

A Linearly Convergent Algorithm for Computing the Petz-Augustin Information

Chun-Neng Chu¹, Wei-Fu Tseng², and Yen-Huan Li^{1,2,3}

¹Department of Computer Science and Information Engineering,
National Taiwan University

²Department of Mathematics, National Taiwan University

³Center for Quantum Science and Engineering,
National Taiwan University

Abstract

We propose an iterative algorithm for computing the Petz-Augustin information of order $\alpha \in (1/2, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$. The optimization error is guaranteed to converge at a rate of $O(|1 - 1/\alpha|^T)$, where T is the number of iterations. Let n denote the cardinality of the input alphabet of the classical-quantum channel, and d the dimension of the quantum states. The algorithm has an initialization time complexity of $O(nd^3)$ and a per-iteration time complexity of $O(nd^2 + d^3)$. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first algorithm for computing the Petz-Augustin information with a non-asymptotic convergence guarantee.

1 Introduction

Several fundamental quantities in quantum information theory, including the quantum channel capacity, the relative entropy of entanglement, and the quantum Rényi information, are formulated as optimization problems and lack closed-form expressions [21, 54]. While their operational meanings and mathematical properties have been explored in depth, much less is known about how to efficiently compute these quantities. Recent works have been primarily focusing on the computation of quantities involving the quantum relative entropy. For instance, the self-concordance property of the quantum relative entropy has been exploited to facilitate the use of interior-point methods [17, 19, 24]. Various representations of the matrix logarithm and quantum relative entropy have been established, enabling numerous optimization tasks to be solved by semidefinite programming [3, 4, 15, 16, 18, 20, 24, 26, 27, 31, 32]. The classical Blahut-Arimoto algorithm has been generalized and quite well studied for computing quantum channel capacities [22, 23, 37, 44, 50].

A natural generalization of the quantum relative entropy is the quantum Rényi divergence. Due to the non-commutative nature of the quantum setup, there are multiple notions of quantum Rényi divergences, such as the Petz-Rényi divergence

[49], the sandwiched Rényi divergence [43, 55], the geometric Rényi divergence [13, 40], and the #-Rényi divergence [14]. Unfortunately, research on optimization involving quantum Rényi divergences remains limited. Fawzi and Fawzi [14], as well as Fang and Fawzi [13], formulated computational tasks involving the #-Rényi divergence and the geometric Rényi divergence as semidefinite programs. Liu et al. [39], by utilizing a specific approximation of the matrix geometric mean, proposed a new class of algorithms that can be used to compute the geometric Rényi divergence. You et al. [56] proposed computing various forms of the quantum Rényi information and the quantum Augustin information via mirror descent with a Polyak-type step size. Notably, their algorithm guarantees only asymptotic convergence and lacks a complexity characterization.

We are particularly interested in computing the Petz-Augustin information of order α , which is defined as the minimum of an expected Petz-Rényi divergence of order α over the set of quantum density matrices (1). The Petz-Augustin information is a generalization of the quantum mutual information and has an application in characterizing the sphere-packing exponent of classical-quantum channel coding [11, 7]. Unlike the quantum mutual information, the Petz-Augustin information does not have a closed-form expression. The optimization problem defining the Petz-Augustin information is convex for orders $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 2]$ [41]. However, the gradients and Hessians of Rényi divergences are unbounded [56, Propositions 3.1 and 3.2], violating standard assumptions in convex optimization literature. As a result, standard first-order optimization algorithms and their theoretical guarantees do not directly apply. To the best of our knowledge, no existing first-order optimization method for computing the Petz-Augustin information of any order has a non-asymptotic convergence guarantee. Although second-order methods [46] may be applicable, their per-iteration time complexities grow rapidly with the dimension of the quantum state, and hence do not scale well with the number of qubits.

We propose a simple iteration rule in Section 4.1, tailored for computing the Petz-Augustin information. We prove that the optimization error of the proposed iteration rule converges at a rate of $O(|1 - 1/\alpha|^T)$ for all $\alpha \in (1/2, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$, where T denotes the number of iterations (Theorem 4.1). This result is achieved by establishing the contractive property of the iterates with respect to the Thompson metric (Lemma 4.2). Notably, our algorithm is computationally cheaper than standard first-order methods, as the time complexity of computing a gradient is $O(nd^2 + d^4)$ [56], whereas the per-iteration time complexity of our algorithm is only $O(nd^2 + d^3)$, where n is the cardinality of the input alphabet of the classical-quantum channel, and d is the dimension of the quantum state.

2 Related Work

2.1 Computing Classical Augustin information

The classical Augustin information [2, 10] can be viewed as a special case of the Petz-Augustin information where all the matrices commute. Augustin [2] proposed a fixed-point iteration, which we refer to as the Augustin iteration, for computing the

Augustin information. The Augustin iteration is proved to converge asymptotically for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ by Karakos et al. [30] and Nakiboğlu [45]. Recently, Tsai et al. [52] proved that the Augustin iteration converges at a linear rate with respect to the Hilbert projective metric for $\alpha \in (1/2, 1) \cup (1, 3/2)$.

Our proposed method can be viewed as a generalization of the Augustin iteration for the classical Augustin information. Denote the function to be minimized in computing the Petz-Augustin information as $f_\alpha(\sigma_B)$, which is given in Section 3.3. The Augustin iteration can be written as¹

$$\sigma_B^{(t+1)} = \sigma_B^{(t)} \left(-\nabla f_\alpha \left(\sigma_B^{(t)} \right) \right),$$

where $\sigma_B^{(t)}$ denotes the t^{th} iterate of the algorithm. On the other hand, our method can be expressed as

$$\sigma_B^{(t+1)} = \sigma_B^{(t)} \left(-\nabla f_\alpha \left(\sigma_B^{(t)} \right) \right)^{1/\alpha},$$

if all the matrices commute. Thus, our method can be viewed as a generalization of the Augustin iteration with an additional parameter $1/\alpha$ in the exponent, which is analogous to the step size in first-order optimization methods.

For algorithms different from the Augustin iteration, an alternating minimization method [29] converges at a rate of $O(1/T)$ for $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$ [52], where T denotes the number of iterations. Riemannian gradient descent with respect to the Poincaré metric also converges at a rate of $O(1/T)$ for all $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ [53].

2.2 Computing Petz-Augustin information

The optimization problem defining the Petz-Augustin information of order α is known to be convex for $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 2]$ [41]. Since the objective function has a locally bounded gradient, entropic mirror descent with Armijo line search [38] or with the Polyak step size [56] is applicable for $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 2]$. However, these two algorithms only guarantee asymptotic convergence. To the best of our knowledge, there is currently no first-order method that guarantees a non-asymptotic convergence rate for any $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$.

Our algorithm (Equation (2)) is inspired by an algorithm proposed by Cohen and Peng [9] for computing the ℓ_p -Lewis weights, which has been proven to converge linearly with respect to the Thompson metric. The ℓ_p -Lewis weights, along with their variants, have applications in ℓ_1 -regression [12, 48] and linear programming [35]. Despite the conceptual connection, our results do not immediately follow from those of Cohen and Peng [9], as discussed in Section 5.

After completing this work, we noticed a recent study by Cheng and Nakiboğlu [5], which also considers an iterative algorithm that coincides with ours. However, their derivation and analysis adopt a different perspective and only guarantee asymptotic convergence for $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$. In contrast, we prove that the algorithm converges at a rate of $O(|1 - 1/\alpha|^T)$ for $\alpha \in (1/2, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$, not only extending the range of α but also providing a non-asymptotic guarantee.

