

Additive invariants on quantum channels and applications to regularized minimum entropy*

Shmuel Friedland

Department of Mathematics, Statistics, and Computer Science
University of Illinois at Chicago
Chicago, Illinois 60607-7045, USA
E-mail: friedlan@uic.edu

August 30, 2008

Abstract

We introduce two additive invariants of output quantum channels. If the value of one these invariants is less than 1 then the logarithm of the inverse of its value is a positive lower bound for the regularized minimum entropy of an output quantum channel. We give a few examples in which one of these invariants is less than 1.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 81P68, 94A17, 94A40, 15A42,

Key words. Quantum information theory, quantum channel, minimum entropy output, regularized minimum entropy output, additivity conjecture, additive invariants.

1 Introduction

Denote by $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$ the Hilbert space of $n \times n$ hermitian matrices, where $\langle X, Y \rangle = \text{tr } XY$. Denote by $\mathcal{S}_{n,+1}(\mathbb{C}) \subset \mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{C}) \subset \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$ the convex set of positive hermitian matrices of trace one, and the cone of positive hermitian matrices respectively. A quantum channel is a completely positive linear transformation $\tau : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$:

$$\tau(X) = \sum_{i=1}^l A_i^* X A_i, \quad A_1, \dots, A_l \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}, \quad X \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}), \quad (1.1)$$

which is trace preserving:

$$\sum_{i=1}^l A_i A_i^* = I_n, \quad (1.2)$$

The *minimum* entropy output of a quantum channel τ is defined

$$H(\tau) = \min_{X \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+1}(\mathbb{C})} -\text{tr } \tau(X) \log \tau(X). \quad (1.3)$$

*This research started during author's participation in AIM workshop "Geometry and representation theory of tensors for computer science, statistics and other areas", July 21-25, 2008.

If $\eta : \mathcal{S}_{n'}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{m'}$ is another quantum channel, then it is well known $\tau \otimes \eta$ is a quantum channel, and

$$H(\tau \otimes \eta) \leq H(\tau) + H(\eta). \quad (1.4)$$

Hence the sequence $H(\otimes^p \tau), p = 1, \dots$, is subadditive. Thus the following limit exists:

$$H_r(\tau) = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \frac{H(\otimes^p \tau)}{p}, \quad (1.5)$$

and is called the *regularized* minimum entropy of quantum channel. Clearly, $H_r(\tau) \leq H(\tau)$.

One of the major open problem of quantum information theory is the additivity conjecture, which claims that equality holds in (1.4). This additivity conjecture has several equivalent forms [9]. If the additivity conjecture holds then $H_r(\tau) = H(\tau)$, and the computation of $H_r(\tau)$ is relatively simple. There are known cases where the additivity conjecture is known, see references in [6]. It is also known that the p analog of the additivity conjecture is wrong [6]. It was shown recently [8] that the additivity of the entangled formation fails over the real numbers. Hence, in author's opinion, the additivity conjecture is false. In this case the computation of $H_r(\tau)$ is hard. This is the standard situation in computing the entropy of Potts models in statistical physics, e.g. [3].

The aim of this paper to give a nontrivial lower bound on $H_r(\tau)$ for certain quantum channels. This is done by introducing two additive invariants on quantum channels. Let

$$\mathbf{A}(\tau) := \sum_{i=1}^l A_i^* A_i \in \mathcal{S}_{m,+}(\mathbb{C}). \quad (1.6)$$

Then $\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = \log \|\mathbf{A}(\tau)\|$, where $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A})$ is the maximal eigenvalue of $\mathbf{A}(\tau)$, is the first additive invariant of quantum channels, with respect to tensor products. Let $\sigma_1(\tau) = \|\tau\|$ be the maximal singular value of the linear transformation given by τ . Then $\log \sigma_1(\tau)$ is the second additive invariant. (These two invariants are incomparable in general, see §5.) The main result of this paper is the inequality

$$H_r(\tau) \geq \max(-\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), -\log \sigma_1(\tau)).$$

This inequality is nontrivial only if $\min(\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \sigma_1(\tau)) < 1$. In the last section we give examples where $\min(\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \sigma_1(\tau)) < 1$. If $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < 1$ then the inequality $H_r(\tau) \geq -\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$ can be improved, see §4.

2 Preliminary results

Let $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ be the field of real and complex numbers respectively, and denote by \mathbb{F}^n the vector space of the column vectors $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^\top$ with coordinates in \mathbb{F} . We view \mathbb{F}^n as an inner product space, i.e. *Hilbert space* \mathcal{H}_A , with the inner product $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle := \mathbf{y}^* \mathbf{x} = \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{y}_j x_j$.

