

## S4 Text

### Proof of the block-factorable optimization.

**Definition (block diagonal).** An  $n \times m$  matrix  $\mathbf{A}_{n,m}$  is said to be block diagonal if it can be written as

$$\mathbf{A}_{n,m} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{B}_{s,t} & \mathbf{0}_{s,m-t} \\ \mathbf{0}_{n-s,t} & \mathbf{C}_{n-s,m-t} \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $1 \leq s < n$  and  $1 \leq t < m$ .

We consider sub-matrices of the connectivity matrix CM of the form  $\text{CM}(\pi_{\text{row}}, \pi_{\text{col}})$ , where

$$[\text{CM}(\pi_{\text{row}}, \pi_{\text{col}})]_{i,j} = [\text{CM}]_{\pi_{\text{row}}(i), \pi_{\text{col}}(j)}.$$

**Definition (block factorable).** A mechanism-purview pair  $(M, P)$  is said to be block factorable if there exists a permutation  $\pi_M$  of the mechanism indices and a permutation  $\pi_P$  of the purview indices such that  $\text{CM}(\pi_M, \pi_P)$  is block diagonal (for effect purviews) or  $\text{CM}(\pi_P, \pi_M)$  is block diagonal (for cause purviews).

**Theorem (block reducibility).** If a mechanism-purview pair is block factorable, then it is reducible ( $\varphi = 0$ ).

*Proof.* Consider a mechanism  $M$  constituted of  $n$  elements and a purview  $P$  constituted of  $m$  elements. Assume without loss of generality that  $P$  is an effect purview. Since  $(M, P)$  is block factorable, there exist permutations  $\pi_M$  and  $\pi_P$  such that  $\text{CM}(\pi_M, \pi_P)$  is block diagonal, *i.e.*,

$$\text{CM}(\pi_M, \pi_P) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{B}_{s,t} & \mathbf{0}_{s,m-t} \\ \mathbf{0}_{n-s,t} & \mathbf{C}_{n-s,m-t} \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $1 \leq s < n$  and  $1 \leq t < m$ .

We define a mechanism-purview partition

$$c := \frac{M_1}{P_1} \times \frac{M_2}{P_2}$$

that cuts edges from  $M_1$  to  $P_2$  and from  $M_2$  to  $P_1$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 &= \{ \pi_M(i) \mid 1 \leq i < s + 1 \} \\ M_2 &= \{ \pi_M(i) \mid s + 1 \leq i < n + 1 \} \\ P_1 &= \{ \pi_P(i) \mid 1 \leq i < t + 1 \} \\ P_2 &= \{ \pi_P(i) \mid t + 1 \leq i < m + 1 \} \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $[\text{CM}(\pi_M, \pi_P)]_{i,j} = 0$  if either  $i \in M_1$  and  $j \in P_2$  or  $i \in M_2$  and  $j \in P_1$ . Thus there are no edges cut by  $c$ , and it leaves the subsystem's TPM unchanged.

Since the effect repertoire of a mechanism-purview combination is a function of the subsystem's TPM, the unpartitioned effect repertoire,  $\text{ER}(M, P)$  and the partitioned repertoire  $\text{ER}_c(M, P)$  are identical.

By definition,  $\varphi_c(M, P)$  is the distance between  $\text{ER}(M, P)$  and  $\text{ER}_c(M, P)$ , so  $\varphi_c(M, P) = 0$ . Now, by definition,

$$\varphi(M, P) = \min_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \varphi_p(M, P),$$

where  $\mathbb{P}$  is the set of all partitions of  $(M, P)$ . Since  $\varphi_c(M, P) = 0$ , by the non-negativity of metrics we have  $\varphi(M, P) = 0$ . ■