

Non-Commutative Blahut-Arimoto Algorithms

Navneeth Ramakrishnan,^{1,*} Raban Iten,^{2,*} Volkher B. Scholz,³ and Mario Berta¹

¹*Department of Computing, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom*

²*Institute for Theoretical Physics, ETH Zurich, Switzerland*

³*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium*

We generalize alternating optimization algorithms of Blahut-Arimoto type to the quantum setting. In particular, we give iterative algorithms to compute the mutual information of quantum channels, the Holevo quantity of classical-quantum channels, the coherent information of less noisy quantum channels, and the thermodynamic capacity of quantum channels. Our convergence analysis is based on quantum entropy inequalities and leads to *a priori* additive ε -approximations after $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-1} \log N)$ iterations, where N denotes the input dimension of the channel. We complement our analysis with an *a posteriori* stopping criterion which allows us to terminate the algorithm after significantly fewer iterations compared to the *a priori* criterion in numerical examples. Finally, we discuss heuristics to accelerate the convergence.

I. INTRODUCTION

In quantum information theory, many quantities of interest are given by convex optimization problems that can often not be solved analytically. Consequently, numerical tools that provably find approximate solutions in an efficient manner are sought after. In our work, we are primarily interested in the efficient calculation of entropic channel capacity formulas from quantum Shannon theory—while giving rigorous guarantees on the approximation error dependent on the number of steps in the algorithm. For example, by the Holevo-Schumacher-Westmoreland theorem the classical capacity of classical-quantum (cq) channels is given by the Holevo quantity [19, 39]. This then represents a convex optimization problem over the set of input probability distributions. Various methods to approximate the solution of such convex optimization problems in quantum information theory have been proposed in the literature [14–16, 18, 25, 31, 35, 40, 42, 43, 52]. In this work, we study alternating optimization algorithms and give quantum extensions of the Blahut-Arimoto algorithm from classical information theory [2, 5]. Blahut-Arimoto type algorithms are specifically tailored for entropic problems and have analytic convergence guarantees derived from entropy inequalities (see [7, 12, 23, 32, 36, 44, 46] for classical extensions of the original works). Accelerated Blahut-Arimoto algorithms with faster analytical and numerical convergence are also known [30, 33, 38, 51]. For classical-quantum problems, Nagaoka [31] also proposed a Blahut-Arimoto type algorithm for computing the classical capacity of cq channels but did not provide a convergence speed and complexity analysis. Notably, already for the classical setting, Nagaoka’s algorithm is different from the original works [2, 5].

II. OVERVIEW OF RESULTS

The starting point of our work is to generalize Nagaoka’s aforementioned algorithm to a generic non-commutative form such that it can not only handle classical-quantum problems but also fully quantum problems. An overview of our results is given in Table I and features the computation of the Holevo quantity of cq channels (Section IV), the thermodynamic capacity of quantum channels

* These authors contributed equally to this work.

Channels	Quantity	Time Complexity
$X \rightarrow Y$	Mutual information $I(\mathcal{E})$	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{ X Y \log X }{\varepsilon}\right)$
$X \rightarrow B$	Holevo quantity $\chi(\mathcal{E})$	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(B ^3+ B ^2 X)\log X }{\varepsilon} + X B ^3\right)$
$A \rightarrow B$	Thermodynamic capacity $T_{\Gamma}(\mathcal{E})$	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(A ^3+ A ^2 B ^2+ B ^3)\log A }{\varepsilon}\right)$
$A \rightarrow B$	Coherent information $I_{\text{coh}}(\mathcal{E})$	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(A ^3+ B ^3+K^3+ A ^2(B ^2+K^2))\log A }{\varepsilon}\right)$
$A \rightarrow B$	Quantum mutual information $I(\mathcal{E})$	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(A ^3+ B ^3+K^3+ A ^2(B ^2+K^2))\log A }{\varepsilon}\right)$

TABLE I. Summary of the Blahut-Arimoto algorithms discussed in this work, with the overall asymptotic worst case complexity for an additive ε -approximation. X and Y refer to classical registers while A and B refer to quantum registers. The complexity for the classical case is the same as in the original works [2, 5]. The classical-quantum case was first proposed in [31]—without an analysis of the convergence speed and complexity. For the coherent information of quantum channels, we require the channel \mathcal{E} to lie in the class of less noisy channels. The Kraus rank of \mathcal{E} is denoted by $K \leq |A||B|$.

(Section V), the coherent information of less noisy quantum channels (Section VI), and the mutual information of quantum channels (Section VII). As special cases of the thermodynamic capacity, the minimal entropy gain [1, 20, 21] and the completely bounded minimal conditional entropy [11] are covered as well.

The algorithms and the convergence proofs are based on the quantum relative entropy $D(\rho||\sigma) = \text{Tr}[\rho(\log\rho - \log\sigma)]$ (see Section III for details)¹ and inequalities satisfied by the relative entropy under the action of channels. The most well-known of these inequalities is the data processing inequality which states that $\forall\rho, \sigma$ we have $D(\mathcal{E}(\rho)||\mathcal{E}(\sigma)) \leq D(\rho||\sigma)$. The number of iterations required by our algorithm to obtain an *a priori* error of ε is $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log N}{\varepsilon}\right)$, where N is the input dimension. Moreover, one can construct an accelerated version of the algorithm similar to the classical case [30, 33]. The accelerated version lowers the number of iterations by a constant factor compared to the standard version and hence, the asymptotic results given Table I are not affected by this. It also gives rise to heuristics that provide a significant speed-up of the algorithm in practical instances as shown in Figures 1, 2, 3 and 4.

To compare with previous work for the classical-quantum case, the algorithm given by Sutter *et al.* [42]—based on convex programming duality and smoothing techniques—has a time complexity of

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon^{-1} \max\{|X|, |B|\}|B|^3\sqrt{\log|X|}\right) \text{ versus our } \mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon^{-1}(|B|^3 + |B|^2|X|)\log|X| + |X||B|^3\right). \quad (1)$$

This suggests that our iterative algorithm is faster for the regime $|B| \gg |X|$ but slower for $|X| \gg |B|$ in the worst case. For other algorithms that compute the Holevo quantity, there is often no explicit complexity analysis given. Comparing with the relative entropy optimization work of Fawzi and Fawzi [14]—based on semi-definite approximations of the matrix logarithm [15]—our numerics suggest that for the specific optimization problems considered here, Blahut-Arimoto type algorithms converge faster (Section IV C). We emphasize that while the advantage of Blahut-Arimoto type algorithms might be explained by their conformity to the specific structure of entropy optimization problems, the method presented in [14] is applicable for a wider range of problems. The *a priori* bound on the error corresponds to the worst case and the number of iterations required is extremely conservative for most problems. Hence, we adapt classical techniques [46]

¹ Here and henceforth, any quantum definition applies to classical probability distributions as well, by embedding them as matrices diagonal in some prefixed basis.

to find *a posteriori* error bounds on the capacity estimate at each iteration of the algorithm (see also [28]). This error bound can then be used as a termination criterion for our numerics as described in Sections IV C, V C, VI C and VII C. We notice that for the channels and capacities we consider, the *a posteriori* error is achieved in significantly fewer iterations compared to the *a priori* requirement. One of the explanations for this speedup is that the convergence of our algorithm can be exponentially fast in certain cases. Specifically, when the quantum relative entropy inequalities used by our convergence proof are strict inequalities, one can show (see Proposition III.6 for more details) that the error in the capacity estimate after the $(t + 1)^{\text{th}}$ iteration for a channel with input dimension N is bounded by $(1 - \delta)^t \log N$ for some $\delta > 0$. We provide sufficient conditions for exponential convergence in Sections IV, V, VI and VII.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. We first give the general structure and convergence proof of Blahut-Arimoto alternating optimization algorithms in Section III and then discuss in more detail the classical-quantum case (incorporating the classical case) in Section IV, the thermodynamic capacity of fully quantum channels in Section V, the coherent information of less noisy channels in Section VI and the mutual information of quantum channels in Section VII. Numerical results are provided for the different cases in Sections IV C, V C, VI C and VII C, respectively. Finally, we discuss some conclusions and give an outlook on further work (Section VIII).

III. STRUCTURE OF QUANTUM BLAHUT-ARIMOTO ALGORITHMS

A. Notation

We label Hilbert spaces (which are assumed to be finite-dimensional) with capital letters e.g. A , B , and denote their dimension by $|A|$, $|B|$, and so on. The set of density operators on a system A , i.e., positive semi-definite matrices ρ_A with $\text{Tr}[\rho_A] = 1$, is denoted $\mathcal{D}(A)$. Whenever we work with a single system, we may omit the sub-index referring to the system. A quantum channel $\mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow B}$ is a linear completely positive trace-preserving map that maps density operators on a system A to density operators on a system B . For simplicity, we may write \mathcal{E} instead of $\mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow B}$ if the input and output systems of the channel are clear from the context. The complementary channel $\mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow E}^c$ of a channel $\mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow B}$ is defined via taking the partial trace over B of the Stinespring dilation $U_{A \rightarrow BE}$ of $\mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow B}$.

For a density operator ρ , the von Neumann entropy is defined as $S(\rho) = -\text{Tr}[\rho \log \rho]$ and for density operators ρ, σ the quantum relative entropy is defined as

$$D(\rho \parallel \sigma) = \begin{cases} \text{Tr}[\rho (\log \rho - \log \sigma)] & \text{if } \sigma \gg \rho \\ \infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where the notation $\sigma \gg \rho$ denotes that the kernel of σ is a subset of the kernel of ρ (i.e., $\ker(\sigma) \subseteq \ker(\rho)$), and where we take the logarithm only on the support of the argument. We also work with discrete probability distributions, which we represent as vectors $\lambda = [\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m]$ with $\sum_i \lambda_i = 1$ or alternatively as diagonal matrices with entries $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m$ i.e., $\rho_\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i |i\rangle\langle i|$ in some pre-defined basis. The definition of the von Neumann entropy and the quantum relative entropy then simplifies for probability distributions to the Shannon entropy and the Kullback-Leibler divergence, respectively.

B. Blahut-Arimoto type

In the following we study a special entropic type of alternating optimization algorithms, called Blahut-Arimoto algorithms [2, 5]². The channel capacities we are interested in are typically given as a convex optimization problem over input states. One may write an extension function J in two variables such that the maximization over both variables gives back the capacity of the channel. Performing the maximizations iteratively leads to an algorithm of the following form.

