B|\) and \(|0_B\rangle\langle 0_B|\) are rank-one projections. We find, using again the matrix representation in Eq. (32), that
\[
(|\epsilon_B\rangle\langle \epsilon_B| + |0_B\rangle\langle 0_B|)^{-1} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\epsilon - 1}{2\sqrt{\epsilon} - \sqrt{1-\epsilon}} \\ \sqrt{\epsilon} \end{pmatrix}.
\]

By forming matrix products and calculating the trace, we can immediately conclude that
\[
\text{tr}[|\epsilon_B\rangle\langle \epsilon_B| (|\epsilon_B\rangle\langle \epsilon_B| + |0_B\rangle\langle 0_B|)^{-1}] = 1, \\
\text{tr}[|0_B\rangle\langle 0_B| (|\epsilon_B\rangle\langle \epsilon_B| + |0_B\rangle\langle 0_B|)^{-1}] = 1.
\]

(33)

If we insert this into Eq. (33), we get \(\tilde{H}_{\rho_\epsilon}(A|B) = 0\).

This previous result shows in particular that we could only expect to be able to prove uniform continuity for the BS-conditional entropy for full-rank states. The presence of the minimal eigenvalue of the states in the continuity bound provided below for the BS-conditional entropy is thus not surprising.
Corollary 6.8 (Uniform continuity of the BS-conditional entropy)
The BS-conditional entropy over the bipartite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ is for $d_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1} > m > 0$
uniformly continuous on $\mathcal{S}_0 = \mathcal{S}_{\geq m}(\mathcal{H})$ and for $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_0$ with $\frac{1}{2}\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$ it holds that
\[
|\tilde{H}_\rho(A|B) - \tilde{H}_\sigma(A|B)| \leq 2l_m^{-1}\varepsilon \log d_A + \frac{l_m + \varepsilon}{l_m}(f_{m^{-1},m^{-1}} + m^{-1}h)\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{l_m + \varepsilon}\right),
\]
with $l_m = 1 - d_{\mathcal{H}}m$.

Proof. We find that $\mathcal{S}_0$ is $s$-perturbed $\Delta$-invariant with $s = md_{\mathcal{H}}$. The justification of this choice
is completely analogous to the reasoning in Lemma 5.13 with $\rho = d_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1}1$, i.e. the maximally mixed state. Furthermore, $f(\cdot) = \tilde{H}(A|B)$ is ALAFF with $a_f = 0$ as $\tilde{H}(A|B)$ is concave, and $b_f = m^{-1}h + f_{m^{-1},m^{-1}}$ since the result in Section 6.1 becomes independent of the states as we go to $\tilde{H}(A|B)$ using point 3 of Proposition 6.5. We further find that
\[
C_f^\delta \leq \sup_{\rho_1,\rho_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} |\tilde{H}_{\rho_1}(A|B) - \tilde{H}_{\rho_2}(A|B)| \leq 2\log d_A,
\]
using Proposition 6.6. This allows us to apply Theorem 4.6 where $E_f^{\max}$ coincides with $E_f$ as of point 4 in Proposition 6.5. This concludes the claim.

Nevertheless, even though a continuity bound for the BS-conditional entropy can only be proven for positive definite states, numerical simulations show us that we could expect a tighter bound on the previous proposition coinciding with that of Corollary 5.5, i.e. without the dependence on the minimal eigenvalues of the states involved. One can find a visualisation of those numeric simulations that underlie the conjecture in Fig. 5. The possibility of obtaining such a tighter bound is left for future work.

6.2.2 Uniform continuity for the BS-mutual information

Let us address now the case of the BS-mutual information. Since the BS-conditional entropy is a particular case of the latter (by assuming that one of the reduced states of $\rho_{AB}$ is maximally mixed), the discontinuity issues presented in the previous subsection are expected to arise in the current one as well. More specifically, the example of discontinuity of the BS-conditional entropy presented in Proposition 6.7 also constitutes an example of discontinuity of the BS-mutual information. Thus, we can only expect to prove uniform continuity for the BS-mutual information for full-rank states.

However, there is a subtle difference between the settings of the BS-conditional entropy and the BS-mutual information. As shown in Proposition 6.6, the former is bounded between the same values as the (usual) conditional entropy, whereas the latter presents some pathological behaviour which is shown in its (tight) upper bound, depending on the minimal eigenvalues of the reduced state, as shown in Eq. (30). For this reason, a continuity bound for the BS-mutual information necessarily will depend on the minimal eigenvalues of the states involved, as in the next result.

Corollary 6.9 (Uniform continuity for the BS-mutual information)
The BS-mutual information on a bipartite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ is for $d_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1} > m > 0$
uniformly continuous on $\mathcal{S}_0 = \mathcal{S}_{\geq m}$ and for $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_0$ with $\frac{1}{2}\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$ we find that
\[
|\tilde{I}_\rho(A : B) - \tilde{I}_\sigma(A : B)| \leq 2l_m^{-1}\varepsilon(\min\{\log d_A, \log d_B\} + \log m^{-1}) + \frac{l_m + \varepsilon}{l_m}z_m\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{l_m + \varepsilon}\right),
\]
with $l_m = 1 - md_{\mathcal{H}}$ and
\[
z_m(p) = 2f_{m^{-1},m^{-1}}(p) + (m^{-1} + 1)h(p).
\]
Figure 5: We investigate the dependence of the remainder term of the BS-conditional entropy on the minimal eigenvalue of the involved states. For the minimal eigenvalues $10^{-4}, 10^{-8}, 10^{-16}, 10^{-32}$ we sampled five hundred pairs of qubits $(\rho, \sigma)$ both of them with controlled eigenvalues. We then sampled for every state pair ten values for $p$, the convex interpolation parameter, and plotted the remainder. As can be seen from the plot, the remainder appears to be independent of the minimal eigenvalue and the shape suggests a binary entropy or Gini impurity as the remainder function. The result shows a similar pattern if the dimension is increased.

**Proof.** As in the case of the BS-conditional entropy, we find that $S_0$ is $s$-perturbed $\Delta$-invariant with $s = \text{md}_H$. To conclude that $I(A : B)$ is ALAFF we first note that because of the convexity of $\hat{D}(\cdot)$

$$\hat{I}_{pp_1 + (1-p)p_2}(A : B) \leq p\hat{D}(\rho_1||\rho_{1,A} \otimes (pp_{1,B} + (1-p)\rho_{2,B})) + (1-p)\hat{D}(\rho_2||\rho_{2,A} \otimes (pp_{1,B} + (1-p)\rho_{2,B})) \leq p\hat{I}_{\rho_1}(A : B) + (1-p)\hat{I}_{\rho_2}(A : B) + h(p).$$

In the last step we used again that $\hat{D}(\cdot)$ is monotone decreasing in its second argument, and $pp_{1,B} \leq pp_{1,B} + (1-p)\rho_{2,B}$, $(1-p)\rho_{2,B} \leq pp_{1,B} + (1-p)\rho_{2,B}$, respectively. Hence $a_f = h$. We follow similar lines to obtain $b_f$. Starting with Theorem 6.3 and point 2 in Proposition 6.5 using that $\|\hat{\rho}_A^{-1}\|_\infty \leq \|\rho_{AB}^{-1}\|_\infty$, and analogously for $\rho_B$, we find

$$\hat{I}_{pp_1 + (1-p)p_2}(A : B) \geq p\hat{D}(\rho_1||\rho_{1,A} \otimes (pp_{1,B} + (1-p)\rho_{2,B})) + (1-p)\hat{D}(\rho_2||\rho_{2,A} \otimes (pp_{1,B} + (1-p)\rho_{2,B})) - m^{-1}h(p) - 2f_{m^{-1},m^{-1}}(p) \geq \hat{I}_{\rho_1}(A : B) + \hat{I}_{\rho_2}(A : B) - m^{-1}h(p) - 2f_{m^{-1},m^{-1}}(p).$$

In the last step we used again that $\hat{D}(\cdot)$ is monotone decreasing in its second argument and that $pp_{1,A} + (1-p)\rho_{2,A} \leq (p + (1-p)m^{-1})\rho_{1,A}$ and $pp_{1,A} + (1-p)\rho_{2,A} \leq (m^{-1}p + (1-p))\rho_{2,A}$, giving us another $f_{m^{-1},m^{-1}}(p)$. Hence $b_f = m^{-1}h + 2f_{m^{-1},m^{-1}}$. We conclude the proof by noticing again that $\|\hat{\rho}_A^{-1}\|_\infty \leq \|\rho_{AB}^{-1}\|_\infty \leq m^{-1}$, yielding the upper bound

$$C^s_f \leq \sup_{\rho \in S_0} \hat{I}_\rho(A : B) \leq \min\{\log d_A, \log d_B\} + \log m^{-1}.$$
Finally we apply Theorem 4.6 and get the claimed bounds as $E_f$ coincides with $E_f^\text{max}$, due to point 4 in Proposition 6.5.

We can again further simplify the continuity bound from the previous result, as we did in Remark 5.12 and Remark 5.15.

**Remark 6.10** To simplify the continuity bound from Corollary 6.9, let us upper bound each of the terms involved in $z_m$. Firstly, for the $f$ term, we have

$$2 \frac{l_m + \varepsilon}{l_m^{m-1}} f_{m^{-1},m^{-1}}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{l_m + \varepsilon}\right) \leq \frac{4 \log^2 m^{-1}}{l_m} \sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$  

Then, we can bound the binary entropy term similarly, as the following holds for any $a \in (0, 1]$:

$$(a + x) h\left(\frac{x}{a + x}\right) \leq \sqrt{2x},$$

since an inspection of the derivative shows that the function is non-decreasing in $a$. Then, we obtain:

$$\left(\frac{m^{-1} + 1}{l_m}\right)^{\frac{\varepsilon}{l_m + \varepsilon}} \leq \frac{m^{-1} + 1}{l_m} \sqrt{2\varepsilon}.$$  

Therefore, combining these inequalities with the fact that $\varepsilon \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ for $\varepsilon \leq 1$, and replacing $l_m = 1 - md_H$, we have

$$|\hat{I}_\rho(A : B) - \hat{I}_\sigma(A : B)| \leq \frac{2 \min\{\log d_A, \log d_B\} + 6 \log^2 m^{-1} + \sqrt{2(m^{-1} + 1)}}{1 - md_H} \sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$  

### 6.2.3 Uniform continuity for the BS-conditional mutual information

Next, we provide a result of uniform continuity for the BS-conditional mutual information, as defined in Eq. (4). This constitutes the analogue of its relative entropy counterpart, presented in Corollary 5.7. Since the BS-conditional mutual information considered in this manuscript is defined as the difference between two BS-conditional entropies, a continuity bound for the former can be directly obtained from a continuity bound for the latter. Moreover, it will not present the pathological behaviour from the BS-mutual information, as the BS-conditional entropies are bounded between the same limits as the (usual) conditional entropies. See Proposition 6.6 for the specific bounds on all these BS-entropic quantities.

Nevertheless, the continuity bound we obtain below for the BS-conditional mutual information also depends on the minimal eigenvalues of the states involved, as happened in the case of the BS-conditional entropies. Again, we believe that our bound should be improvable, although there is no uniform continuity for positive semi-definite states, as the BS-conditional entropy exhibits discontinuities in the presence of zero eigenvalues (Proposition 6.7).

**Corollary 6.11 (Uniform continuity of the BS-conditional mutual information)**

The BS-conditional mutual information over $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C$ is for $d_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1} > m > 0$ uniformly continuous on $S_0 = S_{\geq m}(\mathcal{H})$ and for $\rho, \sigma \in S_0$ with $\frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$ we find that

$$|\hat{I}_\rho(A : B|C) - \hat{I}_\sigma(A : B|C)| \leq 2 \varepsilon l_m^{-1} \min\{\log d_A, \log d_B\} + 2 g_m(\varepsilon),$$

with $l_m = 1 - md_H$ and

$$g_m(\varepsilon) = \frac{l_m + \varepsilon}{l_m} (f_{m^{-1},m^{-1}} + m^{-1} h)\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{l_m + \varepsilon}\right).$$
Proof. We have that $\mathcal{S}_0$ is $s$-perturbed $\Delta$-invariant using the same reasoning as in the proof of Corollary 6.8. Because of the representation $\tilde{I}(A : B|C) = \tilde{H}(A|C) - \tilde{H}(A|BC)$ we can immediately conclude that $\tilde{I}(A : B|C)$ is ALAFF with $a_f = f_{m^{-1},m^{-1}} + m^{-1}h$ and $b_f = f_{m^{-1},m^{-1}} + m^{-1}h$ arguing along the same lines as in Corollary 6.8. Using Proposition 6.6 we can conclude
\begin{align*}
C_f \leq \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} \tilde{I}_\rho(A : B|C) \leq 2 \min \{ \log d_A, \log \sqrt{d_{ABC}} \}.
\end{align*}
Applying Theorem 4.6 and using point 4 of Proposition 6.5 we get that $E_f = E_f^\max$ and thereby conclude the claim.

Similarly to Remark 6.10, we can write the previous continuity bound in a simpler form as we do below.