View $\mathbb{F}^m \otimes \mathbb{F}^n$ as the set of $m \times n$ matrices with entries in \mathbb{F} , denoted by $\mathbb{F}^{m \times n}$. Equivalently, if we identify \mathbb{F}^m with the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_B then $\mathbb{F}^{m \times n} \approx \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_A$. Recall that on $\mathbb{F}^{m \times n}$ we have the inner product $\langle A, B \rangle := \text{tr} AB^*$, where $B^* = A^\top$ if $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $B^* = (\bar{B})^\top$ if $B \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$.

Denote by $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{F}) \subset \mathbb{F}^{n \times n}$ the real space of self-adjoint matrices. I.e. $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$ is the space of real symmetric matrices, and $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is the space of hermitian matrices. Let $X \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{F})$. Denote by $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(X) = (\lambda_1(X), \dots, \lambda_n(X))$ the eigenvalue set of X , where $\lambda_1(X) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(X)$. Then $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n$ is the corresponding orthonormal basis of \mathbb{F}^n consisting of eigenvectors of X

$$X\mathbf{u}_i = \lambda_i(X)\mathbf{u}_i, \quad \mathbf{u}_i^* \mathbf{u}_j = \delta_{ij}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Ky-Fan maximal characterization is, e.g. [2],

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(X) = \max_{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k \in \mathbb{C}^n, \mathbf{x}_p^* \mathbf{x}_q = \delta_{pq}} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{x}_j^* X \mathbf{x}_j = \sum_{j=1}^k \text{tr}(X(\mathbf{x}_j \mathbf{x}_j^*)). \quad (2.1)$$

As in physics, we call $X \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{F})$ *positive* hermitian matrix, or simply positive, and denoted it by $X \geq 0$, if all eigenvalues of X are nonnegative. Also for $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{F})$ we let $Y \geq X$ if $Y - X \geq 0$. Denote by $\mathcal{S}_{n,+1}(\mathbb{F}) \subset \mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{F}) \subset \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{F})$ the convex set of positive hermitian matrices of trace one, and the cone of positive hermitian matrices respectively.

Let $A \in \mathbb{F}^{m \times n}$. Then the positive singular values of A are the positive eigenvalues of $\sqrt{AA^*}$, which are equal to the positive eigenvalues $\sqrt{A^*A}$. Let $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(A) = (\sigma_1(A), \sigma_2(A), \dots, \sigma_l(A))^\top$ be the vector of singular values of $A \in \mathbb{F}^{m \times n}$, where $\sigma_1(A) \geq \sigma_2(A) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_l(A) \geq 0$ are the singular values of A arranged in the decreasing order. We do not fix the number of coordinates l in $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(A)$, but recall that $\sigma_i(A) = 0$ if $i > \min(m, n)$. (So $l \geq \min(m, n)$.) There exists an orthonormal bases $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n \in \mathbb{C}^n, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_m \in \mathbb{C}^m$, called right and left singular vectors of A , such that

$$\begin{aligned} A\mathbf{u}_i &= \sigma_i(A)\mathbf{v}_i, \quad A^*\mathbf{v}_i = \sigma_i(A)\mathbf{u}_i, \quad i = 1, \text{rank } A, \quad A\mathbf{u}_i = \mathbf{0}, \quad A^*\mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{for } i > \text{rank } A, \\ \mathbf{u}_i^* \mathbf{u}_j &= \delta_{ij}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n, \quad \mathbf{v}_p^* \mathbf{v}_q = \delta_{pq}, \quad p, q = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

Note that the Frobenius norm $\|A\|_F := \sqrt{\langle A, A \rangle} = \sqrt{\text{tr}(AA^*)}$ is equal to $\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{\text{rank } A} \sigma_i(A)^2}$.

Assume that $X \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{F})$ then the singular values of X are the absolute values of the eigenvalues of X . In particular, for $X \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{F})$ we have that $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X) = \boldsymbol{\lambda}(X)$.

Recall the well known maximal characterization of the sum of the first k singular values of $A \in \mathbb{F}^{m \times n}$ [5, Thm 3.4.1].