Algorithm 1 Blahut-Arimoto algorithm: Iterative double optimization over density operators

1: Inputs:

- Initial guess $\rho_A^{(1)} \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ with full support, i.e., $\rho_A^{(1)} > 0$
- Function $J_\gamma : \mathcal{D}(A) \times \mathcal{D}(B) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ with a coefficient $\gamma > 0$
- Update relations $\mathcal{F}_1 : \mathcal{D}(A) \mapsto \mathcal{D}(B)$ and $\mathcal{F}_2 : \mathcal{D}(B) \mapsto \mathcal{D}(A)$
- Number of iteration steps n

2: **for** $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ **do**

3: $\sigma_B^{(t)} = \mathcal{F}_1 \left(\rho_A^{(t)} \right)$

4: $\rho_A^{(t+1)} = \mathcal{F}_2 \left(\sigma_B^{(t)} \right)$

5: **end for**

6: Outputs: $\rho_A^{(n+1)}$, $C(n) = J_\gamma \left(\rho_A^{(n+1)}, \sigma_B^{(n)} \right)$,

where $C(n)$ should approximate $C^* = \max_{\rho_A, \sigma_B} J_\gamma(\rho_A, \sigma_B)$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition III.1 (Blahut-Arimoto) *Algorithm 1 together with the following conditions on J , \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 defines a quantum Blahut-Arimoto algorithm: For $\gamma > 0$ and density operators $\sigma \gg \rho$,*

$$J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma) = -\gamma D(\rho||\sigma) + \text{Tr} [\rho \mathcal{F}(\sigma)] \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (3)$$

where \mathcal{F} is a Hermitian matrix valued super-operator on density operators such that $\text{Tr} [\rho \mathcal{F}(\sigma)]$ is continuous in σ for $\sigma \gg \rho$. The update rules are then given by

$$\mathcal{F}_1(\rho) = \arg \max_{\sigma \text{ with } \sigma \gg \rho} J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma), \quad \mathcal{F}_2(\sigma) = \arg \max_{\rho \text{ with } \rho \gg \sigma} J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma). \quad (4)$$

Now, under certain conditions we can find analytic expressions for the optimizers in (4).³

Lemma III.2 (Update rules) *For quantum Blahut-Arimoto algorithms with*

$$\text{Tr} [\rho \{ \mathcal{F}(\sigma) - \mathcal{F}(\rho) \}] \leq \gamma D(\rho||\sigma) \quad \text{for density operators } \sigma \gg \rho, \quad (5)$$

the update rules appearing in Algorithm 1 are of the form

$$\mathcal{F}_1(\rho) = \rho, \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_2(\sigma) = \frac{1}{Z(\sigma)} \exp \left(\log \sigma + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathcal{F}(\sigma) \right) \quad \text{with } Z(\sigma) = \text{Tr} \left[\exp \left(\log \sigma + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathcal{F}(\sigma) \right) \right] \quad (7)$$

for density operators ρ and $\sigma > 0$.

² In the broader context of numerical optimization, Blahut-Arimoto algorithms can be viewed as a proximal point method that maximizes a function iteratively with a penalty term if the current guess moves away from the previous guess [30, 33].

³ We can choose any optimizer in the above optimizations if there is not a unique one.

Proof. By (5) together with the definition in (3), we find

$$J_\gamma(\rho, \rho) = \text{Tr}[\rho \mathcal{F}(\rho)] \geq \text{Tr}[\rho \mathcal{F}(\sigma)] - \gamma D(\rho||\sigma) = J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma) \quad \text{for density operators } \sigma \gg \rho. \quad (8)$$

Hence, the first update rule is given by

$$\mathcal{F}_1(\rho) = \arg \max_{\sigma \gg \rho} J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma) = \rho. \quad (9)$$

For the second update rule we assume that $\sigma > 0$ and hence the optimizer ρ can be chosen from the set of density operators. The form of the optimizer follows directly from Gibbs' variational principle (Lemma A.1). To see this, we write for $\sigma > 0$,

$$\arg \max_{\rho} J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma) = \arg \max_{\rho} -\text{Tr}[\rho \log \rho] + \text{Tr} \left[\rho \left\{ \log \sigma + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathcal{F}(\sigma) \right\} \right]. \quad (10)$$

Setting $\omega = \rho$ and $H = \log \sigma + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathcal{F}(\sigma)$ in Lemma A.1 leads to the claimed form of the second update rule. ■

The next theorem shows convergence of quantum Blahut-Arimoto algorithms under some technical assumptions (which will be satisfied for the applications in Sections IV-VI).

Theorem III.3 (Convergence) *For quantum Blahut-Arimoto algorithms together with a strictly positive definite initial state $\rho^{(1)} > 0$ on a system A and*

$$0 \leq \text{Tr}[\rho \{\mathcal{F}(\sigma) - \mathcal{F}(\rho)\}] \leq \gamma D(\rho||\sigma) \quad \text{for density operators } \sigma \gg \rho, \quad (11)$$

we have that $C(n)$ of Algorithm 1 is monotonically increasing and converges for $n \rightarrow \infty$ to

$$C^* = \max_{\rho, \sigma \text{ with } \sigma \gg \rho} J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma) \quad (12)$$

with the approximation error bounded as

$$|C^* - C(n)| \leq \frac{\gamma D(\rho^*||\rho^{(1)})}{n}, \quad (13)$$

where ρ^ is the optimizer (possibly not unique) that achieves the capacity C^* . If $\rho^{(1)}$ is chosen to be the maximally mixed state, the approximation error is bounded as $|C^* - C(n)| \leq \frac{\gamma \log |A|}{n}$.*

Proof. Let $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\rho^{(t)} \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ be a density operator in the t -th iteration step of Algorithm 1. Note that $\rho^{(t)} > 0$ for all t , since the exponentiation of a matrix in the update rule (7) ensures full support. First, using the update rules given in (6) and in (7), and setting $Z^{(t+1)} = Z(\rho^{(t)})$, we find

$$C(t) = J_\gamma(\rho^{(t+1)}, \sigma^{(t)} = \rho^{(t)}) \quad (14)$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left[\rho^{(t+1)} \left[-\gamma \log \rho^{(t+1)} + \gamma \log \rho^{(t)} + \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)}) \right] \right] \quad (15)$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left[\rho^{(t+1)} \left[-\gamma \left\{ \log \rho^{(t)} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)}) - \log Z^{(t+1)} \right\} + \gamma \log \rho^{(t)} + \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)}) \right] \right] \quad (16)$$

$$= \gamma \log Z^{(t+1)}. \quad (17)$$

Let $\rho^* = \arg \max_{\rho} J_\gamma(\rho, \rho)$, and note that $C^* = J_\gamma(\rho^*, \rho^*) = \text{Tr}[\rho^* \mathcal{F}(\rho^*)]$. Using $C(t) = \gamma \log Z^{(t+1)}$, we derive an upper bound on the additive error at the iteration step t

$$\text{Tr} \left[\rho^* (\log \rho^{(t+1)} - \log \rho^{(t)}) \right] = -\frac{1}{\gamma} C(t) + \frac{1}{\gamma} \text{Tr} \left[\rho^* \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)}) \right] \quad (18)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(C^* - C(t) + \text{Tr} \left[\rho^* \left\{ \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)}) - \mathcal{F}(\rho^*) \right\} \right] \right) \quad (19)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{\gamma} |C^* - C(t)|, \quad (20)$$

where we used the assumption (11) of the lemma in the last step and that $C^* \geq C(t)$, since $C^* = J_\gamma(\rho^*, \rho^*) = \max_{\rho, \sigma \text{ with } \sigma \gg \rho} J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma)$ is the maximum value that J_γ can achieve. The sum over the additive error terms is upper bounded by a telescopic sum, which can itself be upper bounded as follows

$$\sum_{t=1}^k \text{Tr} \left[\rho^* \left(\log \rho^{(t+1)} - \log \rho^{(t)} \right) \right] = \text{Tr} \left[\rho^* \left(\log \rho^{(k+1)} - \log \rho^{(1)} \right) \right] \quad (21)$$

$$= D(\rho^* \parallel \rho^{(1)}) - D(\rho^* \parallel \rho^{(k+1)}) \quad (22)$$

$$\leq D(\rho^* \parallel \rho^{(1)}), \quad (23)$$

where we used the positivity of the quantum relative entropy in the last inequality. We conclude

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} |C^* - C(t)| \leq \gamma D(\rho^* \parallel \rho^{(1)}), \quad (24)$$

and since $D(\rho^* \parallel \rho^{(1)})$ is finite for $\rho^{(1)} \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ with full support, $C(n)$ converges to C^* for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, $C(n)$ increases monotonically in n by construction of the updated states as optimizers in Lemma III.2. Together with (24), this implies the error bound stated in the theorem. ■

The value of the parameter γ appearing in Definition III.1 corresponds to accelerated versions of the Blahut-Arimoto algorithm and hence, γ should be chosen as small as possible. However, to have provable convergence, γ is lower bounded by the requirement in Theorem III.3 that (11) is satisfied. The standard algorithm uses the data processing inequality for the quantum relative entropy to find a γ satisfying (11), whereas the accelerated algorithm uses relative entropy coefficients similar to (36) to establish tight lower bounds on γ . Note that calculating these coefficients is itself a difficult optimization problem and may be intractable for many channels. However, as a heuristic, we may still introduce an adaptive acceleration parameter $\gamma^{(t)}$ at each iteration, similar to the classical case [30].

Remark III.4 (Acceleration heuristic) For $D(\rho^{(t)} \parallel \rho^{(t-1)}) \neq 0$, define an adaptive acceleration parameter

$$\gamma^{(t+1)} = \frac{\text{Tr} \left[\rho^{(t)} \left\{ \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t-1)}) - \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)}) \right\} \right]}{D(\rho^{(t)} \parallel \rho^{(t-1)})}. \quad (25)$$

This adaptive acceleration parameter may be used when strict lower bounds on γ cannot be calculated. The proof of convergence from Theorem III.3 no longer holds since the capacity estimate does not necessarily increase monotonically when the adaptive acceleration method is used. Nevertheless, we find in practice that the adaptive acceleration heuristic provides a significant speed-up (see Figures 1, 2, 3 and 4).

Finally, regardless of whether we use the adaptive acceleration parameter or otherwise, the following proposition allows us to terminate the algorithm when the *a posteriori* error is sufficiently small (see also [28]).