Remark 6.12 We can further simplify the continuity bound from Corollary 6.11 by bounding the $g_m$ term as in the case of Corollary 6.9. Firstly, for the $f$ term, we have
\begin{align*}
2 \frac{l_m + \varepsilon}{l_m} f_{m^{-1},m^{-1}} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{l_m + \varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{4 \log^2 m^{-1}}{l_m} \sqrt{\varepsilon}.
\end{align*}
Then, we can bound the binary entropy term similarly:
\begin{align*}
2m^{-1} \frac{l_m + \varepsilon}{l_m} h \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{l_m + \varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{2m^{-1}}{l_m} \sqrt{2\varepsilon}.
\end{align*}
Combining these inequalities with the fact that $\varepsilon \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ for $\varepsilon \leq 1$, and replacing $l_m = 1 - md_\mathcal{H}$, we have
\begin{align*}
|\tilde{I}_\rho(A : B|C) - \tilde{I}_\sigma(A : B|C)| \leq \frac{2 \min \{ \log d_A, \log \sqrt{d_{ABC}} \} + 4 \log^2 m^{-1} + 2\sqrt{2} m^{-1}}{1 - md_\mathcal{H}} \sqrt{\varepsilon}.
\end{align*}

6.2.4 Divergence bound for the BS-entropy

Finally, we conclude this section by following the same lines as in the case of the relative entropy to provide a divergence bound for the BS-entropy. We will first prove the uniform continuity of the BS-entropy in the first argument and subsequently derive from that result the divergence bound. These results should be compared to their relative entropy analogues, namely Corollary 5.8 and Corollary 5.9, respectively.

Corollary 6.13 (Uniform continuity of the BS-entropy in the first argument)
Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_+(\mathcal{H})$ be fixed. Then $\hat{D}(\cdot||\sigma)$ is uniformly continuous on $\mathcal{S}_0 = \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, and for $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{S}_0$ with $\frac{1}{2} \| \rho_1 - \rho_2 \| \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$ we find that
\begin{align*}
|\hat{D}(\rho_1||\sigma) - \hat{D}(\rho_2||\sigma)| \leq \varepsilon \log (m_\sigma^{-1}) + \left( 1 + \varepsilon \right) m_\sigma^{-1} h \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \right),
\end{align*}
with $m_\sigma$ the minimal eigenvalue of $\sigma$.

Proof. The procedure is familiar. First, $\mathcal{S}_0$ is 0-perturbed $\Delta$-invariant. Second $f(\cdot) = \hat{D}(\cdot||\sigma)$ is ALAFF with $a_f = m_\sigma^{-1} h$ and $b_f = 0$ using Theorem 6.3 and point 1 of Proposition 6.5. Further
\begin{align*}
C_f \leq \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} \hat{D}(\rho||\sigma) \leq \log m_\sigma^{-1}
\end{align*}
since $\rho^{1/2} m_\sigma^{-1} \rho^{1/2} \leq \mathbb{1} m_\sigma^{-1}$. Applying now Eq. (13) gives the claimed result. □
Using the above we can now conclude a result on the divergence bound, which constitutes the analogue for the BS-entropy to Corollary 5.9 for the relative entropy. Note that even the divergence bounds obtained in both cases are very similar, except for the presence of a factor $m_{\sigma}^{-1}$ in the second term of the continuity bound for the BS-entropy case.

**Corollary 6.14 (Divergence bound for the BS-entropy)**

Let $\rho \in S(H)$ and $\sigma \in S_+(H)$, then for $\frac{1}{2}\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$, we have

$$\widehat{D}(\rho\|\sigma) \leq \varepsilon \log m_{\sigma}^{-1} + (1 + \varepsilon)m_{\sigma}^{-1}h\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}\right),$$

with $m_{\sigma}$ the minimal eigenvalue of $\sigma$.

**Proof.** In the context of Corollary 6.13, we just set $\rho_1 = \rho$ and $\rho_2 = \sigma$, giving us that $\frac{1}{2}\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$. Further $\widehat{D}(\rho_2\|\sigma) = \widehat{D}(\sigma\|\sigma) = 0$ and $|\widehat{D}(\rho_1\|\sigma)|$ loses the absolute value, as $\widehat{D}(\cdot\|\cdot) \geq 0$. The bound follows immediately. \qed

With this, we conclude our section on continuity bounds for entropic quantities derived from the BS-entropy. We have deliberately omitted the analogues of Corollary 5.11 and Theorem 5.14 for the BS-entropy, due to their high technicality and the complexity of the continuity bounds that we would obtain with our method. However, the same procedure as for the relative entropy would follow and analogous continuity bounds could be provided also in this setting.

## 7 Applications

In this section, we use some of the continuity bounds from the previous sections to provide applications in various contexts within the field of quantum information.

### 7.1 Quantum hypothesis testing

In this section, we interpret our bounds in terms of hypothesis testing. Quantum state discrimination and quantum hypothesis testing are both well-studied tasks in quantum information theory.

In quantum state discrimination, you are given a source which prepares quantum states $\rho_1$ and $\rho_2$ with equal probability. The task is to perform a measurement in order to identify whether the state prepared by the source is $\rho_1$ or $\rho_2$. In this setting, the optimal probability of successfully identifying the state is given in terms of the trace distance as

$$p_{\text{succ}} = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2}\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1 \right)$$

using the Helstrom measurement (see textbooks such as [58]).

In quantum hypothesis testing, we consider an asymmetric setting with $n$ copies and where we are interested in the asymptotic performance. Again, the task is to discriminate between $\rho$ and $\sigma$, using a measurement $\{E, \mathbb{I} - E\}$ where $0 \leq E \leq 1$. Upon the first outcome, the guess is $\rho$, and upon the second $\sigma$. Therefore, we define the errors of the first and second kind as

$$\alpha(E)_n = \text{Tr}[\rho^\otimes n(\mathbb{I} - E)]$$

and

$$\beta(E)_n = \text{Tr}[\sigma^\otimes nE]$$
We now want to fix the error of the first kind to be at most $\varepsilon$ and define

$$\beta_\varepsilon(\rho^\otimes n||\sigma^\otimes n) := \min\{\beta(E)_n : \alpha(E)_n \leq \varepsilon\},$$

where the minimum runs over $0 \leq E \leq 1$. Then, the quantum Stein’s lemma [42, 61] states that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log[\beta_\varepsilon(\rho^\otimes n||\sigma^\otimes n)] = -D(\rho||\sigma).$$

Therefore, we can interpret the continuity bound in the way that two states that are hard to discriminate have almost the same performance in terms of hypothesis testing. We can illustrate this with Corollary 5.8, just by taking $1 + \varepsilon$ there to be $2p_{\text{succ}}$ following Eq. (34).

**Corollary 7.1** Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ be fixed, $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and let us consider a source which produces $\rho_1, \rho_2$ with equal probability. Moreover, let $p$ be an upper bound on the probability $p_{\text{succ}}$ of successfully identifying the state. Then, the difference in the asymptotic error exponent in hypothesis testing is bounded by

$$\left| \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log[\beta_\varepsilon(\rho^{1,\otimes n}||\sigma^{\otimes n})] - \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log[\beta_\varepsilon(\rho^{2,\otimes n}||\sigma^{\otimes n})] \right| \leq (2p - 1) \log \bar{m}^{-1} + 2p h\left(\frac{2p - 1}{2p}\right),$$

with $\bar{m}^{-1}$ the minimal non-zero eigenvalue of $\sigma$.

### 7.2 Free energy

In Section 7.1, we already saw one interpretation of our results in terms of hypothesis testing. This section gives another interpretation using the language of quantum thermodynamics.

A ubiquitous quantity in quantum thermodynamics is free energy. To define it, we need to fix a Hamiltonian $H \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, $H = H^*$, and some inverse temperature $\beta > 0$. The Gibbs state of this system, describing a quantum system in thermal equilibrium, is

$$\rho_\beta(H) = \frac{e^{-\beta H}}{\text{tr}[e^{-\beta H}]},$$

Now, we can define the free energy as

$$F(\rho) = \text{tr}[H\rho] - \beta^{-1}S(\rho).$$

It can be related to the relative entropy as

$$D(\rho||\rho_\beta(H)) = \beta(F(\rho) - F(\rho_\beta(H))),$$

which can easily be verified by direct computation.

Inspired by quantum information theory, in particular entanglement theory, during the last years various descriptions of quantum thermodynamics as a resource theory have emerged. Resource theories are described in terms of free states and free operations. In quantum thermodynamics, the free state is $\rho_\beta(H)$, whereas the choices of free operations can differ. Possible choices include the thermal operations (TO), their closure (CTO), and the Gibbs preserving covariant operations (GPC). Instead of giving a formal definition here, we refer the reader to [34, Section II.C]. In entanglement theory, we are interested in the distillation of EPR pairs from other states, possibly taking many copies. In the same spirit, in quantum thermodynamics, the corresponding task is the distillation of athermality. The asymptotic distillable athermality is quantified by the free energy
Corollary 5.5, we get the following bound for any state \( \rho \):

\[
\text{Distill}_\mathcal{F}(\rho, \rho_\beta(H)) = D(\rho \| \rho_\beta(H)),
\]

where \( \mathcal{F} \in \{\text{TO, CTO, GPC}\} \). Again, we refer the reader to [34] for the formal definitions. Thus, we can interpret Corollary 5.8 as quantifying the continuity of distillable athermality.

**Corollary 7.2** Let \( H \) be a fixed Hamiltonian with maximal eigenvalue \( \lambda_{\text{max}} \), minimal eigenvalue \( \lambda_{\text{min}} \), and \( \beta > 0 \) an inverse temperature. Then, for \( \rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \) such that \( \frac{1}{2} \| \rho_1 - \rho_2 \|_1 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1 \), it holds that

\[
|\text{Distill}_\mathcal{F}(\rho_1, \rho_\beta(H)) - \text{Distill}_\mathcal{F}(\rho_2, \rho_\beta(H))| \leq \varepsilon \left( \beta \lambda_{\text{max}} + \log \left( \text{tr} \left[ e^{-\beta H} \right] \right) \right) + (1 + \varepsilon) h \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \right),
\]

where \( \mathcal{F} \in \{\text{TO, CTO, GPC}\} \).

### 7.3 Approximate Quantum Markov Chains

In this section, we consider a tripartite Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}_{ABC} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C \) and \( \rho_{ABC} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{ABC}) \) a positive state on it. We further consider the conditional mutual information of \( \rho_{ABC} \) between \( A \) and \( C \) conditioned to \( B \). The well-known property of strong subadditivity of the von Neumann entropy [50] is equivalent to the non-negativity of the conditional mutual information, which is furthermore known [60, 39] to vanish if, and only if,

\[
\rho_{ABC} = \rho_{AB}^{1/2} \rho_B^{-1/2} \rho_{BC} \rho_B \rho_{AB}^{1/2},
\]

i.e., whenever \( \rho_{ABC} \) is a quantum Markov chain. In particular, if we denote \( \mathcal{P}_{B \rightarrow AB}(\rho_{BC}) = \rho_{AB}^{1/2} \rho_B^{-1/2} \rho_{BC} \rho_B \rho_{AB}^{1/2} \), we have

\[
I_{\mathcal{P}_{B \rightarrow AB}(\rho_{BC})}(A : C|B) = 0.
\]

Moreover, by the decomposition of the CMI of \( \rho_{ABC} \) in terms of a difference of conditional entropies, as well as the data processing inequality, we have

\[
I_\rho(A : C|B) = H_\rho(C|B) - H_\rho(C|AB) \leq H_{\mathcal{P}_{B \rightarrow AB}(\rho_{BC})}(C|AB) - H_\rho(C|AB).
\]

Therefore, we can apply our continuity bound for the CMI from Corollary 5.5 (which provides in this case a tighter result than Corollary 5.7) to obtain an upper bound on the CMI of \( \rho_{ABC} \) in terms of how far it is from being recovered with the Petz recovery map, i.e., in terms of

\[
\left\| \rho_{ABC} - \rho_{AB}^{1/2} \rho_B^{-1/2} \rho_{BC} \rho_B \rho_{AB}^{1/2} \right\|_1.
\]

A similar direction was previously explored in [75, Eq. (26)]. Note that, as a direct consequence of Corollary 5.5, we get the following bound for any state \( \rho_{ABC} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{ABC}) \):

\[
I_\rho(A : C|B) \leq 2\varepsilon \min \{ \log d_A, \log d_C \} + (1 + \varepsilon) h \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \right),
\]

with

\[
\varepsilon := \frac{1}{2} \left\| \rho_{ABC} - \rho_{AB}^{1/2} \rho_B^{-1/2} \rho_{BC} \rho_B \rho_{AB}^{1/2} \right\|_1.
\]
Moreover, we can use the following inequality

$$(1 + x)h \left( \frac{x}{1 + x} \right) \leq \sqrt{2x},$$

for every $x \in [0, 1]$, as well as the fact that, since $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$, then $\varepsilon \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$, to upper bound the CMI of $\rho_{ABC}$ by

$$I_\rho(A : C|B) \leq \left( \sqrt{2} \min \{\log d_A, \log d_C\} + 1 \right) \left\| \rho_{ABC} - \rho_{AB}^{1/2} \rho_B^{-1/2} \rho_{BC} \rho_B^{-1/2} \rho_{AB}^{1/2} \right\|_1^{1/2}. \quad (36)$$