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \sigma_j(A) = \max_{\mathbf{x}_p \in \mathbb{F}^n, \mathbf{y}_q \in \mathbb{F}^m, \mathbf{x}_p^* \mathbf{x}_q = \mathbf{y}_p^* \mathbf{y}_q = \delta_{pq}, p, q = 1, \dots, k} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{y}_j^* A \mathbf{x}_j, \quad (2.3)$$

for $k = 1, \dots, \min(m, n)$. Note that $\sigma_1(A) = \|A\| = \max_{\mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{x} = 1} \|A\mathbf{x}\|$, where $\|A\|$ is the ℓ_2 norm of A . A useful observation is

$$\mathbf{y}^* A \mathbf{x} = \text{tr}(A(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}^*)) = \text{tr}(A(\mathbf{y}\mathbf{x}^*)^*) = \text{tr}((\mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}^*)A). \quad (2.4)$$

For any nonnegative vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ denote by

$$H(\mathbf{x}) := - \sum_{j=1}^n x_j \log x_j.$$

Let $\Pi_n \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be the set of probability vectors with n -coordinates. Then $H(\mathbf{x})$ is the entropy of a probability vector \mathbf{x} . For $X \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{F})$ we define the von Neumann entropy

$$H(X) := H(\boldsymbol{\lambda}(X)) = -\operatorname{tr} X \log X.$$

Note that if $X \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{F})$ then $H(X) = 0$ if and only if X is a rank one nonnegative definite matrix with trace 1.

It is well known that if $\phi : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex function then

$$\phi : \mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{F}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \phi(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\lambda_i(X)), \quad X \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{F})$$

is a convex function on $\mathcal{S}_{m,+}(\mathbb{F})$. See for example [2]. This fact is implied by the *majorization* relation

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}(aX + bY) \prec a\boldsymbol{\lambda}(X) + b\boldsymbol{\lambda}(Y), \quad a, b \in \mathbb{R}_+, X, Y \in \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{F}),$$

which is equivalent to

$$\sum_{j=1}^i \lambda_j(aX + bY) \leq \sum_{j=1}^i (a\lambda_j(X) + b\lambda_j(Y)), \quad i = 1, \dots, m-1,$$

and the trace equality $\operatorname{tr}(aX + bY) = a \operatorname{tr} X + b \operatorname{tr} Y$. See [4, 7] for good references on majorization. In particular, $-H(X) = \operatorname{tr}(X \log X)$ is a convex function on $\mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{F})$.

In what follows it is convenient to identify $\mathbb{F}^{m_1 \times n_1} \otimes \mathbb{F}^{m_2 \times n_2}$ with $\mathbb{F}^{(m_1 m_2) \times (n_1 n_2)}$. Assume that $X_i = [x_{pq,i}]_{p=q=1}^{m_i, n_i} \in \mathbb{F}^{m_i \times n_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then we identify $X_1 \otimes X_2$ with the Kronecker product, which is viewed as $(m_1 m_2) \times (n_1 n_2)$ matrix given as a block matrix $[x_{pq,1} X_2]_{p=q=1}^{m_1, n_1}$. So $X_1 \otimes X_2$ maps $\mathbb{F}^{n_1 n_2}$ to $\mathbb{F}^{m_1 m_2}$. Identify \mathbb{F}^{mn} with the matrix space $\mathbb{F}^{n \times m}$. Then

$$(X_1 \otimes X_2)(Y) = X_2 Y X_1^\top, \quad Y \in \mathbb{F}^{n_2 \times n_1}. \quad (2.5)$$

Recall the well known fact that $\operatorname{rank}(X_1 \otimes X_2) = \operatorname{rank} X_1 \operatorname{rank} X_2$. Furthermore, all positive singular values of $X_1 \otimes X_2$ are of the form [5, Thm 4.2.15]

$$\sigma_i(X_1) \sigma_j(X_2), \quad i = 1, \dots, \operatorname{rank} X_1, \quad j = 1, \dots, \operatorname{rank} X_2.$$

In particular

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1(X_1 \otimes X_2) &= \sigma_1(X_1) \sigma_1(X_2), \\ \sigma_{\operatorname{rank} X_1 \otimes X_2}(X_1 \otimes X_2) &= \sigma_{\operatorname{rank} X_1}(X_1) \sigma_{\operatorname{rank} X_2}(X_2). \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

Hence we have the additivity of the entropy formula

$$H(X_1 \otimes X_2) = H(X_1) + H(X_2) \text{ for } X_i \in \mathcal{S}_{n_i,+}(\mathbb{F}), \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (2.7)$$

3 Main inequalities

In this section we view $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$ as \mathbb{R}^{m^2} . The real inner product on $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is given by $\langle X_1, X_2 \rangle = \text{tr}(X_1 X_2^*) = \text{tr}(X_1 X_2)$. Let $\phi : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$ be a linear, (real), transformation. We now apply the notions discussed in the previous section. The adjoint linear transformation $\phi^* : \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is given by the identity

$$\text{tr}(\phi(X)Y) = \text{tr}(X\phi^*(Y)) \text{ for all } X \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}), Y \in \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C}).$$