Proposition III.5 (Termination criteria) For quantum Blahut-Arimoto algorithms that satisfy (11) let us denote the largest eigenvalue of $\mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)})$ by $\alpha_{\max}^{(t)}$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, we have

$$C(t) \leq C^* \leq \alpha_{\max}^{(t)} \quad (26)$$

with $C^* = \max_{\rho, \sigma \text{ with } \sigma \gg \rho} J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma)$. Hence, in particular, $|C^* - C(t)| \leq \alpha_{\max}^{(t)} - C(t)$ provides a bound on the a posteriori error.

Proof. For any $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\text{Tr} [\rho^* (\mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)}) - \mathcal{F}(\rho^*))] \geq 0$ from (11), where ρ^* is the optimizer (possibly not unique) that achieves the capacity C^* . Therefore, there must exist at least one eigenvalue $\alpha_i^{(t)}$ of $\mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)})$ that satisfies $\alpha_i^{(t)} \geq \text{Tr} [\rho^* \mathcal{F}(\rho^*)] = C^*$. In particular, $\alpha_{\max}^{(t)} \geq C^*$. Noting that $C(t) \leq C^*$ finishes the proof. ■

In particular, if $\rho^{(t)}$ converges to a full rank optimizer ρ^* , then we may take the logarithm on both sides of (7) to show that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{\max}^{(t)} = C^*$. This shows that the a posteriori criterion is indeed achieved for some sufficiently large t for full rank optimizers. Next, we show in the following proposition that under certain technical conditions, the speed of convergence is exponential.

Proposition III.6 (Exponential convergence) For quantum Blahut-Arimoto algorithms satisfying (11) with $a > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{\rho \neq \sigma} \frac{\text{Tr} [\rho \{ \mathcal{F}(\sigma) - \mathcal{F}(\rho) \}]}{D(\rho || \sigma)} = a \quad \text{for density operators } \sigma \gg \rho, \quad (27)$$

there exists a unique optimizer ρ^* with $C^* = J_\gamma(\rho^*, \rho^*)$, and the algorithm converges exponentially fast. That is, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$C^* - C(t+1) \leq \gamma (1 - \delta)^t D(\rho^* || \rho^{(1)}), \quad (28)$$

where $\delta = \frac{a}{\gamma} > 0$. Moreover, when $\rho^{(1)}$ is chosen to be the maximally mixed state, we obtain $C^* - C(t+1) \leq \gamma (1 - \delta)^t \log |A|$.

Proof. We first establish the uniqueness of the optimizer. From (18) and (19) in the proof of Theorem III.3, we have

$$D(\rho^* || \rho^{(t)}) - D(\rho^* || \rho^{(t+1)}) = \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(C^* - C(t) + \text{Tr} \left[\rho^* \left\{ \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)}) - \mathcal{F}(\rho^*) \right\} \right] \right) \quad (29)$$

$$\geq \frac{a}{\gamma} D(\rho^* || \rho^{(t)}) \quad (30)$$

$$\implies D(\rho^* || \rho^{(t+1)}) \leq \left(1 - \frac{a}{\gamma} \right) D(\rho^* || \rho^{(t)}). \quad (31)$$

Note that (31) implies that there is a unique optimizer ρ^* since this inequality holds for each t . To see this, we can use standard arguments together with Pinsker's inequality [48, Theorem 5.38] to bound the quantum relative entropy by the trace distance, which satisfies the triangle inequality. From (11) and (19), we find

$$C^* - C(t) \leq \gamma (D(\rho^* || \rho^{(t)}) - D(\rho^* || \rho^{(t+1)})) \quad (32)$$

$$\leq \gamma D(\rho^* || \rho^{(t)}). \quad (33)$$

Noting that this argument holds for all t finishes the proof. ■

IV. HOLEVO QUANTITY OF CLASSICAL QUANTUM CHANNELS

A. Definitions

Here we consider how to compute the capacity of cq channels, as given by the Holevo quantity. A cq channel can be described by a set of input-output pairs $\{(x, \tau_x)\}_{x \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}}$, i.e., the channel takes $x \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ as an input and provides the quantum states $\tau_x \in \mathcal{D}(B)$ as outputs. Alternatively, we may consider cq channels as quantum channels $\mathcal{E}_{X \rightarrow B}$ with $|X| = N$, defined by the completely positive trace-preserving mapping $\mathcal{E}_{X \rightarrow B} : \rho_X \mapsto \sum_x \langle x | \rho_X | x \rangle (\tau_x)_B$. Restricting the quantum channel to the classical input states $|x\rangle\langle x|_X$ then gives us back the original cq channel. For an input distribution vector λ , the output of the cq channel corresponds to

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho_\lambda) = \sum_x \lambda_x \mathcal{E}(|x\rangle\langle x|) = \sum_x \lambda_x \tau_x, \quad (34)$$

where λ_i denotes the i -th component of the probability vector λ and $\rho_\lambda = \sum_k \lambda_k |k\rangle\langle k|$. As shown by Holevo, Schumacher and Westmoreland [19, 39], the classical capacity of a cq channel is given by the Holevo quantity

$$\chi(\mathcal{E}) = \max_\lambda \underbrace{\sum_i \lambda_i \text{Tr} [\tau_{\mathcal{E},i} \{\log \tau_{\mathcal{E},i} - \log \mathcal{E}(\rho_\lambda)\}]}_{=I(\lambda, \mathcal{E})} \quad \text{with } \tau_{\mathcal{E},i} = \mathcal{E}(|i\rangle\langle i|), \quad (35)$$

where $I(\lambda, \mathcal{E})$ is the mutual information between the input and output registers.

B. Blahut-Arimoto algorithm

The following algorithm to compute the Holevo quantity is a quantum Blahut-Arimoto algorithm and was first proposed by Nagaoka [31]. Similar to the classical case [30], we will show that one can accelerate the convergence of Blahut-Arimoto type algorithms. To do so, we will use the contraction coefficient of relative entropy [26], given for a channel \mathcal{E} as

$$\eta_{\text{con}}(\mathcal{E}) = \sup_{\rho \neq \sigma} \frac{D(\mathcal{E}(\rho) \| \mathcal{E}(\sigma))}{D(\rho \| \sigma)} \in [0, 1]. \quad (36)$$

Note that $0 \leq \eta_{\text{con}}(\mathcal{E}) \leq 1$ by the nonnegativity of relative entropy and by the data processing inequality. We now define the following two variable extension of the mutual information for $\gamma \in [\eta_{\text{con}}(\mathcal{E}), 1]$.

$$J_\gamma(\lambda, \mu, \mathcal{E}) = -\gamma D(\lambda \| \mu) + \sum_i \lambda_i \text{Tr} [\tau_{\mathcal{E},i} \{\log \tau_{\mathcal{E},i} - \log \mathcal{E}(\rho_\mu)\}] \quad (37)$$

$$= I(\lambda, \mathcal{E}) - \gamma D(\lambda \| \mu) + D(\mathcal{E}(\rho_\lambda) \| \mathcal{E}(\rho_\mu)), \quad (38)$$

where $\rho_\lambda = \sum_k \lambda_k |k\rangle\langle k|$, $\rho_\mu = \sum_k \mu_k |k\rangle\langle k|$ (with $\rho_\mu \gg \rho_\lambda$) and $\tau_{\mathcal{E},i} = \mathcal{E}(|i\rangle\langle i|)$. Note that $\gamma = 1$ corresponds to the standard algorithm and if it is known that $\eta_{\text{con}}(\mathcal{E}) < 1$, then one may accelerate the algorithm. The condition $\eta_{\text{con}}(\mathcal{E}) < 1$ implies that $\forall \rho \neq \sigma$, $D(\mathcal{E}(\rho) \| \mathcal{E}(\sigma)) < D(\rho \| \sigma)$ i.e. the map strictly decreases the relative entropy. We then bring J_γ into the form

$$J_\gamma = -\gamma \text{Tr} [\rho_\lambda \log \rho_\lambda] + \text{Tr} [\rho_\lambda (\gamma \log \rho_\mu + \mathcal{F}(\rho_\mu))] \quad \text{with} \quad (39)$$

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho_\mu) = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| \text{Tr} [\tau_{\mathcal{E},i} (\log \tau_{\mathcal{E},i} - \log \mathcal{E}(\rho_\mu))] . \quad (40)$$

Note that $\text{Tr}[\rho_\lambda \mathcal{F}(\rho_\mu)]$ is continuous for all $\rho_\mu \gg \rho_\lambda$, since for $\lambda_i \neq 0$, we have $\mu_i \neq 0$ and hence $\ker[\mathcal{E}(\rho_\mu)] = \ker[\sum \mu_k \tau_{\mathcal{E},k}] \subset \ker[\tau_{\mathcal{E},i}]$. Further, a calculation shows

$$\text{Tr}[\rho_\lambda \{\mathcal{F}(\rho_\mu) - \mathcal{F}(\rho_\lambda)\}] = D(\mathcal{E}(\rho_\lambda) \parallel \mathcal{E}(\rho_\mu)) \text{ and hence} \quad (41)$$

$$0 \leq \text{Tr}[\rho_\lambda \{\mathcal{F}(\rho_\mu) - \mathcal{F}(\rho_\lambda)\}] \leq \gamma D(\rho_\lambda \parallel \rho_\mu), \quad (42)$$

where we used the nonnegativity of the quantum relative entropy in the last inequality (together with $\gamma \in [\eta_{\text{con}}(\mathcal{E}), 1]$). From Lemma III.2 whose requirement is satisfied by (42), we find a double optimization form of the capacity $\chi(\mathcal{E})$

$$\max_{\lambda, \mu \text{ with } \rho_\mu \gg \rho_\lambda} J_\gamma(\lambda, \mu, \mathcal{E}) = \max_\lambda J_\gamma(\lambda, \lambda, \mathcal{E}) = \max_\lambda I(\lambda, \mathcal{E}) = \chi(\mathcal{E}). \quad (43)$$

Performing the two maximizations in $\max_{\lambda, \mu} J_\gamma(\lambda, \mu, \mathcal{E})$ iteratively, leads to the following algorithm (see Lemma III.2 for the form of the update rules), which provably converges to the Holevo quantity by Theorem III.3. A detailed analysis of the time complexity can be found in Appendix B 1.