¹Although originally proposed for the classical case, where matrices reduce to vectors, we present it in matrix form, as our algorithm is designed for the quantum case.

3 Preliminaries

3.1 Notations

We denote the sets of vectors in \mathbb{R}^d with nonnegative entries and strictly positive entries by \mathbb{R}_+^d and \mathbb{R}_{++}^d , respectively. We denote \mathbb{C}^d by \mathcal{H}_B . We denote the set of all Hermitian matrices in $\mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ by $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)$.

For any $\sigma_B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, we denote its support by

$$\text{supp}(\sigma_B) := \{u \in \mathcal{H}_B \mid \sigma_B u \neq 0\}.$$

We define A_i to be the i^{th} row of a matrix A and $v[i]$ to be the i^{th} entry of a vector v . For any vector v , we denote by $\text{Diag}(v)$ the diagonal matrix whose i -th diagonal element is $v[i]$. For any $v \in \mathbb{C}^d$, we denote its conjugate transpose by v^* . For any function $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define $f(v)$ as the d -dimensional vector where $f(v)[i] = f(v[i])$. Similarly, for such a function f and $\sigma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, we define $f(\sigma)$ as $\sum_{i=1}^d f(\lambda_i) u_i u_i^*$, where $\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i u_i u_i^*$ is the eigendecomposition of σ .

We denote the probability simplex in \mathbb{R}^d by Δ_{d-1} , i.e.,

$$\Delta_{d-1} := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}_+^d \mid \sum_{i=1}^d v[i] = 1 \right\}.$$

For any $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, we write $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2$ if and only if $\sigma_2 - \sigma_1$ is positive semi-definite. Similarly, we write $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$ if and only if $\sigma_2 - \sigma_1$ is positive definite. We define $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_+$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$ as the nonnegative cone and the positive cone in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, respectively. Specifically,

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_+ := \{\sigma_B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B) \mid \sigma_B \geq 0\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++} := \{\sigma_B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B) \mid \sigma_B > 0\}.$$

We denote the set of quantum density matrices in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_+$ by $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_B) := \{\sigma_B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_+ \mid \text{Tr}[\sigma_B] = 1\}.$$

For any $\sigma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_+$, we denote its i^{th} eigenvalue, ordered in decreasing order, by $\lambda_i(\sigma)$.

3.2 Thompson metric

The Thompson metric is a useful tool to study the behavior of dynamical systems [33, 36, 47, 51]. It can be defined on the interiors of any normal cone in real Banach spaces, such as \mathbb{R}_{++}^d and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$. Here, we are only interested in the following definition of the Thompson metric specialized for $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$.

Definition 3.1 ([51]). *The Thompson metric between any $U, V \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$ is given by*

$$d_T(V, U) := \inf \{ r \geq 0 \mid \exp(-r)V \leq U \leq \exp(r)V \}.$$

We will analyze the convergence of our proposed iteration rule by proving a contractive property of the iterates with respect to the Thompson metric (see Lemma 4.2 and Theorem 4.1). This analysis relies on the following lemmas concerning the Thompson metric, specialized for $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$.

Lemma 3.1 ([51, Lemma 3]). *The Thompson metric is a well-defined metric on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$, and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$ is complete with respect to this metric.*

Lemma 3.2 ([47, Proposition 1.5]). *For any $U, V \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$, we have*

$$d_T(U^r, V^r) \leq |r| d_T(U, V), \quad \forall r \in [-1, 1].$$

Lemma 3.3. *For any $U, V \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$ and $r > 0$, we have*

$$d_T(U, rV) \leq d_T(U, V) + |\log(r)|.$$

Proof. By Definition 3.1, we write

$$\exp(-d_T(V, U)) V \leq U \leq \exp(d_T(V, U)) V.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(-d_T(V, U) - |\log(r)|) V &\leq \exp(-d_T(V, U) + \log(r)) V \\ &\leq rU \\ &\leq \exp(d_T(V, U) + \log(r)) V \\ &\leq \exp(d_T(V, U) + |\log(r)|) V. \end{aligned}$$

By Definition 3.1, the inequalities above imply that

$$d_T(U, rV) \leq d_T(V, U) + |\log(r)|.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

3.3 Petz-Augustin Information

Let $\mathcal{X} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ denote the input alphabet, and let P_X denote the probability distribution of a random variable X defined on \mathcal{X} . Let $\mathcal{W} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ be a classical-quantum channel that maps an element $x \in \mathcal{X}$ to a density matrix ρ_B^x . We assume that $\text{supp}(\sum_{x: P_X(x) > 0} \rho_B^x) = \mathcal{H}_B \setminus \{0\}$. If the assumption does not hold, we may project all the matrices to a lower-dimensional space.

Given $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_+$, the Petz-Rényi divergence of order α is given by [49]

$$D_\alpha(\rho \parallel \sigma) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \text{Tr}[\rho^\alpha \sigma^{1-\alpha}], & \text{if } (\text{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \text{supp}(\sigma)) \\ & \text{or } (\alpha \in (0, 1) \text{ and } \text{supp}(\rho) \cap \text{supp}(\sigma) \neq \emptyset), \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$, where we allow σ to have a trace not equal to 1. The Petz-Augustin information of order α is given by

$$\min_{\sigma_B \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_B)} f_\alpha(\sigma_B), \quad f_\alpha(\sigma_B) := \mathbb{E}_{P_X} [D_\alpha(\rho_B^X \| \sigma_B)]. \quad (1)$$

Under the assumption that $\text{supp}(\sum_{x: P_X(x) > 0} \rho_B^x) = \mathcal{H}_B \setminus \{0\}$, the minimizer of this minimization problem exists [42, Lemma IV.8] and is full-rank [42, Lemma IV.11].

4 A Simple Iteration Rule and Its Convergence

4.1 A Simple Iteration Rule

Let $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$. Given f_α , we define the operator

$$T_{f_\alpha}: \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++} \mapsto \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}: U \mapsto \left(\mathbb{E}_{P_X} \left[\frac{(\rho_B^X)^\alpha}{\text{Tr}[(\rho_B^X)^\alpha U]} \right] \right)^{(1-\alpha)/\alpha}.$$

We propose the following simple iteration rule for solving the optimization problem (1):

- Let $\sigma_B^{(1)}$ be a full-rank density matrix.
- For every $t \in \mathbb{N}$, compute $\sigma_B^{(t+1)} = T_{f_\alpha} \left((\sigma_B^{(t)})^{1-\alpha} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)}$, and output $\frac{\sigma_B^{(t+1)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(t+1)}]}$.

To verify the well-definedness of the operator T_{f_α} , we first observe that for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, since $\rho_B^x \neq 0$, the denominator $\text{Tr}[(\rho_B^x)^\alpha U]$ is finite and positive for any $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$. Consequently, we have

$$\text{supp} \left(\frac{(\rho_B^x)^\alpha}{\text{Tr}[(\rho_B^x)^\alpha U]} \right) = \text{supp}(\rho_B^x).$$

Given the assumption $\text{supp}(\sum_{x: P_X(x) > 0} \rho_B^x) = \mathcal{H}_B \setminus \{0\}$, it follows that the support of $T_{f_\alpha}(U)$ is equal to $\mathcal{H}_B \setminus \{0\}$. This ensures that the operator T_{f_α} is well-defined. To understand why we restrict the domain of the operator T_{f_α} to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$, suppose $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_+$ is not full rank. In this case, the denominator $\text{Tr}[(\rho_B^x)^\alpha U]$ may become zero, rendering the definition of the operator T_{f_α} ill-defined.