The positive singular values of ϕ are the positive eigenvalues of $(\phi\phi^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ or of $(\phi^*\phi)^{\frac{1}{2}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_i(\phi) = \sigma_i(\phi^*) &= (\lambda_i(\phi\phi^*))^{\frac{1}{2}} = (\lambda_i(\phi^*\phi))^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad i = 1, \dots, \text{rank } \phi, \\ \sigma_i(\phi) = \sigma_i(\phi^*) &= 0 \text{ for } i > \text{rank } \phi. \end{aligned}$$

We will denote $\sigma_i(\phi)$ by σ_i where no ambiguity arises. Furthermore, there exist orthonormal bases $\{U_1, \dots, U_{n^2}\}, \{V_1, \dots, V_{m^2}\}$ of $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}), \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$ respectively, such that the following conditions hold.

$$\phi(U_i) = \sigma_i V_i, \quad \phi_i^*(V_i) = \sigma_i U_i, \quad \phi(U_i) = 0, \quad \phi_i^*(V_i) = 0 \text{ for } i > \text{rank } \phi, \quad (3.1)$$

$$\text{tr}(U_i U_j) = \delta_{ij} \text{ for } i, j = 1, \dots, n, \quad \text{tr}(V_p V_q) = \delta_{pq} \text{ for } p, q = 1, \dots, m. \quad (3.2)$$

If $m = n$ and ϕ is self-adjoint, i.e. $\text{tr}(\phi(X)Y) = \text{tr}(X\phi(Y))$, then the singular values of ϕ are the absolute values of the eigenvalues of ϕ . If an addition ϕ is positive operator, i.e. $\text{tr}(\phi(X)X) \geq 0$, the singular values of ϕ are the eigenvalues of ϕ . In that case in (3.1) we assume that $X_i = Y_i, i = 1, \dots, m$. The maximal characterization (2.3) is

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i(\phi) = \max_{X_1, \dots, X_k \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}), Y_1, \dots, Y_k \in \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C}), \text{tr}(X_i X_j) = \text{tr}(Y_i Y_j) = \delta_{ij}} \sum_{i=1}^k \text{tr}(\phi(X_i)Y_i), \quad (3.3)$$

for $k = 1, \dots, \min(m, n)$. If $m = n$ and ϕ is self-adjoint and positive we assume that $X_i = Y_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Note that $\sigma_1(\phi) = \|\phi\|$.

A linear mapping $\phi : \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is called *positive preserving* if $\phi(\mathcal{S}_{m,+}(\mathbb{C})) \subset \mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{C})$. Since $\mathcal{S}_{m,+}(\mathbb{C})$ is a self-adjoint cone, it follows ϕ is positive preserving if and only if ϕ^* is positive preserving. In particular, if ϕ is positive preserving, then the positive operators $\phi\phi^*$ and $\phi^*\phi$ are positive and positive preserving operators. Assume that ϕ is positive preserving. The Krein-Rutman theorem cone preserving theorem imply that in (3.1) we can choose $U_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{C}), V_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{m,+}(\mathbb{C})$. If ϕ is *strict positive preserving*, i.e. for each $0 \neq X \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{C})$ $\phi(X)$ has positive eigenvalues, then $U_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{C}), V_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{m,+}(\mathbb{C})$ are unique. See for example [1].

A ϕ is called trace preserving if ϕ is cone preserving, and $\text{tr}(\phi(X)) = \text{tr}(X)$ for all $X \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$. Note that for a trace preserving ϕ we have $\phi(\mathcal{S}_{n,+1}) \subset \mathcal{S}_{m,+1}$.

Recall that a linear operator $\tau : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$ is called *completely positive* if (1.1) holds. In Kronecker notation (2.5)

$$\tau = \sum_{i=1}^l A_i^\top \otimes A_i^*. \quad (3.4)$$

(Note that the complex space $\mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ is $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) + \sqrt{1-i}\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$, and τ is a *real* transformation.) Observe that if $A_1, \dots, A_l \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ then $\tau(\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})) \subset \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{R})$. Clearly, completely positive operator is cone preserving. Furthermore,

$$\tau^*(Y) = \sum_{i=1}^l A_i Y A_i^* \text{ where } Y \in \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C}). \quad (3.5)$$

Observe that

$$\text{tr } \tau(X) = \text{tr}(X \mathbf{A}'), \quad \mathbf{A}' := \sum_{i=1}^l A_i A_i^*. \quad (3.6)$$

Hence τ is trace preserving if and only if $\mathbf{A}' = I_n$. We will assume the above condition (1.2), unless stated otherwise. Such a mapping τ is called a *quantum channel*.