Algorithm 2 Accelerated Blahut-Arimoto algorithm for the Holevo quantity

- 1: Inputs: cq channel $\mathcal{E}_{X \rightarrow B}$ (given as a lookup table whose i -th entry is $\tau_{\mathcal{E},i} = \mathcal{E}(|i\rangle\langle i|)$), acceleration coefficient $\gamma \in [\eta_{\text{con}}(\mathcal{E}), 1]$, and additive error $\varepsilon > 0$
 - 2: Choose $\lambda_i^{(1)} = \frac{1}{|X|}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, |X|\}$
 - 3: **for** $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, n = \lceil \gamma \log |X| / \varepsilon \rceil\}$ **do**
 - 4: $\lambda_i^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{Z^{(t+1)}} \lambda_i^{(t)} \exp\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} D(\tau_{\mathcal{E},i} \parallel \mathcal{E}(\rho_{\lambda^{(t)}}))\right)$, where $\rho_{\lambda^{(t)}} = \sum_k \lambda_k^{(t)} |k\rangle\langle k|$, $\tau_{\mathcal{E},i} = \mathcal{E}(|i\rangle\langle i|)$ and $Z^{(t+1)} = \sum_i \lambda_i^{(t)} \exp\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} D(\tau_{\mathcal{E},i} \parallel \mathcal{E}(\rho_{\lambda^{(t)}}))\right)$
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: Outputs: $\lambda^{(n+1)}$, $C(n) = J_\gamma(\lambda^{(n+1)}, \lambda^{(n)}, \mathcal{E})$ with $|\chi(\mathcal{E}) - C(n)| \leq \varepsilon$
-

Remark IV.1 (Concavity) *The function $J_\gamma(\lambda, \mu, \mathcal{E}) = -\gamma \text{Tr}[\rho_\lambda \log \rho_\lambda] + \text{Tr}[\rho_\lambda (\gamma \log \rho_\mu + \mathcal{F}(\rho_\mu))]$ is concave in λ (for fixed μ). This follows from the concavity of the von Neumann entropy and by noting that the second term is linear in λ . In contrast to the two-variable function used in the classical Blahut-Arimoto algorithm [2, 5], the function J_γ is not concave in μ . To see this, consider the classical channel given by the stochastic matrix*

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 1 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (44)$$

$\lambda = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0)$, $\mu_1 = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0)$, and $\mu_2 = (\frac{1}{2}, 1/4, 1/4)$. Indeed, for $a = 0.7$ we have $J_1(\lambda, a\mu_1 + (1-a)\mu_2, \mathcal{E}) < aJ_1(\lambda, \mu_1, \mathcal{E}) + (1-a)J_1(\lambda, \mu_2, \mathcal{E})$ showing that the function is not concave. On the other hand, for $a = 0.3$ we have $J_1(\lambda, a\mu_1 + (1-a)\mu_2, \mathcal{E}) > aJ_1(\lambda, \mu_1, \mathcal{E}) + (1-a)J_1(\lambda, \mu_2, \mathcal{E})$ showing that the function is not convex either.

Arimoto [2] showed in the classical case that if the optimizer that achieves the capacity is unique and full rank, there exists an integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $t > N$, the convergence rate is exponential. That is, for $t > N$, there exists $0 < \delta \leq 1$ such that

$$D(\lambda^* \parallel \lambda^{(t)}) \leq (1 - \delta)^{(t-N)} D(\lambda^* \parallel \lambda^{(N)}) \quad (45)$$

Li and Cai [28] show an analogous result for cq channels. Here we provide a different criterion that yields exponential convergence from the first iteration albeit with a stronger assumption. First, similar to (36), we define the relative entropy expansion coefficient as

$$\eta_{\text{exp}}(\mathcal{E}) = \inf \frac{D(\mathcal{E}(\rho) \parallel \mathcal{E}(\sigma))}{D(\rho \parallel \sigma)} \text{ for } \sigma \gg \rho \text{ and } \sigma \neq \rho. \quad (46)$$

Note that $\eta_{\text{exp}}(\mathcal{E}) \in [0, 1]$ by the nonnegativity of relative entropy and by the data processing inequality. Using (41), we see that when the coefficient $\eta_{\text{exp}}(\mathcal{E}) > 0$, we get exponential convergence according to Proposition III.6 with $\delta = \frac{\eta_{\text{exp}}(\mathcal{E})}{\gamma}$. A consequence of the condition $\eta_{\text{exp}}(\mathcal{E}) > 0$ is that $\forall \rho \neq \sigma$, $D(\mathcal{E}(\rho) || \mathcal{E}(\sigma)) \neq 0$ and hence $\mathcal{E}(\rho) \neq \mathcal{E}(\sigma)$ i.e. the map is injective.

C. Simulation results




FIG. 1. Convergence of the standard and adaptive accelerated Blahut-Arimoto algorithm to the Holevo quantity of a random cq channel with input alphabet of size 10 and output dimension 16. The left panel shows the lower bound on the capacity in each iteration step t until the *a posteriori* bound given in Proposition III.5 ensures that we terminate when $|C^* - C(t)| \leq 10^{-6}$. The adaptive accelerated algorithm with the acceleration parameter $\gamma^{(t)}$ from (25) converges in 17 iterations, while the standard version converges after 248 iterations (displayed up to the 50th iteration step). The right panel shows the improvement obtained in the capacity estimate in each iteration (displayed up to the 30th iteration step). The zoomed inset in the panel shows that the adaptive accelerated algorithm does not necessarily have a monotonically increasing capacity estimate.

We numerically compute the classical capacity of a cq channel with the Holevo quantity $\chi(\mathcal{E})$ as given in (35). We choose the ensemble of output density operators randomly using the RandomDensityMatrix package from QETLAB [24]. Figure 1 illustrates the results for a channel with input alphabet of size 10 and output dimension 16. The initial guess $\rho_\lambda^{(1)}$ is chosen to be the maximally mixed state. For several simple choices of channels, the uniform distribution is optimal and our algorithm requires only one iteration to compute the capacity (this is the reason for choosing a random channel for the illustration here). By Proposition III.3, the capacity estimate $C(n)$ is ε -close to C^* after $\lceil \frac{\gamma \log |X|}{\varepsilon} \rceil$ iterations. Setting $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$, it would require around 10^6 iterations for a provable convergence. To reduce the number of iterations, we use the termination criterion given in Proposition III.5. Hence, if we observe that the maximal eigenvalue of $\mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)})$ satisfies $\alpha_{\max}^{(t)} - C(t) \leq \varepsilon$ in the t -th iteration step, we also have that $C^* - C(t) \leq \varepsilon$. With this termination condition, the standard algorithm converges in 248 iterations while the adaptive accelerated algorithm converges in 17 iterations.

We may also compare our numerics to the one given by Fawzi and Fawzi [14]. Their approach to compute the capacity of this particular cq channel requires 2.21 seconds using CVX and the Mosek solver [29]. Their method does not allow us to bound the error between the capacity estimate and the true capacity but the solver tolerance achieved is 1.3×10^{-6} . For the same channel, our

standard Blahut-Arimoto algorithm takes 0.98 seconds to achieve an *a posteriori* error of 10^{-6} and the adaptive accelerated algorithm takes 0.09 seconds.⁴

V. THERMODYNAMIC CAPACITY OF QUANTUM CHANNELS

A. Definitions

The thermodynamic capacity quantifies the information-theoretic power of quantum channels in the presence of physical restrictions imposed by thermodynamics [13] (see also [34]). For a quantum channel $\mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow B}$, relative to operators $\Gamma_A, \Gamma_B > 0$ it can be written as

$$T_\Gamma(\mathcal{E}) = \max_{\rho_A} \underbrace{D(\mathcal{E}(\rho_A) || \Gamma_B) - D(\rho_A || \Gamma_A)}_{=K(\rho_A, \mathcal{E})} \quad (47)$$

$$= \max_{\rho_A} S(\rho_A) - S(\mathcal{E}(\rho_A)) + \text{Tr} \left[\rho_A \left\{ \log \Gamma_A - \mathcal{E}^\dagger(\log \Gamma_B) \right\} \right]. \quad (48)$$

The Γ operators are thereby typically given by Gibbs states generated by Hamiltonians (i.e., some Hermitian operators) H_A and H_B on the input and output systems, respectively. That is, we have the choice $\Gamma_A = \exp(-H_A/\beta)$ for a fixed inverse temperature parameter $\beta \geq 0$ and similarly for the output system B . However, for the sake of our algorithm we leave $\Gamma_A, \Gamma_B > 0$ in general form and refer to [13] for a discussion of the thermodynamic capacity and its properties. An interesting special case is $\Gamma_A = 1_A$ and $\Gamma_B = 1_B$, for which we get $T_1(\mathcal{E}) = -G(\mathcal{E})$, where the minimal entropy gain of the quantum channel is given by [1, 20, 21]

$$G(\mathcal{E}) = \min_{\rho_A} S(\mathcal{E}(\rho_A)) - S(\rho_A). \quad (49)$$

We refer to [6] for a discussion of the minimal entropy gain for finite-dimensional quantum channels. The thermodynamic capacity is also related to the completely bounded minimal conditional entropy [11]

$$S_{\text{CB}, \min}(\mathcal{E}) = \min_{\rho_A} S((\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{I})(\rho_{AR})) - S(\rho_A) \quad (50)$$

with ρ_{AR} a purification of ρ_A . Namely, we have $S_{\text{CB}, \min}(\mathcal{E}) = -T_1(\mathcal{E}^c)$ with $\mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow E}^c$ the complementary channel of $\mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow B}$. The completely bounded minimal conditional entropy plays a role in entanglement theory as shown in [11, Section 5].