To evaluate the time complexity of the proposed iteration rule, we express it explicitly as follows:

$$\sigma_B^{(t+1)} = \left(\sum_{x=1}^n P_X(x) \frac{(\rho_B^x)^\alpha}{\text{Tr}[(\rho_B^x)^\alpha (\sigma_B^{(t)})^{1-\alpha}]} \right)^{1/\alpha}. \quad (2)$$

The matrix powers $(\rho_B^x)^\alpha$ can be computed and stored before the first iteration begins. Given $(\rho_B^x)^\alpha$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, each $\text{Tr}[(\rho_B^x)^\alpha (\sigma_B^{(t)})^{1-\alpha}]$ can be computed in $O(d^2)$

time. Computing $(\sigma_B^{(t)})^{1-\alpha}$ and raising a matrix to the power $(1/\alpha)$ each require $O(d^3)$ time. Consequently, the initialization time complexity is $O(nd^3)$, and the per-iteration time complexity is $O(d^3 + nd^2)$.

4.2 Convergence Analysis

Below, we present our main theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *For any $\alpha \in (1/2, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$, let $\{\sigma_B^{(t)}\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence of iterates generated by our proposed iteration rule. Then, we have*

$$d_{\text{T}} \left((\sigma_B^*)^{1-\alpha}, \left(\frac{\sigma_B^{(T+1)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(T+1)}]} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right) \leq 2 \left| 1 - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right|^T d_{\text{T}} \left((\sigma_B^*)^{1-\alpha}, (\sigma_B^{(1)})^{1-\alpha} \right),$$

and

$$f_{\alpha} \left(\frac{\sigma_B^{(T+1)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(T+1)}]} \right) - f_{\alpha}(\sigma_B^*) \leq \left| \frac{2}{\alpha-1} \right| \cdot \left| 1 - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right|^T d_{\text{T}} \left((\sigma_B^*)^{1-\alpha}, (\sigma_B^{(1)})^{1-\alpha} \right),$$

where σ_B^* is the minimizer of the optimization problem (1). Moreover, for $\alpha > 1$, the function values are non-increasing, i.e.,

$$f_{\alpha} \left(\frac{\sigma_B^{(t+1)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(t+1)}]} \right) \leq f_{\alpha} \left(\frac{\sigma_B^{(t)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(t)}]} \right), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Furthermore, the quantity $d_{\text{T}} \left((\sigma_B^*)^{1-\alpha}, (\sigma_B^{(1)})^{1-\alpha} \right)$ is bounded above.

The proof of Theorem 4.1, which we defer to Section 4.2.5, relies on the following observations.

- The operator $T_{f_{\alpha}}$ is contractive with a ratio of $|1 - 1/\alpha|$ in the Thompson metric (Section 4.2.1). As a result, it has a unique fixed point, and the iterates $\sigma_B^{(t)}$ converge to this fixed point at a rate of $O(|1 - 1/\alpha|^T)$ in the Thompson metric.
- The unique fixed point of $T_{f_{\alpha}}$ coincides with the minimizer of the optimization problem (1) (see Section 4.2.2).
- The iterates $\sigma_B^{(t)}$ may not be “physical,” in the sense that they may not have unit traces. Fortunately, we show that the Thompson metrics between the iterates and the minimizer are preserved under trace normalization, up to a multiplicative constant. Therefore, the trace-normalized iterates still converge to the minimizer at a rate of $O(|1 - 1/\alpha|^T)$.
- The variation in function values can be upper-bounded by the Thompson metric between the iterates and the minimizer (see Section 4.2.4). Consequently, the above error bound in the Thompson metric translates into an error bound in function value.

4.2.1 Contractivity of T_{f_α}

Lemma 4.2 (Contractive Property). *Let $\alpha \in (1/2, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$. For any $U, V \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$, we have*

$$d_T(T_{f_\alpha}(V), T_{f_\alpha}(U)) \leq \left|1 - \frac{1}{\alpha}\right| d_T(V, U).$$

Proof. By Definition 3.1, we have

$$\exp(-d_T(V, U)) V \leq U \leq \exp(d_T(V, U)) V.$$

Since $\rho_B^X \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} T_{f_\alpha}(U)^{\alpha/(1-\alpha)} &= \mathbb{E}_{P_X} \left[\frac{(\rho_B^X)^\alpha}{\text{Tr}[(\rho_B^X)^\alpha U]} \right] \\ &\geq \exp(-d_T(V, U)) \mathbb{E}_{P_X} \left[\frac{(\rho_B^X)^\alpha}{\text{Tr}[(\rho_B^X)^\alpha V]} \right] \\ &= \exp(-d_T(V, U)) T_{f_\alpha}(V)^{\alpha/(1-\alpha)}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we write

$$\begin{aligned} T_{f_\alpha}(U)^{\alpha/(1-\alpha)} &\leq \exp(d_T(V, U)) \mathbb{E}_{P_X} \left[\frac{(\rho_B^X)^\alpha}{\text{Tr}[(\rho_B^X)^\alpha V]} \right] \\ &= \exp(d_T(V, U)) T_{f_\alpha}(V)^{\alpha/(1-\alpha)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Definition 3.1, the two inequalities above imply that

$$d_T(T_{f_\alpha}(V)^{\alpha/(1-\alpha)}, T_{f_\alpha}(U)^{\alpha/(1-\alpha)}) \leq d_T(V, U).$$

Then, by Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_T(T_{f_\alpha}(V), T_{f_\alpha}(U)) &= d_T\left((T_{f_\alpha}(V)^{\alpha/(1-\alpha)})^{(1-\alpha)/\alpha}, (T_{f_\alpha}(U)^{\alpha/(1-\alpha)})^{(1-\alpha)/\alpha}\right) \\ &\leq \left| \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} \right| d_T(T_{f_\alpha}(V)^{\alpha/(1-\alpha)}, T_{f_\alpha}(U)^{\alpha/(1-\alpha)}) \\ &\leq \left| 1 - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right| d_T(V, U). \end{aligned}$$

□

4.2.2 Fixed-Point Property of T_{f_α}

Lemma 4.3. *For any $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$, there exists a unique minimizer σ_B^* of the optimization problem (1). Moreover, for the same σ_B^* , $(\sigma_B^*)^{1-\alpha}$ is the unique fixed point of the operator T_{f_α} for $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$.*

The remainder of this section is devoted to the proof of Lemma 4.3. For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, Lemma 4.3 has been proven by Cheng et al. [7, Proposition 2(b)]. For $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$, the proof of Lemma 4.3 relies on the following observations:

- The traces of the iterates are always less than or equal to 1 (Lemma 4.6).
- The function values are non-increasing (Lemma 4.7).

We will use Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.5 to prove Lemma 4.6.

Lemma 4.4 (Araki-Lieb-Thirring Inequality [1]). *For any $U, V \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$, we have*

$$\mathrm{Tr} \left[(V^{1/2} U V^{1/2})^{sr} \right] \leq \mathrm{Tr} \left[(V^{r/2} U^r V^{r/2})^s \right],$$

for all $s > 0$ and $r \geq 1$.