Theorem 3.1 *Let $\tau : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$ be a linear transformation. Then*

$$\max_{X \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+1}} \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(\tau(X)) = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n, \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_k \in \mathbb{C}^m, \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{x} = 1, \mathbf{y}_p^* \mathbf{y}_q = \delta_{pq}} \sum_{j=1}^k \text{tr}(\tau(\mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^*)(\mathbf{y}_j \mathbf{y}_j^*)), \quad (3.7)$$

for $k = 1, \dots, m$. In particular

$$\max_{X \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+1}} \lambda_1(\tau(X)) \leq \sigma_1(\tau). \quad (3.8)$$

Assume furthermore that τ is completely positive, i.e. (1.1) holds. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{X \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+1}} \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(\tau(X)) = & \quad (3.9) \\ \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n, \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_k \in \mathbb{C}^m, \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{x} = 1, \mathbf{y}_p^* \mathbf{y}_q = \delta_{pq}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{l,k} |\mathbf{y}_j^* A_i^* \mathbf{x}|^2, & \quad k = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$\max_{X \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+1}} \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(\tau(X)) \leq \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \quad j = 1, \dots, m, \quad (3.10)$$

where $\mathbf{A}(\tau)$ is given by (1.6).

Proof. (2.1) yields that $\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(Y)$ is a convex function on $\mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$, e.g. [2]. Therefore, $\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(\tau(X))$ is a convex function on $\mathcal{S}_{n,+1}$. Since the extreme points of $\mathcal{S}_{n,+1}$ are $\mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^*$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $\mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{x} = 1$, we obtain

$$\max_{X \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+1}} \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(\tau(X)) = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n, \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{x} = 1} \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(\tau(\mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^*)).$$

Combine this equality with (2.1) to deduce (3.7). Compare the maximum characterization (3.3) of $\sigma_1(\tau)$ with (3.7), ($k = 1$), to deduce (3.8).

Assume now that (1.1) holds. Note that

$$\mathrm{tr}((A_i^* \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^* A_i) \mathbf{y}_j \mathbf{y}_j^*) = \mathrm{tr}((\mathbf{y}_j^* A_i^* \mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x}^* A_i \mathbf{y}_j)) = |\mathbf{y}_j^* A_i^* \mathbf{x}|^2.$$

Hence, for completely positive operator (3.7) is equivalent to (3.9). The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$|\mathbf{y}_j^* A_i^* \mathbf{x}|^2 = |(A_i \mathbf{y}_j)^* \mathbf{x}|^2 \leq \|A_i \mathbf{y}_j\|^2 \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 = \mathbf{y}_j^* A_i^* A_i \mathbf{y}_j.$$

Hence, the left-hand side of (3.9) is bounded above by

$$\max_{\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_k \in \mathbb{C}^n, \mathbf{y}_p^* \mathbf{y}_q = \delta_{pq}} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{y}_j^* \mathbf{A}(\tau) \mathbf{y}_j.$$

(2.1) yield that the above maximum is equal to $\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(\mathbf{A})$, which implies (3.10). \square

4 Lower bounds on minimal entropies

Recall that minimum entropy output of a quantum channel τ , denoted by $H(\tau)$, is defined by (1.3). Since $H(Y)$ is a concave function on $\mathcal{S}_{m,+}(\mathbb{F})$, and the extreme points of $\mathcal{S}_{n,+}(\mathbb{F})$ are of the form $\mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^*$, where $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}^n$ and $\mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{x} = 1$ it follows that

$$H(\tau) = \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n, \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{x} = 1} H(\tau(\mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^*)). \quad (4.1)$$

Assume $\tau_j : \mathcal{S}_{n_j} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{m_j}(\mathbb{C})$, $j = 1, 2$ are two quantum channels:

$$\tau_j(X_j) = \sum_{i=1}^{l_j} A_{i,j}^* X_j A_{i,j}, \quad A_{i,j} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_j \times m_j}, \quad i = 1, \dots, l_j, \quad j = 1, 2. \quad (4.2)$$

I.e.

$$\tau_j = \sum_{i_j=1}^{l_j} A_{i_j,j}^\top \otimes A_{i_j,j}^*, \quad j = 1, 2.$$

Then $\tau_1 \otimes \tau_2$ is quantum channel since

$$\tau_1 \otimes \tau_2 = \sum_{i_1=i_2=}^{l_1, l_2} (A_{i_1,1}^\top \otimes A_{i_2,2}^\top) \otimes (A_{i_1,1}^* \otimes A_{i_2,2}^*). \quad (4.3)$$