This bound should be compared to lower bounds for the conditional mutual information. On the one hand, Fawzi and Renner proved in [32] the following lower bound for such a quantity in terms of the fidelity $F(\rho, \sigma) = \|\sqrt{\rho} \sqrt{\sigma}\|_1^2$:

$$I_\rho(A : C|B) \geq -\log F(\rho_{ABC}, \mathcal{R}_{B\rightarrow AB}(\rho_{BC})), $$

where $\mathcal{R}_{B\rightarrow AB}$ is another recovery map, the so-called rotated Petz recovery map, which was explicitly constructed in [43]. Several results have been provided in this line in the past decade. Here we specifically focus on [27], in which Carlen and Vershynina proved:

$$I_\rho(A : C|B) \geq \left( \frac{\pi}{8} \right)^4 \left\| \rho_B^{-1/2} \rho_{ABC}^{-1/2} - \rho_{ABC} - \rho_{AB}^{1/2} \rho_B^{-1/2} \rho_{BC} \rho_B^{-1/2} \rho_{AB}^{1/2} \right\|_1^4, \quad (37)$$

Therefore, by combining Eq. (36) with Eq. (37) we obtain the following “sandwich” for the conditional mutual information of a tripartite density matrix $\rho_{ABC}$ in terms of its trace distance to its Petz recovery map:

$$\left( \frac{\pi}{8} \right)^4 \left\| \rho_B^{-1/2} \rho_{ABC}^{-1/2} - \rho_{ABC} - \rho_{AB}^{1/2} \rho_B^{-1/2} \rho_{BC} \rho_B^{-1/2} \rho_{AB}^{1/2} \right\|_1^4 \leq I_\rho(A : C|B) \leq 2 \left( \min \{\log d_A, \log d_C\} + 1 \right) \left\| \rho_{ABC} - \rho_{AB}^{1/2} \rho_B^{-1/2} \rho_{BC} \rho_B^{-1/2} \rho_{AB}^{1/2} \right\|_1^{1/2}. $$

In particular, this implies that a state $\rho_{ABC} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C)$ is an approximate quantum Markov chain [73] (i.e. $I_\rho(A : C|B) < \varepsilon$) if, and only if, it is close to its reconstructed state under the Petz recovery map. This idea was used in [45] to prove that a Gibbs state of a one-dimensional local Hamiltonian is an approximate quantum Markov chain, and subsequently, in [38] to provide an estimate on the time it takes for a Markovian evolution of a density matrix to become an approximate quantum Markov chain. Moreover, a similar inequality has recently been employed in [76] to study the decay of the CMI for purely generated finitely correlated states.

### 7.4 Difference between relative entropy and BS-entropy

It is well-known that the BS-entropy is an upper bound on the Umegaki relative entropy [40, 53, 59], i.e., that

$$D(\rho || \sigma) \leq \hat{D}(\rho || \sigma),$$

and they coincide if and only if $\rho$ and $\sigma$ commute (see, e.g., [40, Proposition 4.7]). In this section, our aim is to quantify how large the difference between the two divergences can become. We start with two upper bounds on $\hat{D}(\rho || \sigma)$ in terms of $D(\rho || \sigma)$. 

---
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Proposition 7.3  Consider two positive definite states $\rho, \sigma \in S_+(\mathcal{H})$. Then, the following inequality holds:

$$\hat{D}(\rho\|\sigma) \leq D(\rho\|\sigma) + m^{-1}\|\rho - \sigma\|_\infty,$$

where $m$ is the minimal eigenvalue of $\sigma$.

Proof. We can upper bound the difference between the entropies by

$$\hat{D}(\rho\|\sigma) - D(\rho\|\sigma) = \text{tr}\left[\rho\left(\log\left(\rho^{1/2}\sigma^{-1/2}\rho^{1/2}\right) - \log\rho + \log\sigma\right)\right]$$

$$= -D\left(\rho\left|\exp\left\{\log\sigma + \log\left(\rho^{1/2}\sigma^{-1/2}\rho^{1/2}\right)\right\}\right|\right)$$

$$\leq \log\text{tr}\left[\exp\left\{\log\sigma + \log\left(\rho^{1/2}\sigma^{-1/2}\rho^{1/2}\right)\right\}\right]$$

$$\leq \log\text{tr}\left[\sigma\rho^{1/2}\sigma^{-1/2}\rho^{1/2}\right],$$

where we have used the non-negativity for the relative entropy of density matrices and Golden-Thompson inequality [33, 78]. Next, we can write

$$\text{tr}\left[\sigma\rho^{1/2}\sigma^{-1/2}\rho^{1/2}\right] = \text{tr}\left[\sigma\rho^{1/2}(\sigma^{-1} - \rho^{-1})\rho^{1/2}\right] + 1.$$ 

Therefore, using $\log(x + 1) \leq x$, we have

$$\hat{D}(\rho\|\sigma) - D(\rho\|\sigma) \leq \text{tr}\left[\sigma\rho^{1/2}(\sigma^{-1} - \rho^{-1})\rho^{1/2}\right].$$

Now, we can use the following expression for invertible matrices $X$ and $Y$:

$$X^{-1} - Y^{-1} = Y^{-1}(Y - X)X^{-1}$$

Then,

$$\text{tr}\left[\sigma\rho^{1/2}(\sigma^{-1} - \rho^{-1})\rho^{1/2}\right] = \text{tr}\left[\sigma\rho^{1/2}(\rho - \sigma)\sigma^{-1}\rho^{1/2}\right]$$

$$\leq \|\rho^{-1/2}(\rho - \sigma)\sigma^{-1}\rho^{1/2}\|_\infty$$

$$\leq \|\sigma^{-1}\|_\infty\|\rho - \sigma\|_\infty,$$

by [16, Proposition IX.1.1] and Hölder’s inequality.

The previous proposition provides a general upper bound for the distance between both entropies in terms of the spectral norm and the minimal eigenvalue of the second input. This is valid for any pair of states but does not yield any further information on specific pairs with better conditions. Alternatively, we can prove the following bound, from which it is obvious that $D(\rho\|\sigma) = \hat{D}(\rho\|\sigma)$ if $\rho$ and $\sigma$ commute.

Proposition 7.4  Consider two positive definite states $\rho, \sigma \in S_+(\mathcal{H})$. Then, the following inequality holds:

$$\hat{D}(\rho\|\sigma) \leq D(\rho\|\sigma) + f([\rho^{1/2}, \sigma^{-1/2}])$$

where the last term is given by

$$f([\rho^{1/2}, \sigma^{-1/2}]) := \left\|\left[\rho^{1/2}, \sigma^{-1/2}\right]\right\|^2 + 2\left\|\left[\rho^{1/2}, \sigma^{-1/2}\right]\right\|_\infty.$$

In particular, whenever $\rho$ and $\sigma$ commute, $f$ vanishes.
Proof. The proof proceeds in the same way as for Proposition 7.3 until
\[ \hat{D}(\rho\|\sigma) - D(\rho\|\sigma) \leq \text{tr} \left[ \sigma \rho^{1/2}(\sigma^{-1} - \rho^{-1})\rho^{1/2} \right]. \]

Let us define now
\[ \eta := \sigma^{1/2} \rho^{1/2} \sigma^{-1/2} \rho^{-1/2} \eta^{1/2}. \]
Then,
\[ \text{tr} \left[ \sigma \rho^{1/2}(\sigma^{-1} - \rho^{-1})\rho^{1/2} \right] = \text{tr}[\eta - \sigma]. \]
Introducing \( \rho \) gives
\[ \text{tr}[\eta - \rho] = \text{tr}[\eta - \rho + \rho - \rho] = \text{tr}[\eta - \rho] + \text{tr}[\rho - \sigma] = \text{tr}[\eta - \rho] \leq \|\eta - \rho\|_1. \]
Moreover, as appears in [19, Remark 2.2], the first term on the right-hand side above can be estimated by
\[ \|\eta - \rho\|_1 \leq \left\| \left[ \rho^{1/2}, \sigma^{-1/2} \right] \right\|^2 + 2 \left\| \left[ \rho^{1/2}, \sigma^{-1/2} \right] \right\|_\infty. \]
This concludes the proof of the proposition.

Finally, we want to compare our previous bounds, proven using some inequalities such as Golden-Thompson or Hölder, with those we could obtain by means of our continuity bounds, as the BS-entropy can in particular be regarded as a relative entropy. For that, we can also apply the continuity bound we derived in Theorem 5.14.

**Corollary 7.5** Let \( \rho \in S(\mathcal{H}) \), \( \sigma \in S_+(\mathcal{H}) \) and \( \tilde{m} \) such that \( d^{-1} > 2\tilde{m} > 0 \) and the minimal eigenvalue of \( \sigma \) is lower bounded by \( 2\tilde{m} \). Let
\[ \sigma^{-1/2} \rho \sigma^{-1/2} = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i P_i \]
be the spectral decomposition with eigenvalues \( \lambda_i \) and projections \( P_i \). Define density matrices
\[ p = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \text{tr}[^{\sigma}P_i] \frac{P_i}{\text{tr}[P_i]}, \quad q = \sum_{i=1}^k \text{tr}[\sigma P_i] \frac{P_i}{\text{tr}[P_i]}. \]
Then, for \( \frac{1}{2}\|\rho - p\| \leq \varepsilon \leq 1 \) and \( \frac{1}{2}\|\sigma - q\|_1 \leq \delta \leq 1 \), it holds that
\[ |\hat{D}(\rho\|\sigma) - D(\rho\|\sigma)| \leq \left( \varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{l_{\tilde{m}}} \right) \log(\tilde{m}^{-1}) + (1 + \varepsilon) h\left( \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \right) + 2 \frac{l_{\tilde{m}} + \delta}{l_{\tilde{m}}} f_{\tilde{m}^{-1}, \tilde{m}^{-1}} \left( \frac{\delta}{l_{\tilde{m}} + \delta} \right), \quad (38) \]
with \( l_{\tilde{m}} = 1 - \tilde{m} \). In particular, if \( [\rho, \sigma] = 0 \), \( \varepsilon \) and \( \delta \) can be taken as 0 such that the RHS of Eq. (38) is zero.
Moreover, we can further simplify the previous bound to
\[ |\hat{D}(\rho\|\sigma) - D(\rho\|\sigma)| \leq (\sqrt{2} + \log \tilde{m}) \sqrt{\varepsilon} + \frac{5 \log 2 \tilde{m}}{1 - \tilde{m}} \sqrt{\delta}. \quad (39) \]
Proof. Our argument is a slight variation of Matsumoto’s minimal reverse test [53] (see also [40]). We can write the BS-entropy as the relative entropy of two commuting density matrices
\[ \hat{D}(\rho||\sigma) = D(p||q), \]
since we can verify with
\[ p_i = \lambda_i \text{tr}[\sigma P_i], \quad q_i = \text{tr}[\sigma P_i] \]
that
\[ D(p||q) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \text{tr} \left[ \frac{P_i}{\text{tr}[P_i]} \left( \log \frac{p_i}{\text{tr}[P_i]} - \log \frac{q_i}{\text{tr}[P_i]} \right) \right] \]
\[ = \sum_{i=1}^{k} p_i (\log p_i - \log q_i) \]
\[ = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i \text{tr}[\sigma P_i] \log \lambda_i \]
\[ = \text{tr} \left[ \sigma \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \log \left( \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right] \]
\[ = \text{tr} \left[ \rho \log \left( \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma^{-1} \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right]. \]
Obviously, if \( m \) is the minimal eigenvalue of \( \sigma \), then \( q_i \geq m \) for all \( i \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \). Thus, the assertion follows from Theorem 5.14. Moreover, it is clear that if \([\rho, \sigma] = 0\) there is a unitary \( U \) which diagonalizes \( \rho \) and \( \sigma \) simultaneously such that \( \rho = p \) and \( \sigma = q \).

Finally, the last simplification from Eq. (39) is a direct consequence of Remark 5.15 and, more specifically, Eq. (24).

### 7.5 Weak quasi-factorization of the relative entropy

Results of quasi-factorization for a divergence allow us to split such a divergence in a bipartite space in terms of the sum of two “conditional” divergences on subsystems and a multiplicative error term that is related to the correlations between both subsystems on the second input of the divergences. A weak version of such a result presents instead an additive error term.