Lemma 4.5 (Hölder Inequality [34]). *For any $U, V \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$ and $p > 1$, we have*

$$\mathrm{Tr}[UV] \leq \mathrm{Tr}[U^p]^{1/p} \mathrm{Tr}[V^{p/(p-1)}]^{1-1/p}.$$

Moreover, equality holds if and only if

$$\frac{U^p}{\mathrm{Tr}[U^p]} = \frac{V^{p/(p-1)}}{\mathrm{Tr}[V^{p/(p-1)}]}.$$

Lemma 4.6 (Bound of Trace). *For any $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$ and $\sigma_B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$ such that $\mathrm{Tr}[\sigma_B] \leq 1$, we have*

$$\mathrm{Tr} \left[T_{f_\alpha}(\sigma_B^{1-\alpha})^{1/(1-\alpha)} \right] \leq 1.$$

Moreover, equality holds if and only if σ_B is a fixed point of $T_{f_\alpha}((\cdot)^{1-\alpha})^{1/(1-\alpha)}$ on $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_B)$.

Proof. Let $\sigma_B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$ such that $\mathrm{Tr}[\sigma_B] \leq 1$. Let $U = T_{f_\alpha}(\sigma_B^{1-\alpha})^{\alpha/(1-\alpha)}$ and $V = \sigma_B^{1-\alpha}$. Then, both U and V are positive definite, and we have

$$\mathrm{Tr}[UV] = \mathrm{Tr} \left[\mathbb{E}_{P_X} \left[\frac{(\rho_B^X)^\alpha}{\mathrm{Tr}[(\rho_B^X)^\alpha \sigma_B^{1-\alpha}]} \right] \sigma_B^{1-\alpha} \right] = 1.$$

Then, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr} \left[(T_{f_\alpha}(\sigma_B^{1-\alpha}))^{1/(1-\alpha)} \right] &= \mathrm{Tr}[U^{1/\alpha}] \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}[(V^{1/(2\alpha)} U^{1/\alpha} V^{1/(2\alpha)}) V^{-1/\alpha}] \\ &\leq \mathrm{Tr} \left[(V^{1/(2\alpha)} U^{1/\alpha} V^{1/(2\alpha)})^\alpha \right]^{1/\alpha} \mathrm{Tr} \left[(V^{-1/\alpha})^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)} \right]^{1-1/\alpha} \\ &= \mathrm{Tr} \left[(V^{1/(2\alpha)} U^{1/\alpha} V^{1/(2\alpha)})^\alpha \right]^{1/\alpha} \mathrm{Tr}[\sigma_B]^{1-1/\alpha} \\ &\leq \mathrm{Tr} \left[(V^{1/(2\alpha)} U^{1/\alpha} V^{1/(2\alpha)})^\alpha \right]^{1/\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the Hölder inequality (Lemma 4.5), the third equality follows from the definition of V , and the last inequality follows from the assumption that $\text{Tr}[\sigma_B] \leq 1$.

Then, by the Araki-Lieb-Thirring inequality (Lemma 4.4), we have

$$\text{Tr} \left[(V^{1/(2\alpha)} U^{1/\alpha} V^{1/(2\alpha)})^\alpha \right] \leq \text{Tr} [V^{1/2} U V^{1/2}] = \text{Tr} [UV] = 1.$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\text{Tr} \left[(T_{f_\alpha}(\sigma_B^{1-\alpha}))^{1/(1-\alpha)} \right] \leq 1.$$

We proceed to prove the if and only if condition. Note that the “if” direction holds trivially. It remains to prove the “only if” direction. Suppose that $\text{Tr} \left[T_{f_\alpha}(\sigma_B^{1-\alpha})^{1/(1-\alpha)} \right] = 1$. Let U and V be defined as above. Recall that we have proved

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} \left[T_{f_\alpha}(\sigma_B^{1-\alpha})^{1/(1-\alpha)} \right] &= \text{Tr} \left[(V^{1/(2\alpha)} U^{1/\alpha} V^{1/(2\alpha)}) V^{-1/\alpha} \right] \\ &\leq \text{Tr} \left[(V^{1/(2\alpha)} U^{1/\alpha} V^{1/(2\alpha)})^\alpha \right]^{1/\alpha} \text{Tr} \left[(V^{-1/\alpha})^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)} \right]^{1-1/\alpha} \\ &= \text{Tr} \left[(V^{1/(2\alpha)} U^{1/\alpha} V^{1/(2\alpha)})^\alpha \right]^{1/\alpha} \text{Tr} [\sigma_B]^{1-1/\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\text{Tr} \left[(V^{1/(2\alpha)} U^{1/\alpha} V^{1/(2\alpha)})^\alpha \right] \leq 1.$$

Since we have assumed that $\text{Tr} \left[T_{f_\alpha}(\sigma_B^{1-\alpha})^{1/(1-\alpha)} \right] = 1$ and $\text{Tr} [\sigma_B] \leq 1$, it must be the case that

$$\text{Tr} \left[(V^{1/(2\alpha)} U^{1/\alpha} V^{1/(2\alpha)})^\alpha \right] = \text{Tr} \left[(V^{-1/\alpha})^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)} \right] = \text{Tr} [\sigma_B] = 1,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Tr} \left[(V^{1/(2\alpha)} U^{1/\alpha} V^{1/(2\alpha)}) V^{-1/\alpha} \right] \\ &= \text{Tr} \left[(V^{1/(2\alpha)} U^{1/\alpha} V^{1/(2\alpha)})^\alpha \right]^{1/\alpha} \text{Tr} \left[(V^{-1/\alpha})^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)} \right]^{1-1/\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the equality condition of the Hölder inequality (Lemma 4.5), the above equality implies

$$\frac{(V^{1/(2\alpha)} U^{1/\alpha} V^{1/(2\alpha)})^\alpha}{\text{Tr} \left[(V^{1/(2\alpha)} U^{1/\alpha} V^{1/(2\alpha)})^\alpha \right]} = \frac{(V^{-1/\alpha})^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)}}{\text{Tr} \left[(V^{-1/\alpha})^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)} \right]},$$

where the denominators on both sides, as concluded above, are equal to 1. Therefore, we have

$$(V^{1/(2\alpha)} U^{1/\alpha} V^{1/(2\alpha)})^\alpha = (V^{-1/\alpha})^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)}.$$

Plugging in the definitions of U and V , we get

$$T_{f_\alpha}(\sigma_B^{1-\alpha})^{1/(1-\alpha)} = \sigma_B.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Next, using Lemma 4.6, we prove that the function values are non-increasing, as stated in Lemma 4.7.

Lemma 4.7 (Monotonicity of the Function Value). *For any $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$ and $\sigma_B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$ such that $\text{Tr}[\sigma_B] \leq 1$, we have*

$$f_\alpha \left(T_{f_\alpha} (\sigma_B^{1-\alpha})^{1/(1-\alpha)} \right) \leq f_\alpha(\sigma_B).$$

Moreover, equality holds if and only if $\sigma_B^{1-\alpha}$ is a fixed point of T_{f_α} .

