Coherence manipulation with dephasing-covariant operations
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We investigate the operational capabilities of dephasing-covariant incoherent operations (DIO), the largest class of quantum channels which can neither create nor detect coherence, in efficiently manipulating quantum coherence as a resource. We first show that pure-state transformations under DIO are completely governed by majorization, establishing for the first time necessary and sufficient conditions for such transformations, and showing that DIO forms another class of operations in which majorization plays a vital role. We then propose an operationally-motivated extension of the set DIO, the input-dependent class ρ-DIO, and characterize its capabilities. We show that, although ρ-DIO cannot detect the coherence of the input state ρ, they can distill more coherence than DIO. However, the advantage disappears in the task of coherence dilution and at the asymptotic level, where both sets of operations achieve the same performance in all transformations.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum coherence, or superposition, is an intrinsic feature of quantum mechanics which underlies the advantages enabled by quantum information processing and quantum technologies [1]. The resource theory of quantum coherence [1–4] has found extensive use in the characterization of our ability to manipulate coherence efficiently within a rigorous theoretical framework, wherein the properties of a resource are investigated under a suitable set of allowed (“free”) operations which reflect the constraints placed on the manipulation of the given resource [5, 6]. Despite many promising developments in the establishment of a comprehensive theory of coherence, the physical constraints governing its manipulation are not clear [1, 7, 8] — in particular, it has not been possible so far to identify a unique class of physically-motivated free operations under which the operational features of coherence should be investigated, akin to the role that local operations and classical communication play in the manipulation of quantum entanglement [9]. This has warranted the study of the operational properties of quantum coherence under a variety of different sets of operations [4, 7, 8, 10–27]. Understanding the exact properties and interrelations of such operations remains as one of the most important outstanding questions in the resource theory of coherence [1].

Many proposed types of free operations stem from meaningful physical considerations: these include the physically incoherent operations [7], which only require the use of incoherent ancillary systems and incoherent measurements, making them very easily implementable; the strictly incoherent operations [4, 12], which allow for a similar implementation with an incoherent ancilla, but require arbitrary measurements; or the genuinely incoherent operations [14], which preserve any incoherent state. However, these operations were found to be very limited in their operational capabilities [14, 26, 27], suggesting that any non-trivial and useful resource theory of coherence would require a larger set of allowed maps. On the other hand, strictly larger sets of maps such as maximally incoherent operations (MIO) [2], while operationally powerful, might be considered as too permissive and lacking a physical justification. It therefore remains to uncover the exact capabilities of different sets of operations, establishing the limits on our power to manipulate quantum coherence while bound by the resource-theoretic restrictions.

Out of the many choices of operations, the study of operations based on dephasing covariance has recently attracted significant attention due to their strong physical justification and considerable operational power [7, 8, 12, 15, 18–20, 22, 23]. The motivation to consider such operations is that they can neither create nor detect (use) coherence [12, 15, 23], and can be considered to be inherently “classical” operations [23, 28]. In this work, we characterize the operational capabilities of such channels in detail. We first study the class of dephasing-covariant incoherent operations (DIO) [7, 8], constituting the largest class of operations that do not detect the coherence of any input state. We establish for the first time a complete description of pure-state transformations under these operations by relating them with the theory of majorization, revealing also an operational connection between DIO and various other classes of free operations. To investigate the ultimate operational limits of coherence non-detecting channels, we then introduce the class of operations ρ-DIO, which are tailored to a specific input state and extend the class DIO. We show in particular that such maps satisfy a curious property: even though ρ-DIO cannot detect the coherence of the state ρ, they can still distill more coherence from ρ than the class DIO; however, this advantage disappears in the asymptotic limit, where DIO match the capabilities of ρ-DIO in all
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state transformations. Our results give insight into the precise operational power of free operations which do not use coherence in manipulating coherence as a resource.