Also, it is straightforward to check that

$$\mathbf{A}(\tau_1 \otimes \tau_2) = \mathbf{A}(\tau_1) \otimes \mathbf{A}(\tau_2). \quad (4.4)$$

Hence

$$\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_1 \otimes \tau_2)) = \log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_1)) + \log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_2)). \quad (4.5)$$

Thus $\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$ is the first additive invariant on quantum channels. Note that

$$\mathcal{S}_{n_1}(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{S}_{n_2}(\mathbb{C}) \subset \mathcal{S}_{n_1 n_2}, \quad \mathcal{S}_{n_1,+}(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{S}_{n_2,+}(\mathbb{C}) \subset \mathcal{S}_{n_1 n_2,+}.$$

Hence we obtain that the minimum entropy output of quantum channels is subadditive (1.4). The additivity conjecture in quantum information theory is if equality always holds in (1.4) [9].

Let $\tau : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$ be a quantum channel. Then the sequence $H(\otimes^p \tau)$ is subadditive:

$$H(\otimes^{p+q} \tau) \leq H(\otimes^p \tau) + H(\otimes^q \tau) \text{ for all integers } p, q \geq 1.$$

Hence the limit (1.5) exists.

The aim of this paper to give a nontrivial lower bound on $H_r(\tau)$ for certain quantum channels. Assume that τ_1, τ_2 are two quantum channels given by (4.2). Viewing τ_1, τ_2 as linear transformation we get

$$\log \|\tau_1 \otimes \tau_2\| = \log \sigma_1(\tau_1 \otimes \tau_2) = \log \sigma_1(\tau_1) + \log \sigma_1(\tau_2) = \log \|\tau_1\| + \log \|\tau_2\|. \quad (4.6)$$

Hence, $\log \|\tau\|$ is the second additive invariant on quantum channels.

Theorem 4.1 *Let $\tau : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$ be a quantum channel. Assume that $\min(\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \|\tau\|) < 1$. Then*

$$H_r(\tau) \geq \max(-\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), -\log \|\tau\|). \quad (4.7)$$

Proof. Let $Y \in \mathcal{S}_{m,+1}$. Since $\lambda_1(Y) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_m(Y) \geq 0$

$$H(Y) = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i(Y) \log \frac{1}{\lambda_i(Y)} \geq \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i(Y) \log \frac{1}{\lambda_1(Y)} \geq -\log \lambda_1(Y).$$

(3.10) for $k = 1$, (4.4) and (3.8) yield

$$\begin{aligned} H(\otimes^p \tau) &\geq -\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\otimes^p \tau)) = -\log \lambda_1(\otimes^p \mathbf{A}(\tau)) = -p \log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \\ H(\otimes^p \tau) &\geq -\log \sigma_1(\otimes^p \tau) = -p \log \sigma_1(\tau) = -p \log \|\tau\| \end{aligned}$$

Hence (4.7) holds. \square

Note that the proof of the above theorem yields that (4.7) always holds. However if $\min(\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \|\tau\|) \geq 1$ then the inequality (4.7) is trivial.

In the next sections we will give examples for which $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < 1$. In that case we can improve the lower bound for $H_r(\tau) \geq -\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$. Denote by $m' \geq 1$ the smallest positive integer that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m'} \lambda_i(\mathbf{A}) \geq 1. \quad (4.8)$$

Since τ is trace preserving (3.10) yields that $m' \geq m$. Note that $m' > 1$ if and only if $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < 1$. Assume first that $m' > 1$. Let

$$F(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = -\eta(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) \log \eta(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) - \sum_{i=1}^{m'-1} \lambda_i(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) \log \lambda_i(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \quad (4.9)$$

$$\text{where } \eta(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m'-1} \lambda_i(\mathbf{A}(\tau)).$$

Note that in this case $0 \leq \eta(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) \leq \lambda_{m'}(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$. Hence

$$F(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) \geq -\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)). \quad (4.10)$$

If $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) \geq 1$ we let $F(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = 0$.

Theorem 4.2 *Let τ be a quantum channel given by (1.1). Let $\mathbf{A}(\tau)$ be given by (1.6) and assume that $F(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$ is defined as above. Then*

$$H_r(\tau) \geq \limsup_{p \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(\otimes^p \mathbf{A}(\tau))}{p}. \quad (4.11)$$

Proof. If $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}) \geq 1$ then $\lambda_1(\otimes^p \mathbf{A}(\tau)) = \lambda_1(\mathbf{A})^p \geq 1$ and $F(\otimes^p \mathbf{A}(\tau)) = 0$. In that case (4.11) is trivial.