Proof. Let $\sigma_B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$ such that $\text{Tr}[\sigma_B] \leq 1$. We write

$$\begin{aligned} & f_\alpha \left(T_{f_\alpha} (\sigma_B^{1-\alpha})^{1/(1-\alpha)} \right) - f_\alpha(\sigma_B) \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \mathbb{E}_{P_X} \left[\log \left(\frac{\text{Tr}[(\rho_B^X)^\alpha T_{f_\alpha}(\sigma_B^{1-\alpha})]}{\text{Tr}[(\rho_B^X)^\alpha \sigma_B^{1-\alpha}]} \right) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \mathbb{E}_{P_X} \left[\frac{\text{Tr}[(\rho_B^X)^\alpha T_{f_\alpha}(\sigma_B^{1-\alpha})]}{\text{Tr}[(\rho_B^X)^\alpha \sigma_B^{1-\alpha}]} - 1 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \left(\text{Tr} \left[T_{f_\alpha} (\sigma_B^{1-\alpha})^{\alpha/(1-\alpha)} T_{f_\alpha} (\sigma_B^{1-\alpha}) \right] - 1 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality exploits the fact that $\log x \leq x - 1$, and the second equality follows from the definition of the operator T_{f_α} . The lemma then follows from Lemma 4.6. \square

Finally, we prove Lemma 4.3 by showing that the unique fixed point of the operator T_{f_α} is also the minimizer of the optimization problem (1).

Proof. (Lemma 4.3) By Lemma 3.1, Lemma 4.2, and the Banach fixed point theorem, there exists a unique $\sigma_B^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$ such that $(\sigma_B^*)^{1-\alpha}$ is the fixed point of the operator T_{f_α} for $\alpha \in (1/2, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$. We recall that for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, Lemma 4.3 has already been proved by Cheng et al. [7, Proposition 2(b)]. For $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$, let $\tilde{\sigma}_B^*$ be the minimizer of the optimization problem (1). Suppose that $(\tilde{\sigma}_B^*)^{1-\alpha}$ is not the fixed point of T_{f_α} . Then, the equality conditions in Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 4.7 do not hold, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} & f_\alpha \left(\frac{T_{f_\alpha} \left((\tilde{\sigma}_B^*)^{1-\alpha} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)}}{\text{Tr} \left[T_{f_\alpha} \left((\tilde{\sigma}_B^*)^{1-\alpha} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)} \right]} \right) \\ &= f_\alpha \left(T_{f_\alpha} \left((\tilde{\sigma}_B^*)^{1-\alpha} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)} \right) + \log \left(\text{Tr} \left[T_{f_\alpha} \left((\tilde{\sigma}_B^*)^{1-\alpha} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)} \right] \right) \\ &< f_\alpha(\tilde{\sigma}_B^*). \end{aligned}$$

This inequality contradicts the optimality of $\tilde{\sigma}_B^*$. Therefore, we conclude that $\sigma_B^* = \tilde{\sigma}_B^*$. \square

Remark 4.1. *After completing our work, we happened to find that the fixed-point property proven by Cheng et al. [6, Proposition 4(c)]² can also lead to the conclu-*

²Note that this result does not appear in the journal version [8].

sion in Lemma 4.3. However, our proof strategy differs from theirs. Furthermore, for $\alpha > 1$, our proof strategy yields an additional useful property for implementing the proposed iteration rule: the function values are non-increasing along the iteration path (Lemma 4.7).

4.2.3 Preservation of Thompson Metric under Trace-Normalization

The constraint set of the optimization problem (1) is the set of density matrices $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, whereas the traces of the iterates $\sigma_B^{(t)}$ may not equal 1. To address this, we show in Lemma 4.8 that the Thompson metric is preserved under trace-normalization, up to a multiplicative constant of 2.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$. For any $U, V \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$ such that $\text{Tr}[V] = 1$, we have*

$$d_{\text{T}}\left(V^{1-\alpha}, \left(\frac{U}{\text{Tr}[U]}\right)^{1-\alpha}\right) \leq 2d_{\text{T}}(V^{1-\alpha}, U^{1-\alpha}).$$

We will use Lemma 4.9 to prove Lemma 4.8.

Lemma 4.9 ([25, Corollary 7.7.4(c)]). *For any $U, V \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$ such that $U \leq V$, we have*

$$\lambda_i(U) \leq \lambda_i(V), \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}.$$

Proof. (Lemma 4.8) Let U, V be as defined in Lemma 4.8. By Lemma 3.3, we write

$$d_{\text{T}}\left(V^{1-\alpha}, \left(\frac{U}{\text{Tr}[U]}\right)^{1-\alpha}\right) \leq d_{\text{T}}(V^{1-\alpha}, U^{1-\alpha}) + |\alpha - 1| \cdot |\log(\text{Tr}[U])|.$$

It remains to bound the quantity $\text{Tr}[U]$, which can be written as follows:

$$\text{Tr}[U] = \sum_{i=1}^d (\lambda_i(U)^{1-\alpha})^{1/(1-\alpha)} = \sum_{i=1}^d (\lambda_i(U^{1-\alpha}))^{1/(1-\alpha)}.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 4.9, for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, we have

$$\exp(-d_{\text{T}}(V^{1-\alpha}, U^{1-\alpha})) \lambda_i(V^{1-\alpha}) \leq \lambda_i(U^{1-\alpha}) \leq \exp(d_{\text{T}}(V^{1-\alpha}, U^{1-\alpha})) \lambda_i(V^{1-\alpha}).$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$\exp\left(\frac{-d_{\text{T}}(V^{1-\alpha}, U^{1-\alpha})}{|1-\alpha|}\right) \text{Tr}[V] \leq \text{Tr}[U] \leq \exp\left(\frac{d_{\text{T}}(V^{1-\alpha}, U^{1-\alpha})}{|1-\alpha|}\right) \text{Tr}[V].$$

Since we assume that $\text{Tr}[V] = 1$, it follows that

$$|\log(\text{Tr}[U])| \leq \left|\frac{1}{\alpha-1}\right| d_{\text{T}}(V^{1-\alpha}, U^{1-\alpha}).$$

This concludes the proof. \square

4.2.4 Bounding Variation in Function Values

Finally, it remains to translate the convergence guarantee of the iterates into that of the function values. We prove that the difference between the function values is bounded above by the Thompson metric.

Lemma 4.10. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$. For any $U, V \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$, we have*

$$f_\alpha(U) - f_\alpha(V) \leq \left| \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \right| d_T(V^{1-\alpha}, U^{1-\alpha}).$$

Proof. (Lemma 4.10) Let U, V be as defined in Lemma 4.10. By Definition 3.1, we have

$$\exp(-d_T(V^{1-\alpha}, U^{1-\alpha})) V^{1-\alpha} \leq U^{1-\alpha} \leq \exp(d_T(V^{1-\alpha}, U^{1-\alpha})) V^{1-\alpha}.$$

Therefore, we write

$$\begin{aligned} f_\alpha(U) &= \mathbb{E}_{P_X} \left[\frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \text{Tr} \left[(\rho_B^X)^\alpha U^{1-\alpha} \right] \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{P_X} \left[\frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \text{Tr} \left[(\rho_B^X)^\alpha (\exp(d_T(V^{1-\alpha}, U^{1-\alpha})) V^{1-\alpha}) \right] \right] \\ &= f_\alpha(V) + \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} d_T(V^{1-\alpha}, U^{1-\alpha}) \end{aligned}$$

for $\alpha > 1$, and

$$\begin{aligned} f_\alpha(U) &\leq \mathbb{E}_{P_X} \left[\frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \text{Tr} \left[(\rho_B^X)^\alpha (\exp(-d_T(V^{1-\alpha}, U^{1-\alpha})) V^{1-\alpha}) \right] \right] \\ &= f_\alpha(V) + \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} d_T(V^{1-\alpha}, U^{1-\alpha}) \end{aligned}$$

for $\alpha < 1$. This concludes the proof. \square

4.2.5 Proof of the Main Theorem

Proof. (Theorem 4.1) Let σ_B^* and $\sigma_B^{(t)}$ be defined as in Theorem 4.1. By Lemma 4.2, Lemma 4.3, and induction, we write

$$d_T \left((\sigma_B^*)^{1-\alpha}, (\sigma_B^{(T+1)})^{1-\alpha} \right) \leq \left| 1 - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right|^T d_T \left((\sigma_B^*)^{1-\alpha}, (\sigma_B^{(1)})^{1-\alpha} \right).$$