II. DIO AND $\rho$-DIO

Quantum coherence is inherently a basis-dependent concept. We will therefore fix an orthonormal basis $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^d$ which we deem incoherent, and use $I$ to denote the set of all states diagonal (incoherent) in this basis. We will use $\Delta(\cdot) = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| \cdot |i\rangle\langle i|$ to denote the completely dephasing channel in this basis.

The class of operations MIO is defined to consist of all maps which do not create coherence in the sense that $\sigma \in I \Rightarrow \Lambda(\sigma) \in I$. Due to their inability to create coherence, it can be regarded as the largest possible class of free operations. However, it satisfies some undesirable properties such as being able to increase the diagonal rank of a pure state [13]: a two-level superposition $\sum_{i=1}^2 \psi_i |i\rangle$ can be mapped with MIO to a multi-level superposition $\sum_{i=1}^d \phi_i |i\rangle$, which could be regarded as effectively increasing the strength of the coherence contained in the state. To circumvent this problem, more restricted choices of operations can be defined. One such class are the precisely DIO, defined to be all maps which commute with the completely dephasing channel, i.e. $\Lambda \circ \Lambda(\rho) = \Lambda \circ \Lambda(\rho) \forall \rho$. The crucial difference between MIO and DIO is that DIO neither create nor detect coherence, in the sense that measurement statistics under any incoherent measurement after a DIO operation $\Lambda$ are the same regardless of whether the input state possessed any coherence or not: we have $\langle i|\Lambda(\rho)|i\rangle = \langle i|\Lambda(\Lambda(\rho))|i\rangle$ for all $i$. These operations have previously been considered in various contexts [15, 28], and indeed they admit several interpretations. The operations DIO can be regarded as inherently classical [23, 28], as any classical (incoherent) observer is unable to distinguish $\Lambda(\rho)$ from $\Lambda \circ \Delta(\rho)$, and hence is unable to say whether the coherence of $\rho$ has been employed in the process. The latter point shows that DIO can also be understood as the operations which do not use coherence [12, 15], as the properties of the output system accessible to a classical observer are independent of the coherence of the input.

The ability to detect coherence is of particular importance in practical setups relying on quantum coherence, such as general interferometric experiments [12, 23, 29]. A general interferometric protocol can be understood as consisting of three separate parts: first, a state in superposition is created; second, path-dependent phases are encoded in the state with suitable unitary operations; and third, the information about the paths is extracted in a measurement. It is then explicit that the ability to create (in the first step) and detect (in the last step) coherence are crucial for any such setup to work, and indeed any operation which can neither create nor detect coherence is inherently free and cannot be used in such an experimental protocol.

However, consider now a scenario in which the input coherent state $\rho$ of a protocol is known: the operations which cannot detect the coherence of the input state are then precisely those which satisfy $\Lambda \circ \Delta(\rho) = \Delta \circ \Lambda(\rho)$ for this choice of $\rho$, and indeed it is not necessary to impose dephasing covariance for all quantum states if one is concerned with detecting the coherence of $\rho$ specifically. This point of view motivates us to define the class of $\rho$-dephasing-covariant incoherent operations ($\rho$-DIO), which we take to be the operations which commute with the dephasing channel $\Delta$ for a given input state $\rho$.

It is clear that a $\rho$-DIO map can in principle create or detect coherence when acting on an input state other than $\rho$. However, the definition of $\rho$-DIO is justified whenever one deals with an explicit protocol which transforms a fixed input state to some desired output. Two of such protocols form the foundations of the manipulation of coherence as a quantum resource: these are the tasks of coherence distillation [4, 19, 25], which aims to convert a given input state to a maximally coherent state, as well as coherence dilution [4, 18], which performs the opposite transformation of a maximally coherent input state to some desired state. The definition of $\rho$-DIO then motivates the question: can the operational capabilities of DIO be surpassed by operations which do not detect the coherence of the input state $\rho$? To address this question, we first describe the transformations achievable under DIO, and later investigate whether $\rho$-DIO can outperform DIO.