B. Blahut-Arimoto algorithm

The thermodynamic capacity can be approximated using a Blahut-Arimoto algorithm of the structure given in Algorithm 1. We define the following two variable extension of $K(\rho_A, \mathcal{E})$ for $\sigma \gg \rho$ for $\gamma \in [1 - \eta_{\text{exp}}(\mathcal{E}), 1]$.

$$J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma, \mathcal{E}) = K(\rho, \mathcal{E}) + (1 - \gamma)D(\rho || \sigma) - D(\mathcal{E}(\rho) || \mathcal{E}(\sigma)), \quad (51)$$

where we omitted the system indices for simplicity. Note that $\gamma = 1$ corresponds to the standard algorithm and if it known that $\eta_{\text{exp}}(\mathcal{E}) > 0$, the one may accelerate the algorithm. With a short calculation, one can bring J_γ into the form

$$J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma, \mathcal{E}) = -\gamma \text{Tr} [\rho \log \rho] + \text{Tr} [\rho \{ \gamma \log \sigma + \mathcal{F}(\sigma) \}] \quad \text{with} \quad (52)$$

⁴ All run-times correspond to a machine with a 2.3 GHz Intel Core i5 processor with 8GB of RAM.

$$\mathcal{F}(\sigma) = -\log \sigma + \mathcal{E}^\dagger(\log \mathcal{E}(\sigma)) + \log \Gamma_A - \mathcal{E}^\dagger \log \Gamma_B. \quad (53)$$

Note that $\text{Tr}[\rho \mathcal{F}(\sigma)]$ is continuous for $\sigma \gg \rho$. Moreover, another short calculation leads to

$$\text{Tr}[\rho \{\mathcal{F}(\sigma) - \mathcal{F}(\rho)\}] = D(\rho||\sigma) - D(\mathcal{E}(\rho)||\mathcal{E}(\sigma)) \text{ and hence} \quad (54)$$

$$0 \leq \text{Tr}[\rho \{\mathcal{F}(\sigma) - \mathcal{F}(\rho)\}] \leq \gamma D(\rho||\sigma), \quad (55)$$

where we used the data processing inequality for the quantum relative entropy (together with $\gamma \geq 1 - \eta_{\text{exp}}(\mathcal{E})$). From Lemma III.2 whose requirement is satisfied by (55), we find a double optimization form of the thermodynamic capacity $T_\Gamma(\mathcal{E})$

$$\max_{\rho, \sigma \text{ with } \sigma \gg \rho} J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma, \mathcal{E}) = \max_{\rho} J_\gamma(\rho, \rho, \mathcal{E}) = \max_{\rho} K(\rho, \mathcal{E}) = T_\Gamma(\mathcal{E}). \quad (56)$$

Performing the two maximizations in $\max_{\rho, \sigma} J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma, \mathcal{E})$ iteratively, leads to the following algorithm (see Lemma III.2 for the form of the update rules), which provably converges to the thermodynamic capacity by Theorem III.3. A detailed analysis of the time complexity can be found in Appendix B.2.

Algorithm 3 Accelerated Blahut-Arimoto type algorithm for the thermodynamic capacity

- 1: Inputs: Quantum channel $\mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow B}$ and its adjoint $\mathcal{E}_{B \rightarrow A}^\dagger$ (both given as lookup tables whose (i, j) -th entry is given by $\mathcal{E}(|i\rangle\langle j|)$ or $\mathcal{E}^\dagger(|i\rangle\langle j|)$, respectively), acceleration coefficient $\gamma \in [1 - \eta_{\text{exp}}(\mathcal{E}), 1]$ and additive error $\varepsilon > 0$
 - 2: Choose $\rho^{(1)} = \frac{1_A}{|A|}$
 - 3: **for** $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, n = \lceil \gamma \log |A|/\varepsilon \rceil\}$ **do**
 - 4: $\rho^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{Z^{(t+1)}} \exp\left(\log \rho^{(t)} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)})\right)$, where $\mathcal{F}(\sigma) = -\log \sigma + \mathcal{E}^\dagger(\log \mathcal{E}(\sigma)) + \log \Gamma_A - \mathcal{E}^\dagger(\log \Gamma_B)$
 and $Z^{(t+1)} = \text{Tr}\left[\exp\left(\log \rho^{(t)} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)})\right)\right]$ normalizes the state.
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: Outputs: $\rho^{(n+1)}$, $T(n) = J_\gamma(\rho^{(n+1)}, \rho^{(n)}, \mathcal{E})$ with $|T_\Gamma(\mathcal{E}) - T(n)| \leq \varepsilon$
-

When the coefficient $\eta_{\text{con}}(\mathcal{E}) < 1$, we get exponential convergence. To see this, note

$$1 - \eta_{\text{con}}(\mathcal{E}) = 1 - \sup_{\rho \neq \sigma} \frac{D(\mathcal{E}(\rho)||\mathcal{E}(\sigma))}{D(\rho||\sigma)} \quad (57)$$

$$= \inf_{\rho \neq \sigma} \frac{D(\rho||\sigma) - D(\mathcal{E}(\rho)||\mathcal{E}(\sigma))}{D(\rho||\sigma)}. \quad (58)$$

Using (54), we see that we have exponential convergence according to Proposition III.6 with $\delta = \frac{1 - \eta_{\text{con}}(\mathcal{E})}{\gamma}$ when the coefficient $\eta_{\text{con}}(\mathcal{E}) < 1$.

C. Simulation results

For unital channels, the thermodynamic capacity is zero and the maximizer is the maximally mixed state, which we have chosen as our initial guess $\rho_\lambda^{(1)}$. Here, we consider the non-unital qubit amplitude damping channel which has the form

$$\mathcal{E}_p^{AD}(\rho) = A_0 \rho A_0^\dagger + A_1 \rho A_1^\dagger \text{ with } A_0 = |0\rangle\langle 0| + \sqrt{1-p}|1\rangle\langle 1|, A_1 = \sqrt{p}|0\rangle\langle 1| \text{ for } p \in [0, 1]. \quad (59)$$

As in Section IV C, we choose an additive error $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$. We use the termination criterion given in Proposition III.5, which significantly reduces the required number of iterations of the algorithm. The results are shown in Figure 2. The standard and the accelerated algorithm converge in 25 and 5 iterations, respectively.




FIG. 2. Convergence of the Blahut-Arimoto algorithm to the thermodynamic capacity of the amplitude damping channel $\mathcal{E}_{0.3}^{AD}$ (given in 59) in the standard and adaptive accelerated case with the adaptive acceleration parameter $\gamma^{(t)}$ in the t -th iteration step (where $\gamma^{(t)}$ is given in (25)). The left panel shows the lower bound on the thermodynamic capacity in each iteration step t until the *a posteriori* bound given in Proposition III.5 ensures that we terminate when $|C^* - C(t)| \leq 10^{-6}$. The adaptive accelerated Blahut-Arimoto algorithm converges after 5 iterations, while the standard algorithm converges after 25 iterations (displayed up to 15 iterations). The right panel shows the improvement obtained in the capacity estimate with each iteration.

VI. COHERENT INFORMATION OF LESS NOISY CHANNELS

A. Definitions

For a quantum channel \mathcal{E} , the coherent information of the channel, $I_{\text{coh}}(\mathcal{E})$, is defined as the maximum of the coherent information $I_{\text{coh}}(\rho, \mathcal{E}) = S(\mathcal{E}(\rho)) - S(\mathcal{E}_c(\rho))$, where the maximization is taken over input states ρ . That is, we have

$$I_{\text{coh}}(\mathcal{E}) = \max_{\rho} \underbrace{S(\mathcal{E}(\rho)) - S(\mathcal{E}_c(\rho))}_{=I_{\text{coh}}(\rho, \mathcal{E})}. \quad (60)$$

A channel \mathcal{E} is called *less noisy* if the private capacity of its complementary channel \mathcal{E}_c is zero [47]. Additionally, this implies that for all density operators ρ and σ , we have

$$D(\mathcal{E}(\rho) || \mathcal{E}(\sigma)) \geq D(\mathcal{E}_c(\rho) || \mathcal{E}_c(\sigma)). \quad (61)$$

The quantum capacity $Q(\mathcal{E})$ of the channel \mathcal{E} is the regularized coherent information of a channel [10] and corresponds to the rate at which Alice can transmit quantum information to Bob. In [47] it is shown that the coherent information of a channel is additive if the channel is less noisy. Hence, for less noisy channels, we have $Q(\mathcal{E}) = I_{\text{coh}}(\mathcal{E})$. We shall only consider less noisy channels henceforth and we therefore drop the distinction between the regularized and single letter formulas.

B. Blahut-Arimoto algorithm

The coherent information of a quantum channel can be approximated using a Blahut-Arimoto algorithm of the structure given in Algorithm 1. We may also accelerate the algorithm and to do

so, we introduce the following coefficient.

$$\zeta_{\text{coh}}(\mathcal{E}) = \sup_{\rho \neq \sigma} \frac{D(\mathcal{E}(\rho) \|\mathcal{E}(\sigma)) - D(\mathcal{E}_c(\rho) \|\mathcal{E}_c(\sigma))}{D(\rho \|\sigma)}. \quad (62)$$

We define the following two variable extension of $I_{\text{coh}}(\rho, \mathcal{E})$ for $\sigma \gg \rho$ and $\gamma \in [\zeta_{\text{coh}}, 1]$.

$$J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma, \mathcal{E}) = I_{\text{coh}}(\rho, \mathcal{E}) + D(\mathcal{E}(\rho) \|\mathcal{E}(\sigma)) - D(\mathcal{E}_c(\rho) \|\mathcal{E}_c(\sigma)) - \gamma D(\rho \|\sigma). \quad (63)$$

With a short calculation, one can bring J_γ into the following form

$$J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma, \mathcal{E}) = -\gamma \text{Tr}[\rho \log \rho] + \text{Tr}[\rho \{\gamma \log \sigma + \mathcal{F}(\sigma)\}] \quad \text{with} \quad (64)$$

$$\mathcal{F}(\sigma) = \mathcal{E}_c^\dagger \log \mathcal{E}_c(\sigma) - \mathcal{E}^\dagger \log \mathcal{E}(\sigma). \quad (65)$$

Note that $\gamma = 1$ corresponds to the standard algorithm and if $\zeta_{\text{coh}}(\mathcal{E}) < 1$, then one may accelerate the algorithm. We also note that $\text{Tr}[\rho \mathcal{F}(\sigma)]$ is continuous for $\sigma \gg \rho$. Moreover, another short calculation leads to

$$\text{Tr}[\rho \{\mathcal{F}(\sigma) - \mathcal{F}(\rho)\}] = D(\mathcal{E}(\rho) \|\mathcal{E}(\sigma)) - D(\mathcal{E}_c(\rho) \|\mathcal{E}_c(\sigma)) \quad \text{and hence} \quad (66)$$

$$0 \leq \text{Tr}[\rho \{\mathcal{F}(\sigma) - \mathcal{F}(\rho)\}] \leq \gamma D(\rho \|\sigma), \quad (67)$$

where we have used (61) along with $\gamma \geq \zeta_{\text{coh}}(\mathcal{E})$. From Lemma III.2, whose requirement is satisfied by (67), we find a double optimization form of the coherent information $I_{\text{coh}}(\mathcal{E})$

$$\max_{\rho, \sigma \text{ with } \sigma \gg \rho} J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma, \mathcal{E}) = \max_{\rho} J_\gamma(\rho, \rho, \mathcal{E}) = \max_{\rho} I_{\text{coh}}(\rho, \mathcal{E}) = I_{\text{coh}}(\mathcal{E}). \quad (68)$$

Performing the two maximizations in $\max_{\rho, \sigma} J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma, \mathcal{E})$ iteratively, leads to the following algorithm (see Lemma III.2 for the form of the update rules), which provably converges to the coherent information by Theorem III.3. A detailed analysis of the time complexity is given in Appendix B.3.