More specifically, it was proven in [23] that, given a bipartite space \( \mathcal{H}_{AB} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \) and \( \rho_{AB}, \sigma_{AB} \in S(\mathcal{H}_{AB}) \), the following inequality holds:
\[ D(\rho_{AB}||\sigma_{AB}) \leq \frac{1}{1 - 2\|h(\sigma_{AB})\|_{\infty}} [D_A(\rho_{AB}||\sigma_{AB}) + D_B(\rho_{AB}||\sigma_{AB})], \tag{40} \]
with
\[ h(\sigma_{AB}) := \sigma_A^{-1/2} \otimes \sigma_B^{-1/2} \sigma_{AB} \sigma_A^{-1/2} \otimes \sigma_B^{-1/2} - \mathbb{1}_{AB}, \]
and
\[ D_X(\rho_{AB}||\sigma_{AB}) := D(\rho_{AB}||\sigma_{AB}) - D(\rho_X||\sigma_X), \quad \text{for } X = A, B, \]
whenever \( \|h(\sigma_{AB})\|_{\infty} < 1/2 \). Note that the term \( \|h(\sigma_{AB})\|_{\infty} \) provides a measure of how far \( \sigma_{AB} \) is from being a tensor product between \( A \) and \( B \). This result, and subsequent extensions with additional conditions on \( \sigma_{AB} \), are expected to find applications on various tasks in quantum information theory, and in particular, have proven to be essential for some recent proofs of positivity of modified logarithmic Sobolev inequalities (MLSIs) for quantum Markov semigroups modelling thermal dissipative evolutions on quantum spin systems [10, 11, 12, 24]. It is important to remark that Eq. (40) is equivalent to a generalization of the property of superadditivity of the relative entropy, as shown in [22].
In [19], some authors of the current manuscript tried to extend the previous result for the Umegaki relative entropy to the BS-entropy framework. However, we showed that the BS-entropy cannot satisfy a property of superadditivity, which makes it impossible to obtain a quasi-factorization for the BS-entropy in the spirit of Eq. (40) without an additive error term. Indeed, we proved that the following inequality (a weak quasi-factorization) holds:

$$\hat{D}(\rho_{AB}\|\sigma_{AB}) \leq \frac{1}{1 - 2\|h(\sigma_{AB})\|_\infty} \left[\hat{D}_A(\rho_{AB}\|\sigma_{AB}) + \hat{D}_B(\rho_{AB}\|\sigma_{AB})\right] + \xi(\rho_{AB}, \sigma_{AB}),$$

with

$$\xi(\rho_{AB}, \sigma_{AB}) := \frac{1 + 2\|h(\sigma_{AB})\|_\infty}{1 - 2\|h(\sigma_{AB})\|_\infty} \left(\|\eta_A - \rho_A\|_1\|\eta_B - \rho_B\|_1 + \|\eta_A - \rho_A\|_1 + \|\eta_B - \rho_B\|_1\right),$$

for

$$\eta_A := \sigma_A^{1/2} \rho_A^{1/2} \sigma_A^{-1/2} \rho_A^{1/2} \sigma_A^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_B := \sigma_B^{1/2} \rho_B^{1/2} \sigma_B^{-1/2} \rho_B^{1/2} \sigma_B^{1/2}.$$ 

Note that, in particular, the additive error term can be bounded by

$$\xi(\rho_{AB}, \sigma_{AB}) \leq f \left(\left[\rho_A^{1/2}, \sigma_A^{-1/2}\right], \left[\rho_B^{1/2}, \sigma_B^{-1/2}\right]\right),$$

with $f$ given by some products of the operator norms of the commutators involved. Therefore, if the marginals of $\rho_{AB}$ and $\sigma_{AB}$ commute, we recover Eq. (40) from Eq. (41).

Here, we can prove another result along the lines of Eq. (40) and Eq. (41) as a consequence of our continuity bound for the relative entropy. Indeed, as a consequence of Theorem 5.14, we obtain the following result of quasi-factorization for the relative entropy with an additive error term.

**Corollary 7.6 (Weak quasi-factorization for the relative entropy)**

*Given $\rho_{AB}, \sigma_{AB} \in S(H_A \otimes H_B)$ such that $\ker(\sigma_X) \subset \ker(\rho_X)$ for $X = A, B, AB$, we have:

$$D(\rho_{AB}\|\sigma_{AB}) \leq D_A(\rho_{AB}\|\sigma_{AB}) + D_B(\rho_{AB}\|\sigma_{AB}) + \xi_{RE}(\rho_{AB}, \sigma_{AB}),$$

with

$$\xi_{RE}(\rho_{AB}, \sigma_{AB}) := \left(\frac{\log \tilde{m}^{-1}}{\sqrt{2}} + 1\right) \|\rho_{AB} - \rho_A \otimes \rho_B\|_1^{1/2} + \frac{5\log^2 \tilde{m}^{-1}}{\sqrt{2}(1 - \tilde{m})} \|\sigma_{AB} - \sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B\|_1^{1/2},$$

where $\tilde{m} = \frac{1}{2} \max\left\{\|\sigma_A^{-1} \otimes \sigma_B^{-1}\|_\infty^{-1}, \|\sigma_A^{-1}\|_\infty^{-1}\right\}$.***

**Proof.** The difference between the relative and the two conditional entropies can be written as

$$D(\rho_{AB}\|\sigma_{AB}) - D_A(\rho_{AB}\|\sigma_{AB}) - D_B(\rho_{AB}\|\sigma_{AB}) = -D(\rho_{A}\|\sigma_{A}) + D(\rho_{A} \otimes \rho_{B}\|\sigma_{A} \otimes \sigma_{B}).$$

Therefore, we can apply Theorem 5.14 to obtain a continuity bound for the difference between the last two relative entropies, obtaining

$$|D(\rho_{AB}\|\sigma_{AB}) - D(\rho_{A} \otimes \rho_{B}\|\sigma_{A} \otimes \sigma_{B})| \leq \left(\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{l_m}\right) \log(\tilde{m}^{-1}) + (1 + \varepsilon) h\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon}\right) + 2\tilde{m} + \frac{\delta}{l_m} f_{\tilde{m}^{-1}, \tilde{m}^{-1}}\left(\frac{\delta}{l_m + \delta}\right),$$

with

$$\varepsilon := \frac{1}{2} \|\rho_{AB} - \rho_A \otimes \rho_B\|_1, \quad \delta := \frac{1}{2} \|\sigma_{AB} - \sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B\|_1.$$
and \( \tilde{m} = 1 - \tilde{m} \), for \( \tilde{m} = \frac{1}{2} \max \{ \| \sigma_A^{-1} \otimes \sigma_B^{-1} \|_{\infty}^{-1}, \| \sigma_{AB}^{-1} \|_{\infty}^{-1} \} \). Moreover, we can apply the simplification of the latter Theorem derived in Remark 5.15, and more specifically in Eq. (24), which upper bounds the continuity bound from the previous inequality by bounding each of the involved terms and noticing that \( \varepsilon \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon} \) and \( \delta \leq \sqrt{\delta} \) for \( \varepsilon, \delta \leq 1 \). We then have
\[
|D(\rho_A \otimes \rho_B \| \sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B) - D(\rho \| \gamma) - D(\rho \| \gamma)| \leq \left( \log \tilde{m}^{-1} + \sqrt{2} \right) \sqrt{\varepsilon} + \frac{5 \log^2 \tilde{m}^{-1}}{l_{\tilde{m}}} \sqrt{\delta},
\]
concluding thus the result.

Note that, even though there is a caveat in this result in the form of an additive error term, which prevents it from being useful to prove the positivity of MLSIs, it presents the advantage with respect to Eq. (40) that there is no multiplicative error term in this case, which might be of more interest for some other contexts, such as for entropy accumulation [55] or in the line of the applications given by the Brascamp-Lieb dualities [15].

### 7.6 Minimal distance to separable states

In this section, we show how to reprove the continuity bounds for the relative entropy of entanglement in [86] from the ALAFF method and how this strategy generalizes if we quantify the minimal distance to the set of separable states in terms of the BS-entropy instead.

Let \( C \subset S(H) \) be a compact convex subset of the set of quantum states with at least one positive definite state. We can define the minimal distance to \( C \) in terms of the relative entropy as
\[
D_C(\rho) := \inf_{\gamma \in C} D(\rho \| \gamma).
\]
As explained in [86], the fact that \( C \) contains a positive definite state guarantees that \( D_C(\rho) < \infty \) for all \( \rho \in S(H) \). Moreover, the infimum is attained, as follows from the fact that the relative entropy is lower semi-continuous [59] and Weierstrass’ theorem on extreme values of such functions [2, Theorem 2.43]. Examples of \( C \) include SEP\(_{AB} \), the set of separable states for systems \( A, B \), and
\[
\{ d_A^{-1} 1_A \otimes \sigma_B : \sigma_B \in S(H_B) \},
\]
which yields \( D_C(\rho_{AB}) = -H_\rho(A|B) + \log d_A \). The quantity \( D_{SEP_{AB}} \) is known as the relative entropy of entanglement [82, 83]. It constitutes a tight upper bound on the distillable entanglement [63, 83]. This is the quantity we focus on for now.

**Lemma 7.7** Let \( C \subset S(H) \) be a compact convex set containing at least one positive definite state. Then, \( D_C \) is convex on \( S(H) \).

**Proof.** This follows directly from the joint convexity of the relative entropy. Indeed, let \( \tau_1 \) and \( \tau_2 \) be states such that
\[
D_C(\rho_1) = D(\rho_1 \| \tau_1), \quad D_C(\rho_2) = D(\rho_2 \| \tau_2).
\]
Let \( p \in [0, 1] \). Then,
\[
D_C(p\rho_1 + (1-p)\rho_2) \leq D(p\rho_1 + (1-p)\rho_2 \| p\tau_1 + (1-p)\tau_2)
\leq p D(\rho_1 \| \tau_1) + (1-p) D(\rho_2 \| \tau_2)
= pD_C(\rho_1) + (1-p)D_C(\rho_2),
\]
where we have used joint convexity for the relative entropy in the second inequality. \(\Box\)
In order to apply the ALAFF method, we need to prove almost concavity next.

**Lemma 7.8** Let $C \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ be a compact convex set containing at least one positive definite state. Moreover, let $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ and $p \in [0,1]$. Then,

$$D_C(pp_1 + (1 - p)p_2) \geq pD_C(\rho_1) + (1 - p)D_C(\rho_2) - h(p).$$

**Proof.** We can use the almost concavity of the relative entropy. Let $\tau$ the state that achieves the infimum in $D_C(pp_1 + (1 - p)p_2)$. By Theorem 5.1 and point 1 of Proposition 5.2, we obtain that

$$D_C(pp_1 + (1 - p)p_2) \geq pD_C(\rho_1) + (1 - p)D_C(\rho_2) - h(p),$$

which is the assertion. \qed

Finally, we need the following estimate:

**Lemma 7.9** Let $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. It holds that

$$\sup_{\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 = 1} |D_{\text{SEP}}(\rho) - D_{\text{SEP}}(\sigma)| \leq \log \min\{d_A, d_B\}.$$ 

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, let $d_A \leq d_B$. For a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ with Schmidt decomposition $\sum_{i=1}^{d_A} \lambda_i |i_A\rangle \otimes |i_B\rangle$, let

$$\tau_\psi = \frac{1}{d_A} \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} |i_A\rangle \langle i_A| \otimes |i_B\rangle \langle i_B|.$$

This state is manifestly separable. Then,

$$\sup_{\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 = 1} |D_{\text{SEP}}(\rho) - D_{\text{SEP}}(\sigma)| \leq \sup_{|\psi\rangle\langle \psi| \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} D_{\text{SEP}}(|\psi\rangle\langle \psi|)$$

$$\leq \sup_{|\psi\rangle\langle \psi| \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} D(|\psi\rangle\langle \psi| || \tau_\psi)$$

$$= \sup_{|\psi\rangle\langle \psi| \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} -\log((\langle \psi| \tau_\psi |\psi\rangle)$$

$$= \log d_A.$$ 

In the first inequality, we have used that $D_{\text{SEP}}$ is positive and convex. \qed

This allows us to prove via the ALAFF method a continuity bound for the relative entropy of entanglement:

**Theorem 7.10** For $\varepsilon \in [0,1]$ and $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, it holds that for $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ with $\frac{1}{2}\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$

$$|D_{\text{SEP}}(\rho) - D_{\text{SEP}}(\sigma)| \leq \varepsilon \log \min\{d_A, d_B\} + (1 + \varepsilon)h\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon}\right).$$

**Proof.** This follows from Theorem 4.6, using Lemma 7.7, Lemma 7.8, point 4 of Proposition 5.2, and Lemma 7.9. \qed
Theorem 7.10 recovers the bound [86, Corollary 8], proven with very similar methods, which improved over the earlier bound in [28]. The interest of executing the proof here is that a similar strategy will give us bounds on a BS-entropy version of the relative entropy of entanglement, as we will show now. We define
\[ \hat{D}_C(\rho) = \inf_{\gamma \in C} \hat{D}(\rho\|\gamma), \]
which measures how far \( \rho \) is from \( C \) in terms of the BS-entropy. The infimum is attained as the BS-entropy is also lower semi-continuous [54, Section 10]. Using the same arguments as for Lemma 7.7, we can prove convexity.

**Lemma 7.11** Let \( C \subset S(\mathcal{H}) \) be a compact convex set containing at least one positive definite state. Then, \( \hat{D}_C \) is convex on \( S(\mathcal{H}) \).

Almost concavity requires more work in this case.

**Lemma 7.12** Let \( C \subset S(\mathcal{H}) \) be a compact convex set containing the maximally mixed state. Moreover, let \( \rho, \sigma \in S(\mathcal{H}), \rho \in [0,1], \) and \( d \in \mathbb{N}, d \geq 2 \) the dimension of \( \mathcal{H} \). Then,
\[ \hat{D}_C(p\rho_1 + (1-p)\rho_2) \geq p\hat{D}_C(\rho_1) + (1-p)\hat{D}_C(\rho_2) - g_d(p). \]
Here, \( g_d(p) := \frac{d}{p(1-p)}h(p) - \log(1-p^{1/d}) \) for \( p \in (0,1) \) and \( g_d(0) := 0 \).