III. PURE-STATE TRANSFORMATIONS UNDER DIO

Although a fundamental and operationally meaningful choice of operations, the class DIO is relatively unexplored, and few of its properties are known. Other classes of operations are better understood: in particular, it is known that the transformations of pure states under the classes of incoherent operations (IO) [3] and strictly incoherent operations (SIO) [4, 12] are governed by majorization theory, in a similar way to the manipulation of pure-state entanglement under local operations and classical communication [30]. Precisely, one has that a pure-state transformation $|\psi\rangle = \sum_i \psi_i |i\rangle \rightarrow |\phi\rangle = \sum_i \phi_i |i\rangle$ is achievable under IO or SIO if and only if $\Delta(\psi) < \Delta(\phi)$ [13, 31, 32], i.e. if $\sum_{i=1}^d |\psi_i|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^d |\phi_i|^2 \forall k \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ where we assume that the coefficients of the states are arranged so that $|\psi_1| \geq \ldots \geq |\psi_d|$. Our first contribution is to extend this relation to the class DIO.

Theorem 1. The deterministic pure-state transformation $\psi \rightarrow \phi$ is possible under DIO if and only if $\Delta(\psi) < \Delta(\phi)$.

We refer to the Appendix for the full proof of the Theorem. This establishes DIO as another class of operations in which pure-state transformations are fully governed by majorization theory, and reveals an operational equivalence between DIO, IO, and SIO in manipulating pure states. The equivalence is non-trivial: the class DIO is
incomparable with IO [13], and there exist coherence monotones which can increase under DIO despite always decreasing under the action of SIO/IO [33].

The Theorem immediately lets us apply a plethora of results to coherence manipulation under DIO. For instance, the recent investigation of moderate-deviation interconversion rates under majorization in [34, 35] allows one to precisely characterize DIO transformations beyond the single-shot regime; similarly, a recent investigation of quantum coherence fluctuation relations [36] relies purely on the theory of majorization, and our result immediately establishes that the results can be directly applied to describe the fluctuations and battery-assisted transformations under DIO operations.

The result can also be extended to so-called heralded probabilistic transformations, where a state |ψ⟩ is transformed to one of the states {|φ⟩i} with a corresponding probability pγ, and the information about the final state is encoded onto a classical flag register, in the sense that ψ → ∑ γ pγ |φ⟩i ⊗ |j⟩⟨j|. One can similarly show that this is possible under DIO if and only if Λ(ψ) < ∑ γ pγ Λ(φ) [37]. This again establishes an equivalence between DIO, IO, and SIO in such transformations, and generalizes earlier results showing this for special cases [22].

IV. COHERENCE MANIPULATION WITH ρ-DIO

The existence of a ρ-DIO transformation between states ρ and σ is equivalent to the existence of a quantum channel Λ such that Λ(ρ) = σ and Λ(Δ(ρ)) = Λ(Δ(σ)). This has strong connections with the concept of relative majorization [38–40], and could perhaps suggest that majorization will also play a role in ρ-DIO transformations, making them no more powerful than DIO. We will show that this is in fact not the case. To investigate this problem, we now focus on the fundamental tasks of distillation and dilution.

A. Distillation

The ε-error one-shot distillable coherence under the class ρ-DIO is defined to be the maximal size of the maximally coherent state |Ψm⟩ = ∑ i 1√m |i⟩ achievable under a single ρ-DIO transformation; formally, we have

$$C_{d, ρ\text{-DIO}}^{(1),ε}(ρ) := \log \max \left\{ m \left| \max_{\Lambda \in \rho\text{-DIO}} F(\Lambda(ρ), Ψ_m) \geq 1 - \varepsilon \right. \right\}$$

where $$F(ρ, σ) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{ρ} \sqrt{σ}}$$ is the fidelity. Our first result exactly characterizes this quantity in terms of the hypothesis testing relative entropy $$D_H^\rho(ρ∥|σ)$$ [41–43]

$$D_H^\rho(ρ∥|σ):=-\log \min \{\text{Tr} M σ \mid 0 \leq M \leq \mathbb{I}, 1 - \text{Tr} M ρ \leq \varepsilon\}.$$ 