Consequently, by Lemma 4.8, we obtain

$$d_T \left((\sigma_B^*)^{1-\alpha}, \left(\frac{\sigma_B^{(T+1)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(T+1)}]} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right) \leq 2 \left| 1 - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right|^T d_T \left((\sigma_B^*)^{1-\alpha}, (\sigma_B^{(1)})^{1-\alpha} \right).$$

By Lemma 4.10, it follows that

$$f_\alpha \left(\frac{\sigma_B^{(T+1)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(T+1)}]} \right) - f_\alpha(\sigma_B^*) \leq \left| \frac{2}{\alpha - 1} \right| \cdot \left| 1 - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right|^T d_{\text{T}} \left((\sigma_B^*)^{1-\alpha}, (\sigma_B^{(1)})^{1-\alpha} \right).$$

It remains to prove that

$$f_\alpha \left(\frac{\sigma_B^{(t+1)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(t+1)}]} \right) \leq f_\alpha \left(\frac{\sigma_B^{(t)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(t)}]} \right), \quad \forall \alpha > 1.$$

By the monotonicity of the function value (Lemma 4.7) and the bound of the trace (Lemma 4.6), we write

$$\begin{aligned} & f_\alpha \left(\frac{T_{f_\alpha} \left(\left(\frac{\sigma_B^{(t)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(t)}]} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)}}{\text{Tr} \left[T_{f_\alpha} \left(\left(\frac{\sigma_B^{(t)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(t)}]} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)} \right]} \right) \\ &= f_\alpha \left(T_{f_\alpha} \left(\left(\frac{\sigma_B^{(t)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(t)}]} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)} \right) + \log \left(\text{Tr} \left[T_{f_\alpha} \left(\left(\frac{\sigma_B^{(t)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(t)}]} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)} \right] \right) \\ &\leq f_\alpha \left(\frac{\sigma_B^{(t)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(t)}]} \right) + 0, \quad \forall \alpha > 1. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to prove that

$$\frac{\sigma_B^{(t+1)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(t+1)}]} = \frac{T_{f_\alpha} \left(\left(\frac{\sigma_B^{(t)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(t)}]} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)}}{\text{Tr} \left[T_{f_\alpha} \left(\left(\frac{\sigma_B^{(t)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(t)}]} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)} \right]}.$$

Note that for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$ and $\gamma > 0$, we have

$$T_{f_\alpha} \left((\gamma\sigma)^{1-\alpha} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)} = \gamma^{(\alpha-1)/\alpha} T_{f_\alpha} \left(\sigma^{1-\alpha} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)},$$

and thus,

$$\frac{T_{f_\alpha} \left((\gamma\sigma)^{1-\alpha} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)}}{\text{Tr} \left[T_{f_\alpha} \left((\gamma\sigma)^{1-\alpha} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)} \right]} = \frac{T_{f_\alpha} \left(\sigma^{1-\alpha} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)}}{\text{Tr} \left[T_{f_\alpha} \left(\sigma^{1-\alpha} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)} \right]}.$$

This implies that, by taking $\sigma = \sigma_B^{(t)}$ and $\gamma = 1/\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(t)}]$,

$$\frac{\sigma_B^{(t+1)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(t+1)}]} = \frac{T_{f_\alpha}\left(\left(\sigma_B^{(t)}\right)^{1-\alpha}\right)^{1/(1-\alpha)}}{\text{Tr}\left[T_{f_\alpha}\left(\left(\sigma_B^{(t)}\right)^{1-\alpha}\right)^{1/(1-\alpha)}\right]} = \frac{T_{f_\alpha}\left(\left(\frac{\sigma_B^{(t)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(t)}]}\right)^{1-\alpha}\right)^{1/(1-\alpha)}}{\text{Tr}\left[T_{f_\alpha}\left(\left(\frac{\sigma_B^{(t)}}{\text{Tr}[\sigma_B^{(t)}]}\right)^{1-\alpha}\right)^{1/(1-\alpha)}\right]}.$$

Finally, since $(\sigma_B^{(1)})^{1-\alpha}$ and $(\sigma_B^\star)^{1-\alpha}$ are full-rank density matrices, and the Thompson metric is a metric on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$ (Lemma 3.1), the quantity $d_T\left((\sigma_B^\star)^{1-\alpha}, (\sigma_B^{(1)})^{1-\alpha}\right)$ is finite. This concludes the proof. \square

5 Interesting Connection with ℓ_p -Lewis Weights

Our iteration rule, introduced in Section 4.1, is inspired by the iteration rule proposed by Cohen and Peng [9] for computing the ℓ_p -Lewis weights. To this end, we introduce the ℓ_p -Lewis weights and discuss their connection to our work.

The ℓ_p -Lewis weights are given by [35]

$$w^\star \in \underset{w \in m\Delta_{d-1}}{\text{argmin}} \frac{-1}{1 - \frac{2}{p}} \log \det(A^\top \text{Diag}(w^{1-2/p}) A),$$

for $p \in (0, \infty)$, where A is a d -by- m real matrix and A^\top denotes the transpose of A . Cohen and Peng [9] proposed the following iteration rule:

$$w^{(t+1)} = T_{\text{CP}}(w^{(t)}),$$

where

$$T_{\text{CP}}(w^{(t)})[i] := \left(A_i^\top \left(A^\top \text{Diag}\left((w^{(t)})^{1-2/p}\right) A \right)^{-1} A_i \right)^{p/2},$$

for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. They proved that the iterates $w^{(t)}$ converge linearly to w^\star with respect to the Thompson metric for $p \in (0, 4)$.

To demonstrate the similarity between their proposed iteration rule and ours (Equation (2)), we note that, when $m = 1$, the ℓ_p -Lewis weights can be written as

$$w^\star \in \underset{w \in \Delta_{d-1}}{\text{argmin}} \frac{-1}{1 - \frac{2}{p}} \log(\text{Tr}[\text{Diag}(a)^{2/p} \text{Diag}(w)^{1-2/p}]),$$

where a is a d -dimensional vector with $a[i] = |A_i|^p$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. Let $\alpha = 2/p$. Then, the problem corresponds to a special case of the optimization problem (1) where all matrices commute. In this case, the iteration rule proposed by Cohen and Peng [9] can be expressed as

$$\text{Diag}(w^{(t+1)}) = \left(\frac{\text{Diag}(a)^\alpha}{\text{Tr}[\text{Diag}(a)^\alpha \text{Diag}(w^{(t)})^{1-\alpha}]} \right)^{1/\alpha},$$

where we deliberately write the iterates as matrices to illustrate the similarity with our iteration rule (2).