Assume that $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < 1$. Let

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) := (\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \dots, \lambda_{m'-1}(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \eta(\mathbf{A}(\tau)), \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{m-m'})^\top \in \mathbb{R}_+^m.$$

(3.10) implies that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\tau(X)) \prec \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$ for each $X \in \mathcal{S}_{n,+1}$. Since $x \log x$ is convex on \mathbb{R}_+ it follows that $-\mathbf{H}(\tau(X)) \leq -\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$. Hence $\mathbf{H}(\tau) \geq \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$. Similarly

$$\mathbf{H}(\otimes^p \tau) \geq \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A}(\otimes^p \tau)) = \mathbf{F}(\otimes^p \mathbf{A}(\tau)).$$

Hence (4.11) holds in this case. \square

We remark that the inequality (4.10) shows that (4.11) is an improvement of the inequality $H_r(\tau) \geq -\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$ when $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < 1$. Since the eigenvalues of $\otimes^p \mathbf{A}(\tau)$ are rearranged coordinates of the vector $\otimes^p \boldsymbol{\lambda}(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$, it should not be too difficult to find the exact formula of the right-hand side of (4.11) in terms of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$.

5 Examples

Example 1. A quantum channel $\tau : \mathcal{S}_1(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$ is of the form

$$\tau(x) = \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{a}_i x \mathbf{a}_i^*, \quad \mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{C}^m, i = 1, \dots, l, \quad \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{a}_i^* \mathbf{a}_i = 1, \quad \mathbf{A}(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_i^*. \quad (5.1)$$

Note that $\text{tr } \mathbf{A}(\tau) = 1$. Hence $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < 1$, unless $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_l$ are colinear. (This happens always if $m = 1$.)

We claim that

$$\sigma_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = \sqrt{\text{tr } \mathbf{A}(\tau)^2}. \quad (5.2)$$

Indeed

$$\max_{|x|=1, Y \in \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C}), \text{tr}(Y^2)=1} |\text{tr } \tau(x)Y| = \max_{Y \in \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C}), \text{tr}(Y^2)=1} |\text{tr } \mathbf{A}(\tau)Y| = \sqrt{\text{tr } \mathbf{A}(\tau)^2}.$$

Hence

$$\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < \sigma_1(\tau) < 1 \text{ iff } \mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_l \text{ are not colinear.} \quad (5.3)$$

If $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_l$ are colinear then $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}) = \sigma_1(\mathbf{A}) = 1$. Note that in this example $H(\tau) = H(\mathbf{A}(\tau))$.

Example 2. A quantum channel $\tau : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_1(\mathbb{C})$ is of the form

$$\tau(X) = \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{a}_i^* X \mathbf{a}_i, \quad \mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{C}^n, i = 1, \dots, l, \quad \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_i^* = I_n, \quad \mathbf{A}(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{a}_i^* \mathbf{a}_i = n. \quad (5.4)$$

So $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = n \geq 1$. On the other hand

$$\sigma_1(\tau) = \max_{X \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}), \text{tr } X^2 = 1, |y|=1} |\text{tr}(\tau(X)y)| = \max_{X \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}), \text{tr } X^2 = 1} |\text{tr } X| = \sqrt{n}. \quad (5.5)$$

So for $n > 1$ $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) > \sigma_1(\tau)$.

Example 3. A quantum channel $\tau : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is called strongly self-adjoint if

$$\tau(X) = \sum_{i=1}^l A_i X A_i, \quad A_i \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}), \quad \sum_{i=1}^l A_i^2 = I_n. \quad (5.6)$$

So $\mathbf{A}(\tau) = I_n$ and $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = 1$. Note that τ is self-adjoint and $\tau(I_n) = I_n$. Since I_n is an interior point of $\mathcal{S}_{n,+}$ it follows that $\sigma_1(\tau) = 1$.

Example 4. Assume $\tau_j : \mathcal{S}_{n_j} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{m_j}(\mathbb{C}), j = 1, 2$ are two quantum channels. Consider the quantum channel $\tau = \tau_1 \otimes \tau_2$. Then

$$\log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) = \log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_1)) + \log \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_2)), \quad \log \sigma_1(\tau) = \log \sigma_1(\tau_1) + \log \sigma_1(\tau_2).$$

Thus, it is possible to have $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < 1$ without the assumption that both τ_1 and τ_2 satisfy the same condition. Combine Example 1 and Example 3 to obtain examples of quantum channels $\tau : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{mn}(\mathbb{C})$, where $n, m > 1$ where $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < 1$. Similar arguments apply for $\sigma_1(\tau)$.