Algorithm 4 Accelerated Blahut-Arimoto type algorithm for the coherent information

- 1: Inputs: Quantum channel $\mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow B}$, its complementary channel \mathcal{E}_c and the respective adjoint channels $\mathcal{E}_{B \rightarrow A}^\dagger$ and \mathcal{E}_c^\dagger (all given as lookup tables whose (i, j) -th entry is given by the action of the channel on $|i\rangle\langle j|$), acceleration coefficient $\gamma \in [\zeta_{\text{coh}}, 1]$ and additive error $\varepsilon > 0$
 - 2: Choose $\rho^{(1)} = \frac{1}{|A|}$
 - 3: **for** $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, n = \lceil \gamma \log |A| / \varepsilon \rceil\}$ **do**
 - 4: $\rho^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{Z^{(t+1)}} \exp\left(\log \rho^{(t)} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)})\right)$, where $\mathcal{F}(\sigma) = \mathcal{E}_c^\dagger \log \mathcal{E}_c(\sigma) - \mathcal{E}^\dagger \log \mathcal{E}(\sigma)$ and $Z^{(t+1)} = \text{Tr}\left[\exp\left(\log \rho^{(t)} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)})\right)\right]$ normalizes the state.
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: Outputs: $\rho^{(n+1)}$, $I_{\text{coh}}(n) = J_\gamma(\rho^{(n+1)}, \rho^{(n)}, \mathcal{E})$ with $|I_{\text{coh}}(\mathcal{E}) - I_{\text{coh}}(n)| \leq \varepsilon$
-

We also have exponential convergence if the channel is strictly less noisy i.e. $D(\mathcal{E}(\rho) \|\mathcal{E}(\sigma)) > D(\mathcal{E}_c(\rho) \|\mathcal{E}_c(\sigma))$ for all $\sigma \gg \rho$ and $\sigma \neq \rho$. To see this, we define

$$\zeta_{\text{exp}}(\mathcal{E}) = \inf \frac{D(\mathcal{E}(\rho) \|\mathcal{E}(\sigma)) - D(\mathcal{E}_c(\rho) \|\mathcal{E}_c(\sigma))}{D(\rho \|\sigma)} \quad \text{for } \sigma \gg \rho \text{ and } \sigma \neq \rho. \quad (69)$$

In general, $\zeta_{\text{exp}}(\mathcal{E}) \in [-1, 1]$ but for less noisy channels, we have that $\zeta_{\text{exp}}(\mathcal{E}) \in [0, 1]$ due to (61). Comparing it to (62), we also note that $\zeta_{\text{exp}}(\mathcal{E}) = -\zeta_{\text{coh}}(\mathcal{E}_c)$. Using (66), we see that when the coefficient $\zeta_{\text{exp}}(\mathcal{E}) > 0$, we get exponential convergence according to Proposition III.6 with $\delta = \frac{\zeta_{\text{exp}}(\mathcal{E})}{\gamma}$. Indeed, it follows from $\zeta_{\text{exp}}(\mathcal{E}) > 0$ that the channel is strictly less noisy.




FIG. 3. Convergence of the Blahut-Arimoto algorithm to the coherent information of the amplitude damping channel $\mathcal{E}_{0.3}^{AD}$ given in (59) in the standard and adaptive accelerated case with acceleration parameter $\gamma^{(t)}$ in the t -th iteration step as defined in (25). The left panel shows the lower bound on the coherent information in each iteration step t until the *a posteriori* bound given in Proposition III.5 ensures that we terminate when $|C^* - C(t)| \leq 10^{-6}$. The adaptive accelerated Blahut-Arimoto algorithm converges after 5 iterations, while the standard algorithm converges after 24 iterations. The right panel shows the improvement obtained in the coherent information estimate with each iteration.

C. Simulation results

Once again we consider the qubit amplitude damping channel whose form is given in (59). We choose an additive error $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$ and use the termination criterion given in Proposition III.5 which significantly reduces the number of iterations of the algorithm required to achieve an estimate of the capacity with additive error smaller than ε . The results are shown in Figure 3. The standard algorithm and the adaptive accelerated algorithm converge in 24 and 5 iterations, respectively.

VII. MUTUAL INFORMATION OF QUANTUM CHANNELS

A. Definitions

The mutual information $I(\mathcal{E})$ of a quantum channel \mathcal{E} is defined as the maximum over input states ρ of the mutual information $I(\rho, \mathcal{E}) = S(\rho) + S(\mathcal{E}(\rho)) - S(\mathcal{E}_c(\rho))$, i.e.,

$$I(\mathcal{E}) = \max_{\rho} \underbrace{S(\rho) + S(\mathcal{E}(\rho)) - S(\mathcal{E}_c(\rho))}_{=I(\rho, \mathcal{E})}, \quad (70)$$

The entanglement assisted classical capacity $C(\mathcal{E})$ of the channel \mathcal{E} is the regularized mutual information of a channel [4]. It is also known that the mutual information of a channel is additive [49] and hence we have $C(\mathcal{E}) = I(\mathcal{E})$.

B. Blahut-Arimoto algorithm

The mutual information of a quantum channel can be approximated using a Blahut-Arimoto algorithm of the structure given in Algorithm 1. First, recall the definition of ζ_{con} given in (62). For

any $\gamma \in [1 + \zeta_{\text{con}}(\mathcal{E}), 2]$, we define the following two variable extension of $I(\rho, \mathcal{E})$ for $\sigma \gg \rho$

$$J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma, \mathcal{E}) = I(\rho, \mathcal{E}) + D(\mathcal{E}(\rho) \parallel \mathcal{E}(\sigma)) - D(\mathcal{E}_c(\rho) \parallel \mathcal{E}_c(\sigma)) + (1 - \gamma)D(\rho \parallel \sigma). \quad (71)$$

Note that $\gamma = 2$ corresponds to the standard algorithm. If it is known that $\zeta_{\text{con}}(\mathcal{E}) < 1$, then one may accelerate the algorithm. With a short calculation, one can bring J_γ into the form

$$J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma, \mathcal{E}) = -\gamma \text{Tr}[\rho \log \rho] + \text{Tr}[\rho \{\gamma \log \sigma + \mathcal{F}(\sigma)\}] \quad \text{with} \quad (72)$$

$$\mathcal{F}(\sigma) = -\log(\sigma) + \mathcal{E}_c^\dagger \log \mathcal{E}_c(\sigma) - \mathcal{E}^\dagger \log \mathcal{E}(\sigma). \quad (73)$$

Note that $\text{Tr}[\rho \mathcal{F}(\sigma)]$ is continuous for $\sigma \gg \rho$. Moreover, a short calculation leads to

$$\text{Tr}[\rho \{\mathcal{F}(\sigma) - \mathcal{F}(\rho)\}] = D(\rho \parallel \sigma) + D(\mathcal{E}(\rho) \parallel \mathcal{E}(\sigma)) - D(\mathcal{E}_c(\rho) \parallel \mathcal{E}_c(\sigma)) \quad \text{and hence} \quad (74)$$

$$0 \leq \text{Tr}[\rho \{\mathcal{F}(\sigma) - \mathcal{F}(\rho)\}] \leq \gamma D(\rho \parallel \sigma), \quad (75)$$

where we have used the data processing inequality and the nonnegativity of relative entropy along with $\gamma \geq 1 + \zeta_{\text{con}}(\mathcal{E})$. From Lemma III.2, whose requirement is satisfied by (75), we find a double optimization form of the coherent information $I(\mathcal{E})$

$$\max_{\rho, \sigma \text{ with } \sigma \gg \rho} J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma, \mathcal{E}) = \max_{\rho} J_\gamma(\rho, \rho, \mathcal{E}) = \max_{\rho} I(\rho, \mathcal{E}) = I(\mathcal{E}). \quad (76)$$

Performing the two maximizations in $\max_{\rho, \sigma} J_\gamma(\rho, \sigma, \mathcal{E})$ iteratively, leads to the following algorithm (see Lemma III.2 for the form of the update rules), which provably converges to the mutual information of the channel \mathcal{E} by Theorem III.3. A detailed analysis of the time complexity is given in Appendix B 4.

Algorithm 5 Accelerated Blahut-Arimoto type algorithm for the mutual information

- 1: Inputs: Quantum channel $\mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow B}$, its complementary channel \mathcal{E}_c and the respective adjoint channels $\mathcal{E}_{B \rightarrow A}^\dagger$ and \mathcal{E}_c^\dagger (all given as lookup tables whose (i, j) -th entry is given by the action of the channel on $|i\rangle\langle j|$), acceleration coefficient $\gamma \in [1 + \zeta_{\text{con}}(\mathcal{E}), 2]$ and additive error $\varepsilon > 0$
 - 2: Choose $\rho^{(1)} = \frac{1_A}{|A|}$
 - 3: **for** $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, n = \lceil \gamma \log |A| / \varepsilon \rceil\}$ **do**
 - 4: $\rho^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{Z^{(t+1)}} \exp\left(\log \rho^{(t)} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)})\right)$, where $\mathcal{F}(\sigma) = -\log(\sigma) + \mathcal{E}_c^\dagger \log \mathcal{E}_c(\sigma) - \mathcal{E}^\dagger \log \mathcal{E}(\sigma)$ and $Z^{(t+1)} = \text{Tr}\left[\exp\left(\log \rho^{(t)} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)})\right)\right]$ normalizes the state.
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: Outputs: $\rho^{(n+1)}$, $I(n) = J_\gamma(\rho^{(n+1)}, \rho^{(n)}, \mathcal{E})$ with $|I(\mathcal{E}) - I(n)| \leq \varepsilon$
-

We also have exponential convergence under certain conditions. Recall the definition $\zeta_{\text{exp}}(\mathcal{E})$ from (69). Using (74), we see that when the coefficient $\zeta_{\text{exp}}(\mathcal{E}) > -1$ (or equivalently, $\zeta_{\text{con}}(\mathcal{E}_c) < 1$), we get exponential convergence according to Proposition III.6 with $\delta = \frac{1 + \zeta_{\text{exp}}(\mathcal{E})}{\gamma}$.