This quantity finds use in the fundamental task of quantum hypothesis testing [44, 45], where one is interested in distinguishing between two quantum states ρ and σ by a measurement {M, 1 - M}, with $$D_H^\rho(ρ∥|σ)$$ quantifying exactly the smallest probability of incorrectly accepting state ρ as true (Tr M σ) while constraining the probability of incorrectly accepting state σ as true (Tr(1 - M) σ) to be at most ε. We remark that $$D_H^\rho(ρ∥|σ)$$ is efficiently computable as a semidefinite program [46].

We relate the hypothesis testing relative entropy with distillation in the following.

Theorem 2. The ε-error one-shot distillable coherence under ρ-DIO for any input state ρ is given by

$$C_{d, ρ\text{-DIO}}^{(1),ε}(ρ) := \log \left[ D_H^\rho(ρ∥|Δ(ρ)) \right]_\log,$$

where $$[x]_\log := \log (2^x).$$

This explicitly shows a very intuitive property of the class of operations ρ-DIO: the most distinguishable a state ρ is from its dephased version Δ(ρ), the more coherence we can extract from it using ρ-DIO. This can be compared with the expression for one-shot distillable coherence under DIO [19], where $$D_H^\rho$$ additionally has to be optimized over a set of operators, and does not enjoy an exact interpretation in this context.

Of particular importance will be the case ε = 0, that is, exact deterministic distillation of coherence. The result then reduces to

$$C_{d, ρ\text{-DIO}}^{(1),0}(ρ) := \log \left[ D_H^\rho(ρ∥|Δ(ρ)) \right]_\log = \log \frac{1}{\text{Tr} Π_p Δ(ρ)}$$

where $$Π_p$$ is the projection onto the support of ρ. In particular, combining the results of Thms. 1 and 2, we have the following.

Corollary 3. A pure state |ψ⟩ = ∑ i ψi |i⟩ can be deterministically transformed to |Ψm⟩ under DIO iff

$$\max_i |ψ_i|^2 \leq \frac{1}{m},$$

while the transformation is possible under ψ-DIO iff

$$\langle ψ|Δ(ψ)|ψ⟩ = \sum_i |ψ_i|^4 \leq \frac{1}{m}.$$

The above allows us to easily construct examples of states such that, even though |ψ⟩ → |Ψm⟩ is impossible under DIO, the transformation can be achieved by ψ-DIO. Consider for example the state |ψ⟩ := \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{5}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\right)^T, for which it can be verified that Δ(|Ψ2⟩) ̸= Δ(|ψ⟩), which means the transformation |ψ⟩ → |Ψ2⟩ is impossible by DIO (and in fact by all MIO [19]). However, we easily compute $$\sum_i |ψ_i|^4 = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} < \frac{1}{2}$$ and so $$C_{d, ρ\text{-DIO}}^{(1),0}(ψ) = 1$$ and hence one coherence bit Ψ2 can be distilled exactly. This explicitly shows an operational advantage provided by
the operations $\rho$-DIO over DIO in state transformations and in particular in coherence distillation. Such an advantage is rather surprising: to any classical observer, the distillation protocol is indistinguishable from a classical operation, yet it can distill more coherence than even the powerful class MIO.

However, consider now the many-copy scenario in which we have access to multiple copies of the given state $\rho$ and perform joint quantum operations on the composite system $\rho^\otimes n$. In the asymptotic independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) limit, one can then define the distillable coherence under $\rho$-DIO as

$$C^\infty_{d,\rho\text{-DIO}}(\rho) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{n} C^{(1),\varepsilon}_{c,\rho\text{-DIO}}(\rho^\otimes n).$$

A simple application of Thm. 1 together with the quantum Stein’s lemma [47, 48] reveals that we have in fact $C^\infty_{d,\rho\text{-DIO}}(\rho) = D(\rho\|\Delta(\rho))$, that is, the relative entropy of coherence $D(\rho\|\Delta(\rho))$ characterizes the asymptotic rate of coherence distillation under $\rho$-DIO. But it is known already that under DIO we also have $C^\infty_{d,DIO}(\rho) = D(\rho\|\Delta(\rho))$ [19, 20], which means that $\rho$-DIO do not perform any better than DIO in the asymptotic limit. Taking into consideration the operational gap between the operations DIO and $\rho$-DIO in single-shot transformations, the asymptotic result can be quite surprising, since it effectively shows that the advantage provided by $\rho$-DIO over DIO will be relatively minor and will disappear completely at the asymptotic level.