Example 5. Recall that if $B \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ and $C \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times q}$ then

$$B \oplus C = \begin{bmatrix} B & 0_{m \times q} \\ 0_{p \times n} & C \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{(m+p) \times (n+q)}.$$

Assume $\tau_j : \mathcal{S}_{n_j} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{m_j}(\mathbb{C}), j = 1, 2$ are two quantum channels given as in (4.2). Then $\tau_1 \oplus \tau_2 : \mathcal{S}_{n_1+n_2}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{m_1+m_2}(\mathbb{C})$ is defined as follows.

$$(\tau_1 \oplus \tau_2)(X) = \sum_{i_1=i_2=1}^{l_1, l_2} (A_{i_1,1}^* \oplus A_{i_2,2}^*) X (A_{i_1} \oplus A_{i_2,2}).$$

Clearly, $\tau_1 \oplus \tau_2$ is a quantum channel. Furthermore,

$$\mathbf{A}(\tau_1 \oplus \tau_2) = \mathbf{A}(\tau_1) \oplus \mathbf{A}(\tau_2).$$

Hence

$$\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_1 \oplus \tau_2)) = \max(\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_1)), \lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_2))). \quad (5.7)$$

This if $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_i)) < 1$ we get that $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_1 \oplus \tau_2)) < 1$.

The formula for $\sigma_1(\tau_1 \oplus \tau_2)$ does not seem to be as simple as (5.7). By viewing $\mathcal{S}_{n_1}(\mathbb{C}) \oplus \mathcal{S}_{n_2}(\mathbb{C})$ as a subspace of $\mathcal{S}_{n_1+n_2}(\mathbb{C})$ we deduce the inequality

$$\sigma_1(\tau_1 \oplus \tau_2) \geq \max(\sigma_1(\tau_1), \sigma_1(\tau_2)).$$

Example 6. We first show how to take a neighborhood of a given quantum channel given by (1.1). View $\mathcal{A} := (A_1, \dots, A_l)$ as a point in $(\mathbb{C}^{n \times m})^l$. Let $O(\mathcal{A}) \subset (\mathbb{C}^{n \times m})^l$ be an open neighborhood of \mathcal{A} such that for any $\mathcal{B} := (B_1, \dots, B_l) \in (\mathbb{C}^{n \times m})^l$ the matrix $C(\mathcal{B}) := \sum_{i=1}^l B_i B_i^*$ has positive eigenvalues. Define

$$\hat{\mathcal{B}} = (\hat{B}_1, \dots, \hat{B}_l) = (C(\mathcal{B})^{-\frac{1}{2}} B_1, \dots, C(\mathcal{B})^{-\frac{1}{2}} B_l) \in (\mathbb{C}^{n \times m})^l.$$

Then $\tau_{\mathcal{B}} : \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{C})$ given by

$$\tau_{\mathcal{B}}(X) = \sum_{i=1}^l (\hat{B}_i)^* X \hat{B}_i$$

is a quantum channel. So if $O(\mathcal{A})$ is a small neighborhood \mathcal{A} then $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}$ is in the small neighborhood of τ . In particular if $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau)) < 1$ then there exists a small neighborhood $O(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}(\tau_{\mathcal{B}})) < 1$ for each $\mathcal{B} \in O(\mathcal{A})$. Similar claim holds if $\sigma_1(\tau) < 1$.

References

- [1] A. Berman and R.J. Plemmons, *Nonnegative Matrices in the Mathematical Sciences*, Academic Press 1979.
- [2] S. Friedland, Convex spectral functions, *Linear Multilin. Algebra* 9 (1981), 299-316.
- [3] S. Friedland and U.N. Peled, Theory of Computation of Multidimensional Entropy with an Application to the Monomer-Dimer Problem, *Advances of Applied Math.* 34(2005), 486-522.
- [4] G.H. Hardy, J.E. Littlewood and G. Pólya, *Inequalities*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Second edition, 1952.
- [5] R.A. Horn and C.R. Johnson, *Topics in Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [6] P. Hayden and A. Winter, Counterexamples to maximal p -norm multiplicativity conjecture, arXiv: 0807.4753v1 [quant-ph] 30 July, 2008.
- [7] A.W. Marshall and I. Olkin, *Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and Its Application*, Academic Press, 1979.
- [8] Notes of Quantum Information Group, American Mathematical Institute workshop “Geometry and representation theory of tensors for computer science, statistics and other areas”, July 21-25, 2008.
- [9] P.W. Shor, Equivalence of additivity questions in quantum information theory, arXiv:quant-ph/030503v4, 3 July 2003.