C. Simulation results

Once again we consider the qubit amplitude damping channel which has the form as in (59). We choose an additive error $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$ and use the termination criterion given in Proposition III.5, which significantly reduces the number of iterations of the algorithm required to achieve an estimate of the capacity with additive error smaller than ε . The results are shown in Figure 4. The standard and the adaptive accelerated algorithm converge to the capacity in 12 and 4 iterations, respectively.




FIG. 4. Convergence of the Blahut-Arimoto algorithm to the mutual information of the amplitude damping channel $\mathcal{E}_{0,3}^{AD}$ given in (59) in the standard and adaptive accelerated case with acceleration parameter $\gamma^{(t)}$ as defined in (25). The left panel shows the lower bound on the mutual information in each iteration step t until the *a posteriori* bound given in Proposition III.5 ensures that we terminate when $|C^* - C(t)| \leq 10^{-6}$. The adaptive accelerated Blahut-Arimoto algorithm converges after 4 iterations, while the standard algorithm converges after 12 iterations. The right panel shows the improvement obtained in the mutual information estimate with each iteration.

VIII. CONCLUSION

We give an analytical and numerical analysis of alternating optimization algorithms of Blahut-Arimoto type for computing various channel capacities in quantum information theory. We note that our algorithms are of zeroth-order and do not need to take into account matrix valued derivatives. Thus, they are rather straightforward and computationally inexpensive to implement — as demonstrated in our numerical examples. It remains open if alternating optimization algorithms, in particular of Blahut-Arimoto type, can also be given for other convex optimization problems in terms of quantum entropy. Starting from the analogous classical settings this could, e.g., be quantum rate distortion functions [9], quantum information bottleneck functions [8], or certain quantum network capacities [50]. For example, in the case of the classical information bottleneck, a Blahut-Arimoto type algorithm is used for the estimation of the information bottleneck functions [44] and helped to gain insight into the black box of deep neural networks [41, 45]. The quantum information bottleneck was investigated in [8, 22, 37].

In contrast to classical Shannon theory, in quantum Shannon theory exact capacity formulas are often not known [49]. Moreover, known upper and lower bounds are not always in the form of convex optimization problems. For example, the complexity of determining the classical capacity of general entanglement breaking channels is NP-complete [3] (see also [17] for hardness of approximation results). For such cases, one might rather aim for numerical tools that do well for the average case in practically relevant examples. Alternating optimization algorithms offer an interesting option in this direction. In fact, Nagaoka explored a version of his quantum Blahut-Arimoto algorithm to study the classical capacity of general quantum channels [35].

Acknowledgements. We thank Joseph Renes and Marco Tomamichel for discussions. RI acknowledges support from the Swiss National Science Foundation through SNSF project No. 200020-165843 and through the National Centre of Competence in Research *Quantum Science and Technology* (QSIT).

Note added. During finalization of the first version of our work we became aware of the related works [27, 28] by Li and Cai.

Appendix A: Gibbs' variational principle

The well known Gibbs' variational principle is given in the following lemma (which is used to show the form of the optimizer in Lemma III.2).

Lemma A.1 (Gibbs' principle) *Let ω a density operator and H a Hermitian matrix on the same space. Then, we have*

$$\text{Tr} [\omega H] - \text{Tr} [\omega \log \omega] \leq \log \text{Tr} [\exp (H)] \quad (\text{A1})$$

with equality if and only if $\omega = \frac{\exp(H)}{\text{Tr}[\exp(H)]}$.

Appendix B: Time complexity

The time complexity of Blahut-Arimoto type algorithms is essentially given by the required number of iteration steps times the complexity of one iteration step. In the following, we give a detailed analysis for the computation of the Holevo quantity and the thermodynamic capacity.

1. Holevo quantity

The time complexity of Algorithm 2 is determined by the required number of iterations and the time complexity for applying the following update rule

$$\lambda_i^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{Z^{(t+1)}} \lambda_i^{(t)} \exp \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} D(\tau_{\mathcal{E},i} || \mathcal{E}(\rho_{\lambda^{(t)}})) \right) \quad (\text{B1})$$

$$= \frac{1}{Z^{(t+1)}} \lambda_i^{(t)} \exp \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} \text{Tr} [\tau_{\mathcal{E},i} \{ \log \tau_{\mathcal{E},i} - \log \mathcal{E}(\rho_{\lambda^{(t)}}) \}] \right). \quad (\text{B2})$$

Let us sketch how to apply the update rule efficiently to derive an upper bound on the time complexity. We use the following:

- the channel $\mathcal{E}_{X \rightarrow B}$ is given as a lookup table, where one can access the elements $\tau_{\mathcal{E},i}$ in constant time. The application of \mathcal{E} to a diagonal density operator $\rho = \sum_{i=1}^{|X|} \rho_{ii} |i\rangle \langle i|$ can then be calculated as $\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^{|X|} \rho_{ii} \tau_{\mathcal{E},i}$ with time complexity $\mathcal{O}(|X||B|^2)$,
- the complexity of calculating the matrix logarithm of ρ_A is $\mathcal{O}(|A|^3)$,
- the complexity of calculating $\text{Tr} [\rho_A \sigma_A]$ is $\mathcal{O}(|A|^2)$.

The algorithm proceeds then with the following calculations:

1. The terms $c_i = \text{Tr} [\tau_{\mathcal{E},i} \log \tau_{\mathcal{E},i}]$ can be computed once for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, |X|\}$ at the start of the algorithm with complexity $\mathcal{O}(|X||B|^3)$.
2. In each iteration step t we have to compute:
 - (a) the matrix $H^{(t)} = \log \mathcal{E}(\rho_{\lambda^{(t)}})$ requiring time $\mathcal{O}(|X||B|^2 + |B|^3)$,

- (b) real numbers $d_i^{(t)} = \text{Tr} [\tau_{\mathcal{E},i} H^{(t)}]$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, |X|\}$ requiring time $\mathcal{O}(|X||B|^2)$,
- (c) the unnormalized coefficients $\tilde{\lambda}_i^{(t+1)} = \lambda_i^{(t)} \exp\left(\frac{1}{\gamma}(c_i - d_i^{(t)})\right)$ requiring time $\mathcal{O}(|X|)$,
- (d) the normalization coefficient $Z^{(t+1)} = \sum_{i=1}^{|X|} \tilde{\lambda}_i^{(t+1)}$ requiring time $\mathcal{O}(|X|)$.

We conclude that the complexity for one iteration step is $\mathcal{O}(|B|^3 + |X||B|^2)$.

The number of required iterations to get an ε -approximation to the capacity is of order $\mathcal{O}(\log |X|/\varepsilon)$ and hence the required time for all the iteration steps is $\mathcal{O}((|B|^3 + |B|^2|X|) \log |X|/\varepsilon)$. We conclude that the time complexity of Algorithm 2 is given by

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(|B|^3 + |B|^2|X|) \log |X|}{\varepsilon} + |X||B|^3\right). \quad (\text{B3})$$

2. Thermodynamic capacity

The time complexity of Algorithm 3 is determined by the required number of iterations and the complexity of applying the following update rule

$$\rho^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{Z^{(t+1)}} \exp\left(\log \rho^{(t)} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)})\right), \quad (\text{B4})$$

where $\mathcal{F}(\sigma) = -\log \sigma + \mathcal{E}^\dagger(\log \mathcal{E}(\sigma)) + \log \Gamma_A - \mathcal{E}^\dagger \log \Gamma_B$ and $Z^{(t+1)} = \text{Tr} \left[\exp\left(\log \rho^{(t)} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)})\right) \right]$ normalizes the state. To calculate the complexity of applying the update rule, we use that

- the quantum channel $\mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow B}$ and its adjoint $\mathcal{E}_{B \rightarrow A}^\dagger$ are both given as lookup tables whose (i, j) -th entry is given by $\mathcal{E}(|i\rangle\langle j|_A)$ or $\mathcal{E}^\dagger(|i\rangle\langle j|_B)$, respectively. We assume constant time access to the entries of the table. Hence, the application of \mathcal{E} (or \mathcal{E}^\dagger) to a density operator ρ_A has time complexity $\mathcal{O}(|A|^2|B|^2)$. Indeed, the channel application can be calculated as $\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{|A|} \rho_{ij} \tau_{\mathcal{E},i,j}$ with $\tau_{\mathcal{E},i,j} = \mathcal{E}(|i\rangle\langle j|_A)$,
- the complexity of calculating the matrix logarithm and exponential of ρ_A is $\mathcal{O}(|A|^3)$,

An iteration step of the form given in (B4) is then found to have complexity $\mathcal{O}(|A|^3 + |A|^2|B|^2 + |B|^3)$. The number of required iterations to get an ε approximation to the capacity is of order $\mathcal{O}(\log |A|/\varepsilon)$ and hence we conclude that the time complexity of Algorithm 3 is given by

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(|A|^3 + |A|^2|B|^2 + |B|^3) \log |A|}{\varepsilon}\right). \quad (\text{B5})$$

3. Coherent information

The time complexity of Algorithm 4 is determined by the required number of iterations and the complexity of applying the following update rule

$$\rho^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{Z^{(t+1)}} \exp\left(\log \rho^{(t)} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)})\right), \quad (\text{B6})$$

where $\mathcal{F}(\sigma) = \mathcal{E}_c^\dagger \log \mathcal{E}_c(\sigma) - \mathcal{E}^\dagger \log \mathcal{E}(\sigma)$ and $Z^{(t+1)} = \text{Tr} \left[\exp\left(\log \rho^{(t)} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)})\right) \right]$ normalizes the state. To calculate the complexity of applying the update rule, we use that

- the application of the quantum channel $\mathcal{E}_{A \rightarrow B}$ and of its adjoint have time complexity $\mathcal{O}(|A|^2|B|^2)$, where the application of the channel $(\mathcal{E}_c)_{A \rightarrow E}$ and of its adjoint have time complexity $\mathcal{O}(|A|^2|E|^2)$ (see Appendix B 2 for the argumentation),
- the complexity of calculating the matrix logarithm and exponential of a density operator ρ_A is $\mathcal{O}(|A|^3)$.