**Proof.** In order to apply the almost concavity of the BS-entropy, we need to control the minimal eigenvalue of \( \tau \), the best approximation of \( \rho \) in \( C \). To this end, we will use a strategy inspired by [28]. Let \( \tau_s \) be the state achieving the infimum in
\[ \inf_{\tau \in C} \hat{D}(\rho\|s\tau + (1-s)\frac{1}{d} \mathbb{I}) \]
for some \( s \in (0,1) \) which we will specify later. Clearly,
\[ \hat{D}_C(\rho) \leq \hat{D}(\rho\|s\tau_s + (1-s)\frac{1}{d} \mathbb{I}). \]
Furthermore, with \( \hat{\tau} \) a state such that \( \hat{D}_C(\rho) = \hat{D}(\rho\|\hat{\tau}) \),
\[ \hat{D}(\rho\|s\tau_s + (1-s)\frac{1}{d} \mathbb{I}) \leq \hat{D}(\rho\|s\hat{\tau} + (1-s)\frac{1}{d} \mathbb{I}) \leq \hat{D}_C(\rho) - \log{s}, \]
as \( s\hat{\tau} + (1-s)\frac{1}{d} \leq s\hat{\tau} \) and the logarithm is operator monotone. Note that without loss of generality, we can assume \( \hat{\tau} \) to be invertible, as \( \hat{D}_C(\rho) < \infty \), which implies \( \text{ker} \hat{\tau} \subseteq \text{ker} \rho \). Thus, we can restrict \( \hat{\tau} \) to the support of \( \rho \), where \( \hat{\tau} \) is positive definite. Combining this bound with Theorem 6.3, we infer
\[ \hat{D}_C(p\rho_1 + (1-p)\rho_2) \geq p\hat{D}_C(\rho_1) + (1-p)\hat{D}_C(\rho_2) - \frac{d}{1-s}h(p) + \log{s}. \]
Here, we have used point 1 of Proposition 6.5. Finally, we have to choose \( s \) such that \( \frac{d}{1-s}h(p) - \log{s} \) goes to zero for \( p \to 0^+ \) and is non-decreasing on \( p \in [0,1/2] \). It turns out that \( s = 1 - p^{1/d} \) is a convenient choice, see Lemma G.1 and Lemma G.2. \[\square\]
Remark 7.13 Note that we could have substituted $g_d$ in Lemma 7.12 by a symmetrized version

$$\tilde{g}_d(p) := \begin{cases} g_d(p) & p \in [0, 1/2] \\ g_d(1-p) & p \in [1/2, 1] \end{cases}$$

in order to obtain

$$\hat{D}_C(pp_1 + (1-p)p_2) \geq p \hat{D}_C(p_1) + (1-p) \hat{D}_C(p_2) - \tilde{g}_d(p).$$

for all $p \in [0,1]$ and $\tilde{g}_d(0) = \tilde{g}_d(1) = 0$. For the ALAFF method with $s = 0$, however, it is only relevant what happens on $[0, 1/2]$.

The final estimate we need in order to apply the ALAFF method is proven in a very similar way as Lemma 7.9.

Lemma 7.14 Let $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. It holds that

$$\sup_{\rho,\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \log \min\{d_A, d_B\}.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, let $d_A \leq d_B$. For a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ with Schmidt decomposition

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d_A} \lambda_i |i_A\rangle \otimes |i_B\rangle,$$

let again

$$\tau_\psi = \frac{1}{d_A} \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} |i_A\rangle |i_B\rangle,$$

which is a separable state. Then,

$$\sup_{\rho,\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \sup_{|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} \hat{D}(|\psi\rangle |\psi\rangle)$$

$$\leq \sup_{|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} - \log \left( \langle \psi | \tau_\psi^{-1} |\psi\rangle \right)$$

$$= \log d_A.$$

In the first inequality, we have used that $\hat{D}_{\text{SEP}_{AB}}$ is positive and convex. Note that $\tau_\psi$ is invertible because we can without loss of generality restrict to its support.

Theorem 7.15 For $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$, $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, and $d_{AB} \in \mathbb{N}$, $d_{AB} \geq 2$, it holds that for $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ with $\frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$

$$|\hat{D}_{\text{SEP}_{AB}}(\rho) - \hat{D}_{\text{SEP}_{AB}}(\sigma)| \leq \varepsilon \log \min\{d_A, d_B\} + (1 + \varepsilon) g_{d_{AB}} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \right).$$

Here, $g_d(p) := \frac{d}{p^{1/d}} h(p) - \log (1 - p^{1/d})$ for $p \in (0, 1)$ and $g_d(0) = 0$.

Proof. As shown in Lemma G.3, it holds that $g_d(p)/(1-p)$ is non-decreasing on $[0,1]$ for all $d \in \mathbb{N}, d \geq 2$. Thus, the assertion follows from Theorem 4.6 using Lemma 7.11, Lemma 7.12 with Lemma G.1 and Lemma G.2, and Lemma 7.14. 
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To end this section, let us investigate the choice
\[ C_0 := \{ d_A^{-1} 1_A \otimes \sigma_B : \sigma_B \in \mathcal{S}(H_B) \}. \]

From the discussion after Eq. (5), we know that
\[ \hat{H}_\rho(A|B) \leq \sup_{\sigma_B \in \mathcal{S}(H_B)} - \hat{D}(\rho_{AB} \parallel 1_A \otimes \sigma_B) =: \hat{H}_\rho^{\text{var}}(A|B), \]
but equality does not hold in general. This is different from the Umegaki relative entropy, where the conditional entropy coincides with its variational expression. Nonetheless, we obtain a continuity bound for \( \hat{H}_\rho^{\text{var}}(A|B) \) from the approach in this section.

**Corollary 7.16** Let \( \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \). For \( \varepsilon \in [0, 1] \) and \( d_{AB} \in \mathbb{N} \), \( d_{AB} \geq 2 \), it holds that for \( \rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \) with \( \frac{1}{2} \| \rho - \sigma \|_1 \leq \varepsilon \)
\[ |\hat{H}_\rho^{\text{var}}(A|B) - \hat{H}_\sigma^{\text{var}}(A|B)| \leq 2\varepsilon \log d_A + (1 + \varepsilon) g_{d_{AB}} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \right). \]
Here, \( g_d(p) := \frac{d}{p^{1/d}} h(p) - \log(1 - p^{1/d}) \) for \( p \in (0, 1) \) and \( g_d(0) = 0 \).

**Proof.** It holds that for \( \rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \) with \( \frac{1}{2} \| \rho - \sigma \|_1 \leq \varepsilon \)
\[ |\hat{H}_\rho^{\text{var}}(A|B) - \hat{H}_\sigma^{\text{var}}(A|B)| = |\hat{D}_{C_0}(\rho) - \hat{D}_{C_0}(\sigma)|, \]
since the normalization does not matter. Thus to apply ALAFF, we need to bound
\[ \sup_{\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} \sup_{\frac{1}{2} \| \rho - \sigma \|_1 = 1} |\hat{D}_{C_0}(\rho) - \hat{D}_{C_0}(\sigma)|. \]
Using Eq. (29) and the fact that \( \hat{D}_{C_0}(\rho) \geq 0 \) for all states \( \rho \), we obtain
\[ \sup_{\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} |\hat{D}_{C_0}(\rho) - \hat{D}_{C_0}(\sigma)| \leq \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} \hat{D}_{C_0}(\rho) \leq \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} -\hat{H}_\rho^{\text{var}}(A|B) + \log d_A \leq \log \min\{d_A, d_B\} + \log d_A \leq 2 \log d_A. \]
The assertion follows from combining the above with Lemma 7.11, Lemma 7.12 with Lemma G.1 and Lemma G.2, and Lemma G.3 to apply Theorem 4.6.

### 7.7 Rains information

Inspired by the Rains bound from entanglement theory [64], for any divergence \( \mathcal{D} \), the **generalized Rains bound** of a quantum state \( \rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B) \) was defined in [80] by
\[ \mathbb{R}(\rho_{AB}) := \min_{\sigma_{AB} \in \text{PPT}(A:B)} \mathcal{D}(\rho_{AB} \parallel \sigma_{AB}), \]
where the minimization is taken over the Rains set
\[ \text{PPT}'(A : B) := \left\{ \sigma_{AB} : \sigma_{AB} \geq 0, \left\| T_B^{\sigma_{AB}} \right\|_1 \leq 1 \right\}. \]
This definition can be easily extended to channels in the following way. For a quantum channel
\( T_{A' \rightarrow B} : S(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A'}) \rightarrow S(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B) \), we define
\[
\mathbb{R}(T) := \max_{\rho_A \in S(\mathcal{H}_A)} \mathbb{R}(T_{A' \rightarrow B}(\phi_{AA'})) ,
\]
for \( \phi_{AA'} \) a purification of \( \rho_A \). In particular, for the Umegaki relative entropy, we introduce the Rains information as
\[
R(T) := \max_{\rho_A \in S(\mathcal{H}_A)} \min_{\sigma_{AB} \in \text{PPT}(A:B)} D(T_{A' \rightarrow B}(\phi_{AA'}) \| \sigma_{AB}) ,
\]
as well as the BS-Rains information by
\[
\tilde{R}(T) := \max_{\rho_A \in S(\mathcal{H}_A)} \min_{\sigma_{AB} \in \text{PPT}(A:B)} \tilde{D}(T_{A' \rightarrow B}(\phi_{AA'}) \| \sigma_{AB}) .
\]
In the rest of the subsection, we will drop the subindex from the channels whenever it is clear in which systems they act. In [29], it was proven that the latter two quantities constitute upper bounds to the quantum capacity of a quantum channel. Indeed, the following inequality holds for any channel \( T \):
\[
Q(T) \leq R(T) \leq \tilde{R}(T) .
\]
Moreover, the BS-Rains information is a limit of Rains informations induced by \( \alpha \)-geometric R´enyi divergences, which can be written as single-letter formulas and computed via an SDP, as shown in [29]. The study of these quantities is therefore of great interest for application in the context of strong converses of quantum capacities of channels.

Here, as a consequence of Corollary 5.8 and Corollary 6.13, respectively, we can provide continuity results for both the Rains information and the BS-Rains information, respectively, following the lines of Theorem 7.10. Beforehand, we need to justify that both quantities are well-defined, i.e., that each of these quantities is attained at a certain \( \rho_A \in S(\mathcal{H}_A) \) and \( \sigma_{AB} \in \text{PPT}(A : B) \), and thus the minimum and maximum in their definitions are properly written. For that, note that we are first taking an infimum on the second input over the compact set \( \text{PPT}(A : B) \). Then, the infimum is attained and the expression obtained is a continuous function, as we will show below in Eq. (43). Next, we perform an optimization problem on the first input over another compact set, namely \( S(\mathcal{H}_A) \). Thus, that supremum is also attained and both Rains informations are well defined.

From now on, for simplicity and for similarity with the quantities introduced in the previous section, given \( \rho_{AB} \in S(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B) \), let us define
\[
D_{\text{PPT}(A:B)}(\rho_{AB}) := \min_{\sigma_{AB} \in \text{PPT}(A:B)} D(\rho_{AB} \| \sigma_{AB}) .
\]
Then, it is clear that we can rewrite, for a quantum channel \( T : S(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A'}) \rightarrow S(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B) \),
\[
R(T) := \max_{\rho_A \in S(\mathcal{H}_A)} D_{\text{PPT}(A:B)}(T(\phi_{AA'})) ,
\]
for \( \phi_{AA'} \) a purification of \( \rho_A \). The next step before applying the ALAFF method is bounding the difference between two Rains informations of two quantum channels. For that, we will use the \( 1 \rightarrow 1 \) norm of the difference between channels. Let us recall that for \( T : S(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A'}) \rightarrow S(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B) \) a quantum channel, its \( 1 \rightarrow 1 \) norm is given by
\[
\|T\|_{1 \rightarrow 1} := \max_{\eta : \|\eta\|_1 \leq 1} \|T(\eta)\|_1 .
\]
For \( T_{A' \rightarrow B}, \) the \( 1 \rightarrow 1 \) norm coincides with the diamond norm. Now, as a consequence of Lemma 7.9 and Theorem 7.10 from the previous section, we can derive the following continuity bound for the Rains information.

**Theorem 7.17** For \( \varepsilon \in [0, 1] \) and \( T_{A' \rightarrow B}^1, T_{A' \rightarrow B}^2 : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A'}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B) \) two quantum channels with \( \frac{1}{2}\| T_{A' \rightarrow B}^1 - T_{A' \rightarrow B}^2 \|_{1 \rightarrow 1} \leq \varepsilon, \) we have:

\[
| R(T_{A' \rightarrow B}^1) - R(T_{A' \rightarrow B}^2) | \leq \varepsilon \log \min \{ d_A, d_B \} + (1 + \varepsilon) h \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \right). \tag{42}
\]

**Proof.** Let us drop the subscripts from the channels for ease of notation. Firstly, note that \( \text{SEP}_{AB} \subset \text{PPT}'(A : B) \). Therefore,

\[
R(T) = \max_{\rho_A \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)} D_{\text{PPT}'(A:B)}(T(\phi_{AA'})) \leq \max_{\rho_A \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)} D_{\text{SEP}_{AB}}(T(\phi_{AA'})).
\]

Hence, in general

\[
\max_{\rho_{AB}, \sigma_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)} | D_{\text{PPT}'(A:B)}(\rho_{AB}) - D_{\text{PPT}'(A:B)}(\sigma_{AB}) | \leq \max_{\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)} D_{\text{PPT}'(A:B)}(\rho_{AB})
\]

\[
\leq \max_{\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)} D_{\text{SEP}_{AB}}(\rho_{AB}),
\]

where in the last inequality we have used Lemma 7.9. Following the lines of Theorem 7.10, we have for \( \rho_{AB}, \sigma_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B) \) with \( \frac{1}{2}\| \rho_{AB} - \sigma_{AB} \|_1 \leq \varepsilon \) the following continuity bound:

\[
| D_{\text{PPT}'(A:B)}(\rho_{AB}) - D_{\text{PPT}'(A:B)}(\sigma_{AB}) | \leq \varepsilon \log \min \{ d_A, d_B \} + (1 + \varepsilon) h \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \right).
\]