Despite the similarity in algorithms, our results cannot be trivially derived from the work of Cohen and Peng [9]. Specifically, there are two main challenges in adapting their proposed algorithm to compute the Petz–Augustin information:

- The optimization problem (1) defining the Petz–Augustin information includes an additional expectation term, $\mathbb{E}_{P_X}[\cdot]$. Consequently, even when all the matrices commute, the computation of the Petz–Augustin information cannot be reduced to that of the ℓ_p -Lewis weights.
- Cohen and Peng [9] established the contractive property of their proposed algorithm with respect to the Thompson metric by proving

$$\log\left(\max\left\{\frac{T_{\text{CP}}(u)[i]}{T_{\text{CP}}(v)[i]}, \frac{T_{\text{CP}}(v)[i]}{T_{\text{CP}}(u)[i]}\right\}\right) \leq \left|1 - \frac{p}{2}\right| \log\left(\max\left\{\frac{u[i]}{v[i]}, \frac{v[i]}{u[i]}\right\}\right),$$

for each $1 \leq i \leq d$. This can be viewed as comparing the eigenvalues of the commuting matrices $\text{Diag}(u)$ and $\text{Diag}(v)$. However, in our case, the iterates $\sigma_B^{(t)}$ and the minimizer σ_B^* , as defined in Theorem 4.1, may not commute, making it infeasible to compare their eigenvalues within matched eigenspaces.

For the first challenge, we identify an appropriate generalization of the algorithm proposed by Cohen and Peng [9], leading to a new algorithm introduced in Section 4.1 for computing the Petz-Augustin information.

For the second challenge, we leverage the properties of the Thompson metric specialized for $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)_{++}$ (Lemma 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3). Specifically, in Lemma 4.2, we show that our proposed algorithm is a contraction with respect to the Thompson metric for $\alpha \in (1/2, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$.

6 Numerical Results

We implement our proposed iteration rule described in Section 4.1 to compute the Petz-Augustin information for α in $\{0.2, 0.4, 0.8, 1.5, 3, 5\}$. The source code is available on GitHub³. Throughout the experiments for $\alpha > 0.5$, we set the cardinality of \mathcal{X} to 2^5 and the dimension of \mathcal{H}_B to 2^7 . The quantum states ρ_B^x are generated using the `rand_dm` function from the Python package QuTiP [28]. Since the exact solution of the optimization problem (1) is unavailable, we compute an approximate optimization error instead. The approximate optimization error is defined as $f_\alpha\left(\sigma_B^{(t)} / \text{Tr}\left[\sigma_B^{(t)}\right]\right) - \hat{f}^*$, where \hat{f}^* denotes the function value of the last iterate after 30 iterations of our proposed algorithm.

For experiments with $\alpha \leq 0.5$, we manually design a challenging instance of the optimization problem (1), detailed in the `README.md` file in the aforementioned GitHub repository. The approximate optimization error is defined similarly as above. However, our proposed algorithm is not guaranteed to converge for $\alpha \leq 0.5$. Hence,

³<https://github.com/chunnengchu/PetzAugustin/>




Figure 1: Approximate optimization error versus the number of iterations for $\alpha > 0.5$

for $\alpha \leq 0.5$, we replace \hat{f}^* with the function value of the best iterate over 30 iterations of entropic mirror descent with the Polyak step size [56], as this method is guaranteed to converge asymptotically and is known to converge quickly in practice.

In Figure 1, we observe linear convergence rates for the optimization error when $\alpha > 0.5$. Notably, Theorem 4.1 establishes that the exponent of the linear convergence rate is bounded above by $|1 - \frac{1}{\alpha}|$. Consistent with this result, Figure 1 demonstrates a similar relationship between α and the empirical convergence rate.

Since Lemma 4.3 implies that our algorithm functions as a fixed-point iteration for $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$, despite the fact that our convergence guarantee in Theorem 4.1 does not cover the case where $\alpha \leq 0.5$, we present in Figure 2 the experimental results for $\alpha \in \{0.2, 0.4\}$. Numerical experiments suggest that our proposed algorithm seems to diverge for $\alpha \in \{0.2, 0.4\}$ on the aforementioned synthetic instance of the optimization problem (1). Since no existing algorithm for computing the Petz-Augustin information of order $\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$ has a non-asymptotic convergence guarantee, developing a rigorous algorithm for this purpose remains an open direction for future research.




Figure 2: Approximate optimization error versus the number of iterations for $\alpha \leq 0.5$

7 Acknowledgements

This work is supported by the Young Scholar Fellowship (Einstein Program) of the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) of Taiwan under grant number NSTC 112-2636-E-002-003; the 2030 Cross-Generation Young Scholars Program (Excellent Young Scholars) of the NSTC under grant number NSTC 112-2628-E-002-019-MY3; the research project “Geometry of Quantum Learning and Optimization” of National Taiwan University under grant number NTU-CC-114L895006; and the Academic Career Development Research Program (Laurel Research Project) of National Taiwan University under grant number NTU-CDP-114L7744.

References

- [1] H. Araki. On an inequality of Lieb and Thirring. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 19:167–170, 1990. p. 9
- [2] U. Augustin. *Noisy channels*. Habilitation thesis, Univ. Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1978. p. 2, p. 2
- [3] P. Brown, H. Fawzi, and O. Fawzi. Device-independent lower bounds on the conditional von Neumann entropy. 2024. arXiv:2106.13692v3. p. 1
- [4] V. Chandrasekaran and P. S. Shah. Relative entropy optimization and its applications. *Math. Program., Ser. A*, 161:1–32, 2017. p. 1
- [5] H.-C. Cheng and B. Nakiboğlu. A new characterization of Augustin information and mean. In *IEEE Int. Symp. Information Theory*, pages 2538–2543, 2024. p. 3
- [6] H.-C. Cheng, L. Gao, and M.-H. Hsieh. Properties of noncommutative Rényi and Augustin information. 2018. arXiv:1811.04218v1. p. 11
- [7] H.-C. Cheng, M.-H. Hsieh, and M. Tomamichel. Quantum sphere-packing bounds with polynomial prefactors. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 65(5):2872–2898, 2019. p. 2, p. 9, p. 11