An iteration step of the form given in (B6) is then found to have complexity $\mathcal{O}(|A|^3 + |B|^3 + |E|^3 + |A|^2(|B|^2 + |E|^2))$. By Stinesprings theorem, the dimension of the environment can be bounded by $|E| \leq K$, where $K \leq |A||B|$ denotes the Kraus rank of \mathcal{E} , i.e., the minimal number of Kraus operators required to represent \mathcal{E} . Hence, the complexity of one iteration step is $\mathcal{O}(|A|^3 + |B|^3 + K^3 + |A|^2(|B|^2 + K^2))$. The number of required iterations to get an ε approximation to the capacity is of order $\mathcal{O}(\log |A|/\varepsilon)$ and hence we conclude that the time complexity of Algorithm 4 is given by

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(|A|^3 + |B|^3 + K^3 + |A|^2(|B|^2 + K^2)) \log |A|}{\varepsilon}\right). \quad (\text{B7})$$

4. Mutual information

The time complexity of Algorithm 5 is determined by the required number of iterations and the complexity of applying the following update rule

$$\rho^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{Z^{(t+1)}} \exp\left(\log \rho^{(t)} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)})\right), \quad (\text{B8})$$

where $\mathcal{F}(\sigma) = -\log(\sigma) + \mathcal{E}_c^\dagger \log \mathcal{E}_c(\sigma) - \mathcal{E}^\dagger \log \mathcal{E}(\sigma)$ and $Z^{(t+1)} = \text{Tr} \left[\exp\left(\log \rho^{(t)} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathcal{F}(\rho^{(t)})\right) \right]$ normalizes the state. Note that the complexity of the update rule is the same as in Appendix B 3 since the additional term $\log(\sigma)$ in $\mathcal{F}(\sigma)$ does not change the asymptotic complexity. We conclude that the time complexity of Algorithm 5 is given by

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(|A|^3 + |B|^3 + K^3 + |A|^2(|B|^2 + K^2)) \log |A|}{\varepsilon}\right). \quad (\text{B9})$$

-
- [1] R. Alicki. “Isotropic quantum spin channels and additivity questions”. arXiv:quant-ph/0402080, 2004.
 - [2] S. Arimoto. “An algorithm for computing the capacity of arbitrary discrete memoryless channels”. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **18**(1): 14–20, 1972.
 - [3] S. Beigi and P. W. Shor. “On the Complexity of Computing Zero-Error and Holevo Capacity of Quantum Channels”. arXiv:0709.2090, 2007.
 - [4] C. H. Bennett, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal. “Entanglement-assisted capacity of a quantum channel and the reverse Shannon theorem”. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **48**(10): 2637–2655, 2002.
 - [5] R. Blahut. “Computation of channel capacity and rate-distortion functions”. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **18**(4): 460–473, 1972.
 - [6] F. Buscemi, S. Das, and M. M. Wilde. “Approximate reversibility in the context of entropy gain, information gain, and complete positivity”. Physical Review A **93**(6): 062314, 2016.
 - [7] C.-I. Chang and L. D. Davisson. “On calculating the capacity of an infinite-input finite (infinite)-output channel”. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **34**(5): 1004–1010, 1988.
 - [8] N. Datta, C. Hirche, and A. Winter. “Convexity and Operational Interpretation of the Quantum Information Bottleneck Function”. arXiv:1810.03644, 2018.

- [9] N. Datta, M. Hsieh, and M. M. Wilde. “Quantum Rate Distortion, Reverse Shannon Theorems, and Source-Channel Separation”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **59**(1):615–630, 2013.
- [10] I. Devetak. “The private classical capacity and quantum capacity of a quantum channel”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **51**(1):44–55, 2005.
- [11] I. Devetak, M. Junge, C. King, and M. B. Ruskai. “Multiplicativity of Completely Bounded p -Norms Implies a New Additivity Result”. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **266**(1):37–63, 2006.
- [12] F. Dupuis, W. Yu, and F. M. J. Willems. “Blahut-Arimoto algorithms for computing channel capacity and rate-distortion with side information”. In *International Symposium on Information Theory*, page 179, 2004.
- [13] P. Faist, M. Berta, and F. Brandão. “Thermodynamic capacity of quantum processes”. *Physical Review Letters* **122**(20):200601, 2019.
- [14] H. Fawzi and O. Fawzi. “Efficient optimization of the quantum relative entropy”. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **51**(15):154003, 2018.
- [15] H. Fawzi, J. Saunderson, and P. A. Parrilo. “Semidefinite Approximations of the Matrix Logarithm”. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* **19**(2):259–296, 2019.
- [16] M. W. Girard, G. Gour, and S. Friedland. “On convex optimization problems in quantum information theory”. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **47**(50):505302, 2014.
- [17] A. W. Harrow and A. Montanaro. “Testing Product States, Quantum Merlin-Arthur Games and Tensor Optimization”. *Journal of the ACM* **60**(1):3:1–3:43, 2013.
- [18] M. Hayashi, H. Imai, K. Matsumoto, M. B. Ruskai, and T. Shimono. “Qubit Channels Which Require Four Inputs to Achieve Capacity: Implications for Additivity Conjectures”. *Quantum Information and Computation* **5**(1):13–31, 2005.
- [19] A. S. Holevo. “The capacity of the quantum channel with general signal states”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **44**(1):269–273, 1998.
- [20] A. S. Holevo. “Entropy gain and the Choi-Jamiolkowski correspondence for infinite-dimensional quantum evolutions”. *Theoretical and Mathematical Physics* **166**(1):123–138, 2011.
- [21] A. S. Holevo. “The entropy gain of quantum channels”. In *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pages 289–292, 2011.
- [22] M. Hsieh and S. Watanabe. “Channel Simulation and Coded Source Compression”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **62**(11):6609–6619, 2016.
- [23] J. Huang and S. P. Meyn. “Characterization and computation of optimal distributions for channel coding”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **51**(7):2336–2351, 2005.
- [24] N. Johnston. “QETLAB: A MATLAB toolbox for quantum entanglement, Version 0.9”. qetlab.com, 2016.
- [25] K. Kato, M. Oto, H. Imai, and K. Imai. “Computational geometry analysis of quantum state space and its applications”. In *Generalized Voronoi Diagram: A Geometry-Based Approach to Computational Intelligence*, pages 67–108. Springer 2009.
- [26] A. Lesniewski and M. B. Ruskai. “Monotone Riemannian metrics and relative entropy on noncommutative probability spaces”. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **40**(11):5702–5724, 1999.
- [27] H. Li and N. Cai. “A Blahut-Arimoto Type Algorithm for Computing Classical-Quantum Channel Capacity”. [arXiv:1904.11188](https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.11188), 2019.
- [28] H. Li and N. Cai. “Computing the Classical-Quantum channel capacity: experiments on a Blahut-Arimoto type algorithm and an approximate solution for the binary inputs, two-dimensional outputs channel”. [arXiv:1905.08235](https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.08235), 2019.
- [29] J. Löfberg. “YALMIP : A Toolbox for Modeling and Optimization in MATLAB”. In *In Proceedings of the CACSD Conference*, Taipei, Taiwan2004.
- [30] G. Matz and P. Duhamel. “Information geometric formulation and interpretation of accelerated Blahut-Arimoto-type algorithms”. In *Information Theory Workshop*, pages 66–70, 2004.
- [31] H. Nagaoka. “Algorithms of Arimoto-Blahut type for computing quantum channel capacity”. In *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, page 354, 1998.
- [32] I. Naiss and H. H. Permuter. “Extension of the Blahut-Arimoto Algorithm for Maximizing Directed Information”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **59**(1):204–222, 2013.
- [33] Z. Naja, F. Alberge, and P. Duhamel. “Geometrical interpretation and improvements of the Blahut-Arimoto’s algorithm”. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pages 2505–2508, 2009.

- [34] M. Navascués and L. P. García-Pintos. “*Nonthermal Quantum Channels as a Thermodynamical Resource*”. *Physical Review Letters* **115**(1):010405, 2015.
- [35] S. Osawa and H. Nagaoka. “*Numerical Experiments on The Capacity of Quantum Channel with Entangled Input States*”. *IEICE Transactions Fundamentals* **E84-A**(10):2583–2590, 2001.
- [36] M. Rezaeian and A. Grant. “*Computation of total capacity for discrete memoryless multiple-access channels*”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **50**(11):2779–2784, 2004.
- [37] S. Salek, D. Cadamuro, P. Kammerlander, and K. Wiesner. “*Quantum Rate-Distortion Coding of Relevant Information*”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **65**(4):2603–2613, 2019.
- [38] J. Sayir. “*Iterating the Arimoto-Blahut algorithm for faster convergence*”. In *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, page 235, 2000.
- [39] B. Schumacher and M. D. Westmoreland. “*Sending classical information via noisy quantum channels*”. *Physical Review A* **56**(1):131–138, 1997.
- [40] P. W. Shor. “*Capacities of quantum channels and how to find them*”. *Mathematical Programming* **97**(1):311–335, 2003.
- [41] R. Shwartz-Ziv and N. Tishby. “*Opening the Black Box of Deep Neural Networks via Information*”. arXiv:1703.00810 [cs] , 2017.
- [42] D. Sutter, T. Sutter, P. Mohajerin Esfahani, and R. Renner. “*Efficient Approximation of Quantum Channel Capacities*”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **62**(1):578–598, 2016.
- [43] T. Tanuma, H. Imai, and S. Moriyama. “*Revisiting hyperbolic Voronoi diagrams in two and higher dimensions from theoretical, applied and generalized viewpoints*”. In *Transactions on Computational Science XIV*, pages 1–30. Springer 2011.
- [44] N. Tishby, F. C. Pereira, and W. Bialek. “*The information bottleneck method*”. In *Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control and Computing*, pages 368–377, 1999.
- [45] N. Tishby and N. Zaslavsky. “*Deep Learning and the Information Bottleneck Principle*”. arXiv:1503.02406 [cs] , 2015.
- [46] P. O. Vontobel. “*A generalized Blahut-Arimoto algorithm*”. In *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, page 53, 2003.
- [47] S. Watanabe. “*Private and quantum capacities of more capable and less noisy quantum channels*”. *Physical Review A* **85**(1):012326, 2012.
- [48] J. Watrous. *The theory of quantum information*. Cambridge University Press 2018.
- [49] M. M. Wilde. *Quantum Information Theory*. Cambridge University Press 2017.
- [50] A. Winter. “*The capacity of the quantum multiple-access channel*”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **47**(7):3059–3065, 2001.
- [51] Y. Yu. “*Squeezing the Arimoto-Blahut Algorithm for Faster Convergence*”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **56**(7):3149–3157, 2010.
- [52] Y. Zinchenko, S. Friedland, and G. Gour. “*Numerical estimation of the relative entropy of entanglement*”. *Physical Review A* **82**(5):052336, 2010.