Note that since \( \text{PPT}'(A : B) \) does not only contain states, but also subnormalized states, Lemma 7.7 and Lemma 7.8 are not directly applicable. One can however verify that the corresponding statements for \( \text{PPT}'(A : B) \) still hold using the same arguments. For simplicity, let us denote

\[
b(\varepsilon) := \varepsilon \log \min \{ d_A, d_B \} + (1 + \varepsilon) h \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \right).
\]

To estimate an upper bound on the difference that appears in Eq. (42), first note that, given \( T^1, T^2 : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A'}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B) \) two quantum channels with \( \frac{1}{2}\| T^1 - T^2 \|_{1 \rightarrow 1} \leq \varepsilon, \) and \( \rho_A \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A) \) with \( \phi_{AA'} \) a purification of it, we have

\[
\frac{1}{2}\| T^1(\phi_{AA'}) - T^2(\phi_{AA'}) \|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}\| T^1 - T^2 \|_{1 \rightarrow 1} \leq \varepsilon.
\]

Consider now \( \rho^1, \rho^2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A) \) with respective purifications \( \phi^1_{AA'}, \phi^2_{AA'} \), the states in which the respective maxima of \( R(T^1) \) and \( R(T^2) \) are attained. Then, we clearly have, for \( i, j = 1, 2 \) and \( i \neq j, \)

\[
|R(T^j) - D_{\text{PPT}'(A:B)}(T^i(\phi^j_{AA'}))) | = | D_{\text{PPT}'(A:B)}(T^j(\phi^j_{AA'})) - D_{\text{PPT}'(A:B)}(T^i(\phi^j_{AA'})) | \leq b(\varepsilon),
\]

and thus,

\[
R(T^i) \geq D_{\text{PPT}'(A:B)}(T^i(\phi^j_{AA'})) \geq R(T^j) - b(\varepsilon).
\]
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Therefore, we can conclude
\[ |R(T^1) - R(T^2)| \leq b(\varepsilon), \]
and consequently
\[ |R(T^1) - R(T^2)| \leq \varepsilon \log \min\{d_A, d_B\} + (1 + \varepsilon)h\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon}\right). \]

In a similar way, we can also prove uniform continuity and provide explicit continuity bounds for the BS-Rains information. Analogously to what we have done above for the Rains information, we can define for \(\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)\) the following quantity:
\[
\tilde{D}_{\text{PPT}}^{(A:B)}(\rho_{AB}) := \min_{\sigma_{AB} \in \text{PPT}^{(A:B)}} \tilde{D}(\rho_{AB}||\sigma_{AB}),
\]
and thus, we can rewrite, for a quantum channel \(T : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A'}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)\),
\[
\tilde{R}(T) := \max_{\rho_A \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)} \tilde{D}_{\text{PPT}}^{(A:B)}(T(\phi_{AA'})),
\]
for \(\phi_{AA'}\) a purification of \(\rho_A\). We can finally use Lemma 7.14 and Theorem 7.15 from the previous section, for the BS-entropy, to obtain a continuity bound for the BS-Rains information. However, the bound obtained, as well as the procedure employed to derive it, are a straightforward combination of the strategies of the continuity bound for the Rains information Theorem 7.17 and the continuity bound for the BS-entropy of entanglement from Theorem 7.15. Therefore, we omit it, to avoid unnecessary repetitions.

**Theorem 7.18** For \(\varepsilon \in [0, 1]\) and \(T^1_{A' \rightarrow B}, T^2_{A' \rightarrow B} : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A'}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)\) two quantum channels with \(\frac{1}{2}\|T^1 - T^2\|_{1 \rightarrow 1} \leq \varepsilon\), we have:
\[
|\tilde{R}(T^1) - \tilde{R}(T^2)| \leq \varepsilon \log \min\{d_A, d_B\} + (1 + \varepsilon)g_{d_{AB}}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon}\right),
\]
where \(g_d(t) := \frac{d}{d+1} h(t) - \log(1 - t^{1/d}).\)

8 Outlook

In this paper, we have introduced a new method to derive results of uniform continuity and explicit continuity bounds for divergences. Our method (cf. Theorem 4.6), named ALAFF after the functions to which it applies (almost locally affine functions), is based on the previous ideas by Alicki, Fannes, and Winter from their results of continuity bounds for the conditional entropy, but applies to a much wider class of divergences, namely all those for which we can prove almost concavity. More specifically, our method considers an entropic quantity which is (jointly) convex and almost (jointly) concave, and outputs continuity bounds for such a quantity and any derived entropic quantity from it.

In particular, in the current paper, we have applied our ALAFF method to the specific cases of the Umegaki relative entropy and the Belavkin-Staszewski relative entropy. For both of them, we have proven results of almost concavity (for the Umegaki case, our result is shown to be tight), and these, together with the well-known results of convexity for these quantities, have yielded a plethora of results of continuity bounds for both the Umegaki and BS-entropy, as well as for many
other quantities derived from them. In particular, our results recover the previously known almost tight continuity bounds for the conditional entropy and the (conditional) mutual information.

A natural question arises from the findings of this paper: Is our method applicable to any other family of divergences? We expect this to be the case, since, as shown in Section 2, our method only requires almost concavity and convexity (already known for divergences) in order to work. Therefore, a result of almost concavity with a “well-behaved” correction factor would be enough for the ALAFF method and is expected to exist, for families such as the 𝛼-sandwiched Rényi divergences or the 𝛼-geometric Rényi divergences, as they converge to the quantities studied in this paper. This possibility will be explored in a future manuscript.

Let us conclude this section, and our paper, with some analysis of the results obtained here. For both the Umegaki and the BS-entropies, we have presented results of almost concavity in order to provide some continuity bounds. However, while for the former (cf. Theorem 5.1) we have shown that the result is tight, for the latter (cf. Theorem 6.3) we are certain that there is room for improvement. Indeed, our almost concavity bound for the BS-entropy depends on the minimal eigenvalues of some of the states involved even in the simplified case that reduces to the BS-conditional entropy. In such a case, numerical simulations, as well as analytical proof, have shown us that there is a universal bound for the BS-conditional entropy of a state which is independent of the state involved. Therefore, we would expect an almost convexity result for the BS-conditional entropy being independent of the states involved, and this is clearly not the case at the moment. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the BS-entropy, and quantities derived from it, are “pathological” in some sense. First of all, we have shown that the BS-conditional entropy exhibits discontinuities in the presence of vanishing eigenvalues (cf. Proposition 6.7), as opposed to the conditional entropy, which behaves well in that setting. This motivates the idea that the minimal eigenvalue of the involved states should appear in the most general bounds of almost concavity and continuity. Additionally, we can compare some upper bounds of some entropic quantities derived from the Umegaki and the BS-entropy:

- For the relative entropy, we have the following 3 bounds:

  \[-H_\rho(A|B) \leq 2 \log d_A, \quad I_\rho(A:B) \leq 2 \log d_A, \quad D(\rho||\sigma) \leq \log \tilde{m}_\sigma^{-1}.\]

- For the BS-entropy, we have the following 3 bounds:

  \[-\hat{H}_\rho(A|B) \leq 2 \log d_A, \quad \hat{I}_\rho(A:B) \leq \log d_A \tilde{m}^{-1}_{(\rho_A)}, \quad \hat{D}(\rho||\sigma) \leq \log \tilde{m}_\sigma^{-1}.\]

Therefore, we can conclude that one of the main differences between the relative entropy and the BS-entropy is that, whereas the mutual information behaves like the conditional entropy, the BS-mutual information behaves like the BS-entropy between two states, not like the BS-conditional entropy.
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A Numerical investigation of the variational definition of the BS-conditional entropy
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Figure 6: The red line is the BS-conditional entropy defined via the partial trace evaluated at $\rho_{AB}$. The dots are the BS-entropy of the states $\rho_{AB}$ and $\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B$ with a state $\sigma_B \in S(\mathcal{H}_B)$. The orange dots are the cases when the $-\hat{D}(\rho_{AB}\|\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B)$ exceeds $\hat{H}(A|B)$. We sampled a total of 100,000 pairs of $\rho_{AB}$ and $\sigma_B$ and evaluated both $\hat{H}(A|B)$ and $-\hat{D}(\rho_{AB}\|\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B)$. Only a tenth of all samples were kept in addition to the ones that violated the bound. Those were then plotted in ascending order w.r.t. the magnitude of their BS conditional entropy. We further controlled the minimal eigenvalue to reduce the risk of numerical flaws. The numerical simulation was conducted on $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B = \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$.

B Supplements to the proof of Theorem 5.1

We will now show that the result of the inequality in Eq. (17) is still true, even if $\rho_1, \rho_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2$ are not full rank. We have that

$$\ker \sigma \subseteq \ker \sigma_1 \subseteq \ker \rho_1.$$

If $\ker \sigma \not\subseteq \ker \rho_1$ we set

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{\rho_1} := P_{\ker \rho_1 \cap (\ker \sigma)^\perp} \quad , \quad \Pi_{\rho_1} := \left\| \tilde{\Pi}_{\rho_1} \right\|_1^{-1} \tilde{\Pi}_{\rho_1},$$

and if $\ker \sigma \not\subseteq \ker \sigma_1$,

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{\sigma_1} := P_{\ker \sigma_1 \cap (\ker \sigma)^\perp} \quad , \quad \Pi_{\sigma_1} := \left\| \tilde{\Pi}_{\sigma_1} \right\|_1^{-1} \tilde{\Pi}_{\sigma_1},$$

normalised projections on the spaces in the index. Both of the latter are quantum states and fulfil

$$\Pi_{\rho_1} \rho_1 = \rho_1 \Pi_{\rho_1} = 0, \quad \Pi_{\sigma_1} \sigma_1 = \sigma_1 \Pi_{\sigma_1} = 0, \quad \Pi_{\sigma_1} \rho_1 = \rho_1 \Pi_{\sigma_1} = 0 \quad (44)$$
For $1 > \varepsilon > 0$ and $1 > \delta > 0$, let

$$\rho_{1,\varepsilon} = \begin{cases} \varepsilon \Pi \rho_1 + (1 - \varepsilon) \rho_1 & \text{if } \ker \sigma \subset \ker \rho_1 \\ \rho_1 & \text{if } \ker \sigma = \ker \rho_1 \end{cases},$$

$$\sigma_{1,\delta} = \begin{cases} \delta \Pi \sigma_1 + (1 - \delta) \sigma_1 & \text{if } \ker \sigma \subset \ker \sigma_1 \\ \sigma_1 & \text{if } \ker \sigma = \ker \sigma_1 \end{cases}.$$  

We then have that $\ker \rho_{1,\varepsilon} = \ker \sigma_{1,\delta} = \ker \sigma$. This means, however, considering $\text{tr}[\rho_{1,\varepsilon} (\log \sigma - \log \sigma_{1,\delta})]$ we can reduce to the subspace where they are all full rank. We then apply the Peierls-Bogolubov inequality [3] and the multivariant trace inequality by Sutter et al. [74, Corollary 3.3]

$$\text{tr}[\rho_{1,\varepsilon} (\log \sigma - \log \sigma_{1,\delta})] \leq \log \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \beta_0(t) \text{tr} \left[ \rho_{1,\varepsilon} \frac{\mu - 1}{\sigma \sigma_{1,\delta}} \right].$$  

(45)

Both of the traces on the LHS and RHS of Eq. (45) can without change be extended to the full Hilbert space again. Next, we take limits on both sides of the inequality and in doing so recover the claim. We first note that clearly the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$ requires no more argument as both sides are linear in $\varepsilon$. Hence, we get

$$\text{tr}[\rho_1 (\log \sigma - \log \sigma_{1,\delta})] \leq \log \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \beta_0(t) \text{tr} \left[ \rho_1 \frac{\mu - 1}{\sigma \sigma_{1,\delta}} \right].$$  

(46)

The limit $\delta \to 0$ on the other hand is, in the case of $\ker \sigma \subset \ker \sigma_1$, a little more involved. Due to the orthogonality in Eq. (44) we cannot only split up the logarithm but also eliminate terms. More specifically, we have

$$\log \sigma_{1,\delta} = \log(\delta \Pi \sigma_1) + \log((1 - \delta) \sigma_1),$$

where the logarithms in the RHS have to be understood as living in the support of the respective argument (and complemented with zeros in the rest). Hence, we obtain for the LHS of Eq. (46)

$$\text{tr}[\rho_1 (\log \sigma - \log \sigma_{1,\delta})] = \text{tr}[\rho_1 (\log \sigma - \log(\delta \Pi \sigma_1 + (1 - \delta) \sigma_1))]
= \text{tr}[\rho_1 (\log \sigma - \log((1 - \delta) \sigma_1))] + \text{tr}[\rho_1 \log(\delta \Pi \sigma_1)]
= \text{tr}[\rho_1 (\log \sigma - \log((1 - \delta) \sigma_1))]
= \text{tr}[\rho_1 (\log \sigma - \log \sigma_1)] + \log(1 - \delta).$$

Moreover, for the RHS of Eq. (46) we use that

$$\sigma_{1,\delta}^\varepsilon = \delta^\varepsilon \Pi_{\sigma_1}^\varepsilon + (1 - \delta)^\varepsilon \sigma_1^\varepsilon,$$
We first of all note that for all $C$ Proof of Proposition 5.2
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Taking the limit $\delta \to 0$ now directly follows from the continuity of the logarithm. We thereby conclude

$$p \text{ tr}[\rho_1 (\log(\sigma) - \log(\sigma_1))] \leq p \log \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \beta_0(t) \text{ tr} \left[ \rho_1 \frac{\sigma^1}{\sigma^{1-1}} \right],$$

for $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho_1$ not full rank.