Finally, one can define the zero-error distillable coherence as

$$C^{\infty,0}_{d,\rho\text{-DIO}}(\rho) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} C^{(1),0}_{d,\rho\text{-DIO}}(\rho^\otimes n).$$

Noting the additivity of $D^0(\rho\|\Delta(\rho))$, from Eq. (1) we immediately get that $C^{\infty,0}_{d,\rho\text{-DIO}}(\rho) = -\log \text{Tr} \Pi_\rho \Delta(\rho)$.

### B. Dilution

Consider the case when one wants to transform a maximally coherent state $\Psi_m$ into a general state $\rho$, using a $\Psi_m$-DIO protocol. The one-shot coherence cost is then given by

$$C^{(1),\varepsilon}_{c,\Psi_m\text{-DIO}}(\rho) := \log \min \left\{ m \left| \max_{\Lambda \in \Psi_m\text{-DIO}} F(\Lambda(\Psi_m), \rho) \geq 1 - \varepsilon \right. \right\}.$$

To characterize this quantity, we will consider the coherence monotone based on the max-relative entropy between $\rho$ and $\Delta(\rho)$ [13], given by

$$R_\Delta(\rho) := \min \left\{ \lambda \left| \rho \leq (1 + \lambda) \Delta(\rho) \right. \right\} = \|\Delta(\rho)^{-1/2} \rho \Delta(\rho)^{-1/2}\|_1 - 1.$$

It is easy to verify that $R_\Delta(\lambda(\rho)) \leq R_\Delta(\rho)$ for any $\rho$-DIO operation $\Lambda$. Using this quantity, we have the following.

**Theorem 4.** The $\varepsilon$-error one-shot coherence cost under $\Psi_m$-DIO operations is given by

$$C^{(1),\varepsilon}_{c,\Psi_m\text{-DIO}}(\rho) = \log \min \left\{ R_\Delta(\rho) + 1 \left| \omega \in \mathbb{D}, F(\rho, \omega) \geq 1 - \varepsilon \right. \right\} \|\rho\|_{\log(2^\varepsilon)}$$

where $\mathbb{D}$ denotes density matrices and $[x]_{\log(2^\varepsilon)} := \log(2^\varepsilon)$.

Interestingly, comparing the above with the results obtained previously for DIO [18], we have that

$$C^{(1),\varepsilon}_{c,\Psi_m\text{-DIO}}(\rho) = C^{(1),\varepsilon}_{c,\text{DIO}}(\rho);$$

that is, the operations $\Psi_m$-DIO provide no advantage over DIO whatsoever. Combining this with the fact that the asymptotic coherence cost under DIO is given exactly by $D(\rho\|\Delta(\rho))$ [20], we similarly have that

$$C^\infty_{d,\Psi_m\text{-DIO}}(\rho) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} C^{(1),\varepsilon}_{c,\Psi_m\text{-DIO}}(\rho^\otimes n) = D(\rho\|\Delta(\rho)),$$

We can also note that the zero-error coherence cost under $\Psi_m$-DIO (or DIO) is given exactly by $[\log(R_\Delta(\rho) + 1)]_{\log(2)}$ and noticing the multiplicativity of $R_\Delta$, we can see that the asymptotic zero-error cost of coherence dilution will be given simply by $\log(R_\Delta(\rho) + 1)$.