- [8] H.-C. Cheng, L. Gao, and M.-H. Hsieh. Properties of noncommutative Rényi and Augustin information. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 390:501–544, 2022. p. 11
- [9] M. B. Cohen and R. Peng. ℓ_p row sampling by Lewis weights. In *Proc. 47th Annu. ACM Symp. Theory of Computing*, pages 183–192, 2015. p. 3, p. 3, p. 15, p. 15, p. 16, p. 16, p. 16
- [10] I. Csiszár. Generalized cutoff rates and Rényi’s information measures. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 41(1):26–34, 1995. p. 2
- [11] M. Dalai and A. Winter. Constant compositions in the sphere packing bound for classical-quantum channels. In *IEEE Int. Symp. Information Theory*, pages 151–155, 2014. p. 2
- [12] D. Durfee, K. A. Lai, and S. Sawlani. ℓ_1 regression using Lewis weights preconditioning and stochastic gradient descent. In *Proc. 31st Conf. Learning Theory*, pages 1626–1656, 2018. p. 3
- [13] K. Fang and H. Fawzi. Geometric Rényi divergence and its applications in quantum channel capacities. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 384:1615–1677, 2021. p. 2, p. 2
- [14] H. Fawzi and O. Fawzi. Defining quantum divergences via convex optimization. *Quantum*, 5:387, 2021. p. 2, p. 2
- [15] H. Fawzi and O. Fawzi. Semidefinite programming lower bounds on the squashed entanglement. 2022. arXiv:2203.03394. p. 1
- [16] H. Fawzi and J. Saunderson. Lieb’s concavity theorem, matrix geometric means, and semidefinite optimization. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 513:240–263, 2017. p. 1
- [17] H. Fawzi and J. Saunderson. Optimal self-concordant barriers for quantum relative entropies. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 33(4):2858–2884, 2023. p. 1
- [18] H. Fawzi, J. Saunderson, and P. A. Parrilo. Semidefinite approximations of the matrix logarithm. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 19(2):259–296, 2019. p. 1
- [19] L. Faybusovich. Matrix monotonicity and self-concordance: how to handle quantum entropy in optimization problems. *Optim. Lett.*, 11(8):5710–5730, 2017. p. 1
- [20] P. E. Frenkel. Integral formula for quantum relative entropy implies data processing inequality. *Quant.*, 7:1102, 2023. p. 1
- [21] M. Hayashi. *Quantum Information Theory*. Springer, 2017. p. 1
- [22] M. Hayashi and G. Liu. Generalized quantum Arimoto–Blahut algorithm and its application to quantum information bottleneck. *Quantum Sci. Technol.*, 9(4):045036, 2024. p. 1

- [23] K. He, J. Saunderson, and H. Fawzi. A Bregman proximal perspective on classical and quantum Blahut-Arimoto algorithms. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 70(8): 5710–5730, 2024. p. 1
- [24] K. He, J. Saunderson, and H. Fawzi. Exploiting structure in quantum relative entropy programs. 2024. arXiv:2407.00241v2. p. 1, p. 1
- [25] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, 2nd edition, 2013. p. 12
- [26] Z. Huang and M. M. Wilde. Semi-definite optimization of the measured relative entropies of quantum states and channels. 2024. arXiv:2406.19060. p. 1
- [27] A. Jeřcová. Recoverability of quantum channels via hypothesis testing. *Lett. Math. Phys*, 114, 2024. p. 1
- [28] J. Johansson, P. Nation, and F. Nori. QuTiP: An open-source Python framework for the dynamics of open quantum systems. *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, 183(8): 1760–1772, 2012. p. 16
- [29] A. Kamatsuka, K. Kazama, and T. Yoshida. Algorithms for computing the Augustin–Csiszár mutual information and Lapidoth–Pfister mutual information. 2024. arXiv:2404.10950v2. p. 3
- [30] D. Karakos, S. Khudanpur, and C. E. Priebe. Computation of Csiszár’s mutual information of order α . In *IEEE. Int. Symp. Information Theory*, pages 2106–2110, 2008. p. 3
- [31] G. Kořmann and R. Schwonnek. Optimising the relative entropy under semi definite constraints - a new tool for estimating key rates in QKD. 2024. arXiv:2404.17016. p. 1
- [32] G. Kořmann and M. M. Wilde. Semidefinite optimization of the quantum relative entropy of channels. 2024. arXiv:2410.16362. p. 1
- [33] U. Krause. *Positive Dynamical Systems in Discrete Time*. De Gruyter, Berlin, DE, 2015. p. 4
- [34] G. Larotonda. The case of equality in Hölder’s inequality for matrices and operators. *Math. Proc. R. Ir. Acad.*, 118A(1):1–4, 2018. p. 9
- [35] Y. T. Lee and A. Sidford. Solving linear programs with $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\text{rank}})$ linear system solves. 2020. arXiv:1910.08033v2. p. 3, p. 15
- [36] B. Lemmens and R. Nussbaum. *Nonlinear Perron-Frobenius Theory*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, 2012. p. 4
- [37] H. Li and N. Cai. A Blahut-Arimoto type algorithm for computing classical-quantum channel capacity. In *IEEE Int. Symp. Information Theory*, pages 255–259, 2019. p. 1

- [38] Y.-H. Li and V. Cevher. Convergence of the exponentiated gradient method with Armijo line search. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 181:588–607, 2019. p. 3
- [39] N. Liu, Q. Wang, M. M. Wilde, and Z. Zhang. Quantum algorithms for matrix geometric means. 2024. arXiv:2405.00673. p. 2
- [40] K. Matsumoto. A new quantum version of f -divergence. In *Nagoya Winter Workshop: Reality and Measurement in Algebraic Quantum Theory (NWW 2015)*, volume 261, pages 229–273, 2018. p. 2
- [41] M. Mosonyi and T. Ogawa. Strong converse exponent for classical-quantum channel coding. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 355:373–426, 2017. p. 2, p. 3
- [42] M. Mosonyi and T. Ogawa. Divergence radii and the strong converse exponent of classical-quantum channel coding with constant compositions. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 67(3):1668–1698, 2021. p. 6, p. 6
- [43] M. Müller-Lennert, F. Dupuis, O. Szechr, S. Fehr, and M. Tomamichel. On quantum Rényi entropies: A new generalization and some properties. *J. Math. Phys.*, 54(12), 2013. p. 2
- [44] H. Nagaoka. Algorithms of Arimoto-Blahut type for computing quantum channel capacity. In *IEEE Int. Symp. Information Theory*, pages 354–, 1998. p. 1
- [45] B. Nakiboğlu. The Augustin capacity and center. *Probl. Inf. Transm.*, 55:299–342, 2019. p. 3
- [46] Y. Nesterov. *Lectures on convex optimization*. Springer, Cham, CH, second edition, 2018. p. 2
- [47] R. D. Nussbaum. *Hilbert’s projective metric and iterated nonlinear maps*. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1988. p. 4, p. 5
- [48] A. Parulekar, A. Parulekar, and E. Price. L1 regression with Lewis weights subsampling. In *Int. Workshop on Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*, 2021. p. 3
- [49] D. Petz. Quasi-entropies for finite quantum systems. *Rep. Math. Phys.*, 23(1): 57–65, 1986. p. 2, p. 5
- [50] N. Ramakrishnan, R. Iten, V. B. Scholz, and M. Berta. Computing quantum channel capacities. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 67(2):946–960, 2021. p. 1
- [51] A. C. Thompson. On certain contraction mappings in a partially ordered vector space. *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.*, 14(3):438–443, 1963. p. 4, p. 4, p. 5
- [52] C.-E. Tsai, G.-R. Wang, H.-C. Cheng, and Y.-H. Li. Linear convergence in Hilbert’s projective metric for computing Augustin information and a Rényi information measure. 2024. arXiv:2409.02640v2. p. 3, p. 3

- [53] G.-R. Wang, C.-E. Tsai, H.-C. Cheng, and Y.-H. Li. Computing Augustin information via hybrid geodesically convex optimization. In *IEEE Int. Symp. Information Theory*, pages 2532–2537, 2024. p. 3
- [54] M. M. Wilde. *Quantum Information Theory*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2017. p. 1
- [55] M. M. Wilde, A. Winter, and D. Yang. Strong converse for the classical capacity of entanglement-breaking and Hadamard channels via a sandwiched Rényi relative entropy. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 331:593–622, 2014. p. 2
- [56] J.-K. You, H.-C. Cheng, and Y.-H. Li. Minimizing quantum Rényi divergences via mirror descent with Polyak step size. In *IEEE Int. Symp. Information Theory*, pages 252–257, 2022. p. 2, p. 2, p. 2, p. 3, p. 17