C Proof of Proposition 5.2

We first of all note that for all $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in S(\mathcal{H})$ $\frac{1}{2} \| \rho_1 - \rho_2 \|_1 \leq 1$, hence as a direct consequence $f_{c_1, c_2} + \frac{1}{2} \| \rho_1 - \rho_2 \|_1^2 h \leq f_{c_1, c_2} + h$. We therefore will drop the $\frac{1}{2} \| \rho_1 - \rho_2 \|$ in front of the $h$ here already.

1. If $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 =: \sigma$, we find for $j = 1, 2$
that

$$c_j = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \beta_0(t) \text{ tr} \left[ \rho_j \sigma^{\frac{j}{2}} \sigma \sigma^{\frac{1-j}{2}} \right] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \beta_0(t) \text{ tr}[\rho_j] = 1.$$

The reduction of $f_{c_1, c_2} + h$ to $h$ then happens because $\log(p + (1 - p)) = \log(1) = 0$ gives $f_{c_1, c_2} = 0$.

2. With $j, k = 1, 2, j \neq k$ we can write

$$\sigma_j^{-1/2} \sigma_k \sigma_j^{-1/2} = \sigma_j^{-1/2} P_{\sigma_j} \sigma_k \sigma_j^{-1/2} \leq \sigma_j^{-1/2} \bar{m}^{-1} \sigma_j \sigma_j^{-1/2} = \bar{m}^{-1} P_{\sigma_j}$$

where $P_{\sigma_j}$ is the projection onto the support of $\sigma_j$. What we used in the inequality is that clearly $P_{\sigma_j} \sigma_k P_{\sigma_j} \leq P_{\sigma_j} \leq \bar{m}^{-1} \sigma_j$. If we use Eq. (47) we find that

$$c_j \leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \beta_0(t) \bar{m}^{-1} \text{ tr} \left[ \rho_j \sigma_j^{\frac{j}{2}} P_{\sigma_j} \sigma_j^{\frac{1-j}{2}} \right] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \beta_0(t) \bar{m}^{-1} \text{ tr} \left[ \rho_j \sigma_j^{\frac{j}{2}} \sigma_j^{\frac{1-j}{2}} \right] = \bar{m}^{-1}$$

By the monotonicity of the logarithm, we obtain $f_{c_1, c_2} \leq f_{\bar{m}^{-1}, \bar{m}^{-1}}$ and hence $f_{c_1, c_2} + h \leq f_{\bar{m}^{-1}, \bar{m}^{-1}} + h$. 61
3. For \( j, k = 1, 2, j \neq k \) we have
\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d}{dt} \beta_0(t) \text{ tr} & \left[ \rho_{j,AB} (I_A \otimes \rho_{j,B}) \frac{t_{i-1}}{2} I_A \otimes \rho_{k,B} (I_A \otimes \rho_{j,B}) \right] \\
& = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \beta_0(t) \text{ tr} \left[ \rho_{j,AB} I_A \otimes \left( \frac{t_{i-1}}{2} \rho_{k,B} \rho_{j,B} \right) \right] \\
& = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \beta_0(t) \text{ tr} \left[ \rho_{j,B} \left( \frac{t_{i-1}}{2} \rho_{k,B} \rho_{j,B} \right) \right] \\
& = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \beta_0(t) \text{ tr} [\rho_{k,B}] = 1.
\end{align*}
\]

We used that the functional calculus has the property that \( f(A \otimes B) = f(A) \otimes f(B) \) for \( A, B \) self-adjoint, as can easily be verified by direct computation, and that the trace is cyclic. This gives us \( f_{c_1,c_2} = f_{1,1} = 0 \) which concludes the claim.

4. The derivative of \( p \mapsto \frac{1}{1-p} h(p) \) at \( p \in (0, 1) \) is \( -\frac{\log(p)}{(1-p)^2} \geq 0 \), which proves the second assertion.

For \( p \mapsto \frac{1}{1-p} f_{m_1,m_2}(p) = \frac{1}{1-p} \log(p + m_1(1-p)) + \log(1 - p + m_2 p) \) we do the same, however, splitting the sum into two parts. First we find that \( m_2 \geq 1 \) hence \( \log(1 - p + m_2 p) = \log(1 + (m_2 - 1)p) \) is monotone in \( p \), i.e. in particular non-decreasing. Second we look at \( p \mapsto \frac{1}{1-p} \log(p + m_1(1-p)) \). Forming the derivative at \( p \in (0, 1) \), we get
\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{(1-p)^2} \left( \frac{p}{p + (1-p)m_1} + \log(p + m_1(1-p)) - p \right) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{(1-p)^2} \left( \frac{p}{p + (1-p)m_1} + \frac{p + (1-p)m_1 - 1}{p + m_1(1-p)} - p \right) \\
& = \frac{1}{(1-p)^2} \left( \frac{m_1(1-p) + 2(p - 1)}{p + (1-p)m_1} - p \right) \\
& = \frac{1}{(1-p)^2} \left( \frac{m_1(1-p) + 2(p - 1) - p(p + (1-p)m_1)}{p + (1-p)m_1} \right) \\
& = \frac{1}{(1-p)^2} \left( \frac{(m_1 - 1)(p - 1)^2}{p + (1-p)m_1} \right) \\
& \geq 0,
\end{align*}
\]
where we used that for \( x \geq 1 \), \( \log(x) \geq \frac{x-1}{x} \) (this can be seen by taking the derivative and realizing that both sides coincide for \( x = 1 \)) and \( m_1 \geq 1 \). This concludes the claim.

**D Proof of Lemma 5.13**

We first show that for \( s \geq \tilde{m} \), \( S_0 \) is \( s \)-perturbed \( \Delta \)-invariant. For that purpose let \( \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in S_0 \), then we find
\[
\Delta^{\pm}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) = s \rho + (1-s)[\sigma_1 - \sigma_2]_{\pm} \geq \tilde{m} \rho,
\]
which immediately gives the kernel inclusion as well as the condition to be lower bounded by \( \tilde{m} \rho \). Therefore, \( \Delta^{\pm}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \tau) \in S_0 \) which makes \( S_0 \) a \( s \)-perturbed \( \Delta \)-invariant set. We show the other
direction by contrapositive. Let \( s < \tilde{m} \). Since \( \tilde{m} < 1 \) we find an \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and two orthonormal \( |0\rangle, |1\rangle \in \text{supp} \rho \), as rank \( \rho \geq 2 \), such that \( \tilde{m}\rho < \rho - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} |i\rangle \langle i| \) for \( i = 0, 1 \). We then have that

\[
\begin{align*}
\sigma_1 &= \rho + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} |0\rangle \langle 0| - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} |1\rangle \langle 1| \\
\sigma_2 &= \rho - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} |0\rangle \langle 0| + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} |1\rangle \langle 1| 
\end{align*}
\]

manifestly are contained in \( S_0 \). Furthermore, \( \frac{1}{2} \|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2\|_1 = \varepsilon \) and

\[
\begin{align*}
\varepsilon^{-1}[\sigma_1 - \sigma_2]_+ &= |0\rangle \langle 0| \\
\varepsilon^{-1}[\sigma_1 - \sigma_2]_- &= |1\rangle \langle 1|.
\end{align*}
\]

We will now show that there exists no \( \tau \in S(H) \) such that \( \Delta^\pm (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \tau) \in S_0 \) again, meaning \( S_0 \) is not \( s \)-perturbed \( \Delta \)-invariant. Assume there is an operator \( \tau \geq 0 \) such that \( \Delta^\pm (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \tau) \in S_0 \) we then would have

\[
\begin{align*}
|0\rangle \langle 0| &\perp |0\rangle \langle 0| \perp |0\rangle \langle 0| \\
|1\rangle \langle 1| &\perp |1\rangle \langle 1| \perp |1\rangle \langle 1|.
\end{align*}
\]

(48)

where \( |i\rangle \langle i|_\perp := P_\rho - |i\rangle \langle i| \) for \( i = 0, 1 \). Here \( P_\rho \) is the projection on the support of \( \rho \). We further used \( \Delta^\pm (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \tau) \geq \tilde{m}\rho \) as \( \Delta^\pm (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \tau) \) are in \( S_0 \) by assumption. To fulfil Eq. (48) we clearly need to choose \( s > 0 \) and since \( s < \tilde{m} \) we directly obtain the conditions

\[
\begin{align*}
|0\rangle \langle 0| &\perp |0\rangle \langle 0| \perp |0\rangle \langle 0| \quad \text{and} \quad |1\rangle \langle 1| &\perp |1\rangle \langle 1| \perp |1\rangle \langle 1|.
\end{align*}
\]

This gives us,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tr}[\tau] \geq & \text{tr} \left[ |0\rangle \langle 0| \perp |0\rangle \langle 0| + |0\rangle \langle 0| \perp |0\rangle \langle 0| \right] = \text{tr} \left[ |0\rangle \langle 0| \perp |0\rangle \langle 0| + |0\rangle \langle 0| \perp |0\rangle \langle 0| \right] \\
&> \text{tr} \left[ |0\rangle \langle 0| \perp |0\rangle \langle 0| + |0\rangle \langle 0| \perp |0\rangle \langle 0| \right] = \text{tr} \left[ |0\rangle \langle 0| \perp |0\rangle \langle 0| + |0\rangle \langle 0| \perp |0\rangle \langle 0| \right] = 1,
\end{align*}
\]

using that \( |0\rangle \) and \( |1\rangle \) are orthogonal, hence \( |0\rangle \langle 0| |1\rangle \langle 1| = |1\rangle \langle 1| |0\rangle \langle 0| = |0\rangle \langle 0| \) and \( |0\rangle \langle 0|^2 = |0\rangle \langle 0|, (|0\rangle \langle 0|^2)^2 = |0\rangle \langle 0| \). We thus conclude \( \tau \notin S(H) \) proving the claim.

### E Proof of Proposition 6.5

1. If \( \sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \sigma \), then for \( j = 1, 2 \)

\[
\hat{c}_j = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \beta_0(t) \text{tr} \left[ \rho_j (\rho_j^{1/2} \sigma^{-1} \rho_j^{1/2}) \frac{a_1 + 1}{2} \rho_j^{-1/2} \sigma \rho_j^{-1/2} (\rho_j^{1/2} \sigma^{-1} \rho_j^{1/2}) - \frac{a_1 + 1}{2} \right] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \beta_0(t) \text{tr}[\rho_j] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \beta_0(t) = 1
\]

which gives us immediately \( f \hat{c}_1, \hat{c}_2 + \hat{c}_0 h = \hat{c}_0 h \).
2. For \( j, k = 1, 2 \) with \( j \neq k \) we first have \( \sigma_k \leq m^{-1} \sigma_j \) giving us

\[
\hat{c}_j \leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \beta_0(t) \text{tr} \left[ \rho_j^{1/2} \sigma_j^{-1/2} \rho_j^{1/2} \frac{\sigma_j^{1/2}}{m} \right] = m^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \beta_0(t) \text{tr}[\rho_j] = m^{-1}.
\]

Since \( \hat{c}_0 \leq m^{-1} \) and because the logarithm is monotone this immediately gives \( f_{\hat{c}_1, \hat{c}_2} + \hat{c}_0 h \leq f_{m^{-1}, m^{-1} + m^{-1} h} \).

3. The proof is along the same lines as the one for 2., however with \( \sigma_j = d_A^{-1} \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \rho_{j,B} \). We just have to show that the minimal eigenvalue of \( \sigma_j \) is bounded from below by \( m \). We use that \( T_A : \tau \mapsto d_A^{-1} \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \tau_B \) is a conditional expectation and that \( d_A^{-1} \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \tau_B \) is full rank if \( \tau \) was full rank \([25, \text{Theorem} 4.13]\). This means, however,

\[
(d_A^{-1} \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \rho_{j,B})^{-1} = T_A(\rho_j)^{-1} \leq T_A(\rho_j^{-1}),
\]

which gives us that

\[
\| (d_A^{-1} \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \rho_{j,B})^{-1} \|_\infty \leq \| T_A(\rho_j^{-1}) \|_\infty \leq \| \rho_j^{-1} \|_\infty \leq m^{-1}. \tag{49}
\]

Hence, we have that \( \| (d_A^{-1} \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \rho_{j,B})^{-1} \|_\infty \) the minimal eigenvalue of \( d_A^{-1} \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \rho_{j,B} \) is bounded from below by \( m \). From here on the proof is analogous to the one in 2. We obtain \( f_{\hat{c}_1, \hat{c}_2} + \hat{c}_0 h \leq f_{m^{-1}, m^{-1} + m^{-1} h} \) and again use Eq. (49) to get \( f_{m^{-1}, m^{-1} + \hat{c}_0 h} \leq f_{m^{-1}, m^{-1} + m^{-1} h} \).