### C. General transformations and monotones

When discussing asymptotic state transformations, one is in particular interested in the largest rate $R(\rho \to \sigma)$ at which copies of $\rho$ can be transformed to copies of $\sigma$ under the given class of operations. Our results can be used to show that the rate of any such transformation under $\rho$-DIO is completely characterized by the relative entropy between the states and their diagonals. As this is true also for DIO [20], asymptotically, $\rho$-DIO provide no advantage whatsoever over DIO in any state transformation.

To see this, notice first that any transformation $\rho \to \omega \to \sigma$ such that the operation taking $\rho$ to $\omega$ is $\rho$-DIO and the operation taking $\omega$ to $\sigma$ is $\omega$-DIO results in an overall protocol $\rho \to \sigma$ which is $\rho$-DIO. This in particular allows us to employ maximally coherent states $\Psi_m$ as an intermediary in coherence transformations. Using the fact that $\Psi_m = \{|+\rangle\|\sqrt{m}\rangle\}$, we can interpret the distillable coherence $C_{d,\rho\text{-DIO}}^{\infty}(\rho)$ as the rate $R(\rho \to |+\rangle\langle+|)$ under $\rho$-DIO, and the coherence cost $C_{c,\Psi_m\text{-DIO}}^{\infty}(\sigma)$ as the rate $1/R(|+\rangle\langle+| \to \sigma)$ under $|+\rangle\langle+|$-$\text{DIO}$; a straightforward argument in analogy with [49] then shows the following.

**Corollary 5.** For any states $\rho$ and $\sigma$, the maximal rate of the asymptotic transformation $\rho \to \sigma$ under $\rho$-DIO operations is given by

$$R(\rho \to \sigma) = \frac{D(\rho\|\Delta(\rho))}{D(\sigma\|\Delta(\sigma))}.$$
Furthermore, one can obtain various useful sufficient conditions for the transformations in the one-shot setting. For instance, we show that the monotone $R_\Lambda$ can also be used to characterize state transformations under $\rho$-DIO which go beyond coherence distillation and dilution.

**Proposition 6.** If $R_\Lambda(\sigma) + 1 \leq 1/\text{Tr} \Pi_\Lambda(\rho)$, then there exists a $\rho$-DIO map such that $\Lambda(\rho) = \sigma$.

In the particularly simple case of single-qubit transformations, we furthermore establish an equivalence of $\rho$-DIO and DIO.

**Proposition 7.** For any single-qubit states $\rho$ and $\sigma$, the transformation $\rho \rightarrow \sigma$ is possible under $\rho$-DIO if and only if it is possible under DIO, which holds if and only if $|\rho|_{\ell_1} \geq |\sigma|_{\ell_1}$.

Here, $|\rho|_{\ell_1} = \sum_k |\langle i | \rho | j \rangle|$.

We note from [13] that single-qubit DIO transformations have been shown to be equivalent to both MIO and SIO transformations, and our result thus extends this equivalence also to $\rho$-DIO. This does not hold beyond dimension 2, as we have demonstrated in Sec. IV A a transformation from a qutrit to a qubit system achievable with $\rho$-DIO but impossible under MIO and DIO.

In the case of general pure-state transformations $\psi \rightarrow \phi$ under $\rho$-DIO, more conditions can be obtained. For instance, consider $d$-dimensional pure states $|\psi \rangle$ and $|\phi \rangle$, define the unitary matrix $U = \text{diag}(1, \omega, \omega^2, \ldots, \omega^{d-1})$ where $\omega$ is a primitive $d$th root of unity, and use it to define the states $|\psi_k \rangle = U^k |\psi \rangle$ and $|\phi_k \rangle = U^k |\phi \rangle$. Then, if there exists a quantum channel such that $\Lambda(\psi_k) = \phi_k \forall k \in \{0, \ldots, d-1\}$, this means precisely that $\Lambda$ is a $\psi$-DIO transformation mapping $\psi$ to $\phi$ due to the fact that $\sum_k U^k \psi_k U^k = d \Lambda(\psi)$. The existence of such a quantum channel between sets of pure states can be verified very efficiently by comparing their Gram matrices [50].