4. The proof is completely analogous to the one in 4. of Appendix C.

F Proof of Proposition 6.6

1. We begin with the BS-conditional information. The upper bound on \( \tilde{H}_A(\rho_{AB}) \) can be obtained by

\[
\tilde{H}_\rho(\rho_{AB}) = -\tilde{D}(\rho_{AB}, d_A^{-1} \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \rho_B) + \log d_A \leq \log d_A.
\]

where we used the non-negativity of \( \tilde{D}(\cdot, \cdot) \) on quantum states. The bound is attained if one inserts the maximally mixed state, i.e., \( \rho_{AB} = d_A^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{AB} \). For the lower bound we use that \( -\tilde{D}(\cdot, \cdot) \) is jointly concave and \( \text{tr}[] \) linear which means without loss of generality one can assume \( \rho \) to be pure, i.e., a rank one projection. Then

\[
\tilde{H}_{\rho_\psi}(\rho_{AB}) = -\tilde{D}(\rho_{\psi_B}, \mathbb{1}_A \otimes P_B) = - \text{tr} \left[ \rho_{\psi_B} \log \rho_{\psi_B} \right] \frac{1}{2} \left( \mathbb{1}_A \otimes P_B^{-1} \right) \rho_{\psi_B} \frac{1}{2}
\]

\[
= - \text{tr} \left[ \rho_{\psi_B} \left( \mathbb{1}_A \otimes P_B^{-1} \right) \right] = - \text{tr} [P_B P_B^{-1}],
\]

with \( P_B = \text{tr}_A[|\psi\rangle \langle \psi|] \). Employing the Schmidt decomposition to \( |\psi\rangle \langle \psi| \) we find that

\[
P_B = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i^2 P_i
\]
with $P_i$ orthogonal rank one projections on $\mathcal{H}_B$, $\lambda_i^2 > 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i^2 = 1$. Further $d \leq \min\{d_A, d_B\}$ the Schmidt rank. This gives us that

$$\text{tr}[P_B P_B^{-1}] = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i^2 \lambda_i^{-2} = d \leq \min\{d_A, d_B\}.$$ 

Through monotonicity of the logarithm, we obtain the lower bound, i.e.,

$$\hat{H}_\rho(A|B) \geq - \min\{\log d_A, \log d_B\}.$$ 

This bound is attained for $\rho$ a pure state with full Schmidt rank, which can directly be seen from the above calculations.

2. We now tackle the BS-mutual information. The lower bound, i.e. $\hat{D}(\rho||\sigma) \geq 0$ for every pair of states, is a direct consequence of the data processing inequality [41]. Applying $\text{tr}_A[\cdot]$, we find

$$\hat{I}_\rho(A : B) = \hat{D}(\rho_{AB}||\rho_A \otimes \rho_B) \geq \hat{D}(\rho_B||\rho_B) = 0.$$ 

To proof the upper bound, we w.l.o.g assume that $\|\rho_A^{-1}\|_\infty \leq \|\rho_B^{-1}\|_\infty$. We then use that $\rho_A \otimes \rho_B \geq \|\rho_A^{-1}\|_\infty P_{\rho_A} \otimes \rho_B$, where $P_{\rho_A}$ is the projection to the support of $\rho$. This gives us

$$\hat{I}_\rho(A : B) = \hat{D}(\rho_{AB}||\rho_A \otimes \rho_B) \leq \hat{D}(\rho_{AB}||P_{\rho_A} \otimes \rho_B) + \log \|\rho_A^{-1}\|_\infty$$

$$\leq \min\{\log d_A, \log d_B\} + \log \|\rho_A^{-1}\|_\infty$$

In the second equality we used that $(\ker \rho_A) \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \subseteq \ker \rho_{AB}$, so extending $P_{\rho_A}$ to $\mathds{1}_A$ has no effect. With the next example, we will not only see that the bound is tight but also that the scaling is of the order of the given bound. For that purpose let $d_A \in \mathbb{N}$ and a bipartite space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ with $\mathcal{H}_A$ having dimension $d_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$ dimension $d_B = d_A + 1$. Furthermore, let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. We then consider sets of orthonormal vectors $\{|i_A\}_i \subset \mathcal{H}_A$, $\{|i_B\}_i \subset \mathcal{H}_B$ and define

$$|\psi_{AB}\rangle := \sum_{i=1}^{d_A-1} \frac{\varepsilon}{d_A - 1} |i_A\rangle \otimes |i_B\rangle + \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon}\ |(d_A)_{A}\rangle \otimes |(d_A)_{B}\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} \sqrt{\lambda_i} |i_A\rangle \otimes |i_B\rangle ,$$

with the $\lambda_i$ defined accordingly. We find that

$$\rho_A := \text{tr}_B[|\psi_{AB}\rangle \langle \psi_{AB}|] = \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} \lambda_i |i_A\rangle \langle i_A| ,$$

$$\rho_B := \text{tr}_A[|\psi_{AB}\rangle \langle \psi_{AB}|] = \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} \lambda_i |i_B\rangle \langle i_B| ,$$

and the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse (in the case of $P_A$ it is an inverse)

$$\rho_A^{-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} \lambda_i^{-1} |i_A\rangle \langle i_A| ,$$

$$\rho_B^{-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} \lambda_i^{-1} |i_B\rangle \langle i_B| .$$
We find
\[
\text{tr} [\psi_{AB} \rho_{A}^{-1} \otimes \rho_{B}^{-1}] = \sum_{i,j,k,l} \frac{\sqrt{\lambda_i} \sqrt{\lambda_j}}{\lambda_k \lambda_l} \langle i_A|k_A \rangle \langle j_A|l_A \rangle \langle i_B|l_B \rangle \langle j_B|k_B \rangle
\]
\[
= \sum_{i,j,k,l} \frac{\sqrt{\lambda_i} \sqrt{\lambda_j}}{\lambda_k \lambda_l} \delta_{ik} \delta_{kj} \delta_{il} \delta_{lj}
\]
\[
= \sum_{i} \frac{1}{\lambda_i} = \frac{(d_A - 1)^2}{\epsilon} + \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon},
\]
with which, as \(|\psi_{AB}\rangle\langle\psi_{AB}|\) is a rank one projection
\[
\hat{I}_{\psi_{AB} \psi_{AB}}(A : B) = \text{tr} [\psi_{AB} \rho_{A}^{-1} \otimes \rho_{B}^{-1} |\psi_{AB}\rangle\langle\psi_{AB}|^{1/2}]
\]
\[
= \log \text{tr} [\psi_{AB} \rho_{A}^{-1} \otimes \rho_{B}^{-1}]
\]
\[
= \log \left( \frac{(d_A - 1)^2}{\epsilon} + \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon} \right) \geq \log \left( \frac{(d_A - 1)^2}{\epsilon} \right).
\]
We directly obtain \(\|\rho_{A}^{-1}\|_{\infty} = \|\rho_{B}^{-1}\|_{\infty} = \frac{d_A - 1}{\epsilon}\) and by construction \(d_A < d_B\), hence the bound in Eq. (30) gives
\[
\hat{I}_{\psi_{AB} \psi_{AB}}(A : B) \leq \log \left( \frac{d_A (d_A - 1)}{\epsilon} \right). \tag{50}
\]
We first note that for \(\epsilon = 1 - \frac{1}{d_A}\) we get equality in Eq. (50). What is, however, more interesting is the fact that
\[
\log \left( \frac{(d_A - 1)^2}{\epsilon} \right) \leq \hat{I}_{\psi_{AB} \psi_{AB}}(A : B) \leq \log \left( \frac{d_A (d_A - 1)}{\epsilon} \right),
\]
with
\[
\left| \log \left( \frac{d_A (d_A - 1)}{\epsilon} \right) - \log \left( \frac{(d_A - 1)^2}{\epsilon} \right) \right| = \log \left( \frac{d_A}{d_A - 1} \right).
\]
I.e., the error of the bound is of order \(\log \left( \frac{d_A}{d_A - 1} \right)\) independent of the \(\epsilon\). This means, that the scaling behaviour of the bound, in terms of the minimal non-zero eigenvalue of \(\rho_{A}\) and \(\rho_{B}\) respectively is the best one can do.

3. The lower bound of the BS-CMI is again a consequence of the data processing inequality. The upper bound is a direct consequence of the bounds obtained for the BS-conditional information due to the definition of the conditional mutual information in Eq. (4)
\[
\hat{I}_{\rho}(A : B|C) = \hat{H}_{\rho}(A|C) - \hat{H}_{\rho}(A|BC)
\]
\[
\leq \log d_A + \min \{ \log d_A, \log d_{BC} \}
\]
\[
= \min \{ \log d_A^2, \log d_{ABC} \}.
\]
We expect that the tightness of such a bound can be proven in a similar way to the one for the BS-mutual information.
G Behavior of \( g_d \)

Let \( d \in \mathbb{N}, d \geq 2 \). In this section, we study the function \( g_d(0) := 0, g_d(p) := \frac{d}{p^{1/d}} h(p) - \log (1-p^{1/d}) \) for \( p \in (0,1) \). This function appears in some of the continuity bounds in Section 7.6.

**Lemma G.1** Let \( d \in \mathbb{N}, d \geq 2 \). Then, \( \lim_{p \to 0^+} g_d(p) = 0 \). In particular, \( g_d \) is continuous on \( p \in [0,1) \).

**Proof.** Since \( \lim_{p \to 0^+} \log (1-p^{1/d}) = 0 \), we can focus on \( \frac{d}{p^{1/d}} h(p) \). The assertion follows from applying L’Hospital’s rule twice. Indeed,

\[
\lim_{p \to 0^+} \frac{d}{p^{1/d}} h(p) = \lim_{p \to 0^+} \frac{d(\log(1-p) - \log(p))}{p^{1/d-1}} = \lim_{p \to 0^+} \frac{d(-1 - p^{-1})}{(1 - d)p^{1/d-2}/d^2} = \lim_{p \to 0^+} \frac{a^2}{d-1} \left( \frac{p^{2/d-1}}{1-p} + p^{1-1/d} \right) = 0.
\]

Continuity, therefore, follows from the definition of the function.

**Lemma G.2** Let \( d \in \mathbb{N}, d \geq 2 \). Then, the function \( g_d \) is non-increasing on \([0,1/2] \).

**Proof.** We can differentiate \( g_d(p) \) on \((0,1/2) \). This yields

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial p} g_d(p) = \frac{1}{p^{1/d}} \left( \frac{p^{2/d-1}}{d(1-p^{1/d})} + (d-1+p^{-1}) \log(1-p) - (d-1) \log(p) \right) =: \frac{1}{p^{1/d}} g'_d(p).
\]

We will now show monotonicity in \( d \) of \( g'_d(p) \) for all \( p \in (0,1/2) \). This will allow us to show non-negativity of Eq. (51) on \((0,1/2) \) only for \( d = 2 \) and conclude it for all \( d \geq 2 \). We have

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial d} g'_d(p) = \frac{p^{2/d-1} \left( d(p^{1/d} - 1) + (p^{1/d} - 2) \log(p) \right)}{d^3(p^{1/d} - 1)^2} + \log(1-p) + \log(p).
\]

The above is non-negative for \( p \in (0,1/2) \), if

\[
(2 - p^{1/d}) \log \frac{1}{p} \geq d(1-p^{1/d}) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (1 + \frac{1}{1 - p^{1/d}}) \log \frac{1}{p} \geq d
\]

One obtains the last inequality by substitution of \( p = e^{dt} \) with \( t \in (-\infty, -\log(2)/d) \) giving us

\[
-dt \left( 1 + \frac{1}{1 - e^t} \right) \geq d \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad -t(1 + \frac{1}{1 - e^t}) \geq 1
\]

which is true for \( t \in (-\infty, 0) \) hence in particular on \(( -\infty, -\log(2)/d) \). We thereby have that for \( d \geq 2 \) \( p \in (0,1/2) \) \( g'_d(p) \geq g'_2(p) \). It is straightforward to see that \( g'_2(p) \geq 0 \) on \( p \in (0,1/2) \). This finally lets us conclude the claim that \( g_d(p) \) is non-decreasing on \( p \in [0,1/2] \) as \( g_d(p) \) is continuous on \([0,1/2] \) by Lemma G.1.

\(\square\)
Lemma G.3  \textit{Let }d \in \mathbb{N}, d \geq 2. \textit{ Then, the function } p \mapsto \frac{g_d(p)}{1-p} \textit{ is non-increasing on } [0, 1).

\textit{Proof.} The argument follows similar lines as the one in Lemma G.2. We first note that } p \mapsto \frac{1}{1-p} \textit{ is non decreasing on } [0, 1/2) \textit{ and } p \mapsto g_d(p) \textit{ is as well, as proven in Lemma G.2. Hence } p \mapsto \frac{1}{1-p} g_d(p) \textit{ is non decreasing on } [0, 1/2]. \textit{ What now remains to show is that it is non-decreasing on } [1/2, 1). \textit{ We can differentiate the function on the interval } [1/2, 1) \textit{ and obtain}

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial p} \frac{g_d(p)}{1-p} = \frac{p^{-1/d}}{d^2(1-p)(1-p^{1/d})} \left( d^2 p(1-p^{1/d}) \log \frac{1}{p} + p^{2/d} \log \frac{1}{p} - dp(1-p^{1/d}) \log^2 \frac{1}{p} 
\right.
\]
\[
\left. + d(1-p)(1-p^{1/d})(d - \log \frac{1}{p}) \log \frac{1}{1-p} \right) \geq 0.
\]

\textit{The last inequality holds since } p \geq \frac{1}{2} \textit{ and therefore } d \geq \log(2) \geq \log \frac{1}{p}, \textit{ hence}

\[
d^2 p(1-p^{1/d}) \log \frac{1}{p} \geq dp(1-p^{1/d}) \log^2 \frac{1}{p} \]
\[
d - \log \frac{1}{p} \geq 0.
\]

\textit{Thus } p \mapsto \frac{g_d(p)}{1-p} \textit{ is non-decreasing on } [1/2, 1), \textit{ which concludes the assertion.}$