In the Appendix, we discuss also a generalization of this idea based on Gram matrices which leads to a stronger sufficient condition for pure-state transformations.

Necessary conditions for single-shot $\rho$-DIO transformations can be characterized by monotonies under this class, that is, functions which obey the property that whenever there exists a transformation $\rho \rightarrow \sigma$ under $\rho$-DIO, it implies that $f(\rho) \geq f(\sigma)$. Some DIO monotonies, discussed e.g. in [13], will in fact also be $\rho$-DIO monotonies — this includes $R_\Lambda$ or the relative entropy of coherence $D(\rho)\frac{\Lambda(\rho)}{\Lambda(\Delta(\rho))}$, where the monotonicity of the latter follows from the data processing inequality. Indeed, any quantity which obeys $f(\rho) \geq f(\sigma)$ for each monotone $f$ will form a $\rho$-DIO monotone — importantly, this includes Rényi relative entropies $D_\alpha(\rho)\frac{\Lambda(\rho)}{\Lambda(\Delta(\rho))} = \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log Tr \rho^\alpha(\Lambda(\rho))^{1-\alpha}$, but only in the range $\alpha \in [0, 2]$ [51], which contrasts with the set DIO for which all $\alpha$ give a valid monotone [13]. For a pure state, the Rényi relative entropies reduce to $D_{\alpha}(\psi)\frac{\Lambda(\psi)}{\Lambda(\Delta(\psi))} = S_{\alpha-1}(\psi)$ [13] where $S_\gamma(\psi) = \frac{1}{\gamma-1} \log \|\Delta(\psi)\|_{\ell_1}$ are the Rényi entropies. This shows in particular that $\ell_p$ norms of the squared moduli of the coefficients of a pure state are $\psi$-DIO monotones for $p$ in the range $p \in [0, 1]$ and reverse monotones for $p \in [1, 2]$. An outstanding question is whether such monotonies form a complete set, in the sense that the inequality $f(\rho) \geq f(\sigma)$ for each monotone $f$ implies that there exists a $\rho$-DIO transformation taking $\rho$ to $\sigma$. Although a complete set of infinitely many monotonies can certainly be defined [52–54], it is in unclear at this stage if there exists a finite set of conditions fully characterizing state transformations under $\rho$-DIO.

**V. DISCUSSION**

In this work, we tackled the fundamental question of how to efficiently manipulate quantum coherence as a resource under operations which do not use coherence and thus, to an outside observer, appear classical. We studied this question under two classes of channels: DIO, respecting dephasing covariance for any input state, and $\rho$-DIO, tailored to a specific input state. We first shed light on the operational power of DIO and explicitly characterized pure-state transformations under this class, revealing a novel connection between DIO and majorization theory and thus connecting DIO to several other classes of free operations. To push the question of coherence manipulation under coherence non-detecting operations to its very limit, we introduced the class of operations $\rho$-DIO and investigated the advantages that this extension provides. We showed in particular that, even though the coherence of the input state is not detected, $\rho$-DIO allow one to distill more coherence than DIO in the one-shot setting. However, despite $\rho$-DIO constituting a significant relaxation of the constraints of DIO, the increased capabilities of such channels are limited to non-asymptotic regimes — we showed that the advantages disappear completely at the asymptotic level, where both sets of operations achieve the same performance in all transformations. This suggests that the simpler class $\rho$-DIO closely approximates the performance of all DIO and can be used as a substitute for DIO in operational tasks. The results provide insight into the structure of the ultimate physical constraints on coherence manipulation with free operations and establish new connections in the operational description of quantum coherence.
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APPENDIX

I. PURE-STATE TRANSFORMATIONS UNDER DIO

Let \( \{ |x\rangle \}_{x=1 \ldots d_{in}} \subset \mathcal{H}_{in} \) and \( \{ |y\rangle \}_{y=1 \ldots d_{out}} \subset \mathcal{H}_{out} \) be the incoherent bases on the input and output Hilbert spaces respectively.

**Definition 8 (DIO).** A channel \( \mathcal{E} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{in}) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{out}) \) is a dephasing-covariant incoherent operation (DIO) if \( \Delta_{out} \circ \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E} \circ \Delta_{in} \), where

\[
\Delta_{in}(\cdot) := \sum_{x} |x\rangle \langle x| \cdot |x\rangle \langle x| ;
\]

\[
\Delta_{out}(\cdot) := \sum_{y} |y\rangle \langle y| \cdot |y\rangle \langle y| .
\]

We now cast the DIO property of a channel in terms of its Kraus operator representations. Let \( \mathcal{E}(\cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} K_i(\cdot) K_i^\dagger \); we don’t have to worry about the value of \( n \). The equivalence of \( \Delta_{out} \circ \mathcal{E} \) and \( \mathcal{E} \circ \Delta_{in} \) can be translated to the equality of their Choi operators:

\[
\mathbb{1} \otimes [\Delta_{out} \circ \mathcal{E} \left( \sum_{x_1, x_2} |x_1 x_1\rangle \langle x_2 x_2| \right)] = \mathbb{1} \otimes [\mathcal{E} \circ \Delta_{in} \left( \sum_{x_1, x_2} |x_1 x_1\rangle \langle x_2 x_2| \right)]
\]

\[
\Rightarrow \sum_{i, x_1, x_2, y} |x_1\rangle \langle x_2| \otimes (|y\rangle \langle y| K_i |x_1\rangle \langle x_2| K_i^\dagger |y\rangle \langle y|) = \sum_{i, x} |x\rangle \langle x| \otimes \left( K_i |x\rangle \langle x| K_i^\dagger \right) .
\]

This leads to the following handy properties of any Kraus operator representation of a DIO:

**Observation 1.** Define the vectors \( K(y, x) \in \mathcal{V} = \mathbb{C}^{n}, d_{in} d_{out} \) in number, as follows:

\[
K(y, x) := \left( \langle y| K_1 |x\rangle , \langle y| K_2 |x\rangle , \ldots , \langle y| K_n |x\rangle \right) .
\]

Also define \( S_{y|x} := \langle K(y, x), K(y, x) \rangle \), where \( \langle \cdot , \cdot \rangle \) is the standard Hermitian inner product on \( \mathbb{C}^{n} \). Then, the following conditions together capture the DIO property of the CP map \( \mathcal{E}(\cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} K_i(\cdot) K_i^\dagger \):

1. Diagonal (i.e., incoherent) input produces diagonal output on average: \( \langle K(y, x), K(y_1, x) \rangle = S_{y|x} \delta_{yy_1} \).

2. Diagonal-free input produces diagonal-free output on average: \( \langle K(y, x), K(y, x_1) \rangle = S_{y|x} \delta_{xx_1} \).

3. Trace is preserved: \( \sum_{y=1}^{d_{out}} S_{y|x} = 1 \) for all \( x \in \{ 1, 2, \ldots , d_{in} \} \) (justifying the “conditional” notation).

It is important to bear in mind that each of these conditions involves summing over all the \( n \) Kraus operators. In particular, if the “on average” condition 1 were tightened to apply to each Kraus operator separately while relaxing 2 altogether, the resulting conditions would characterize the class of incoherent operations (IO). Likewise, if both 1 and 2 were tightened to apply to every Kraus operator, we would have strictly incoherent operations (SIO).

For convenience, we also define the normalized vectors \( \hat{K}(y, x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{S_{y|x}}} K(y, x) \), whence \( \langle \hat{K}(y, x), \hat{K}(y_1, x) \rangle = \delta_{yy_1} \) and \( \langle \hat{K}(y, x), \hat{K}(y, x_1) \rangle = \delta_{xx_1} \). In cases where \( S_{y|x} = 0 \), just define \( \hat{K}(y, x) \) to be some unit vector orthogonal to the rest, suitably expanding the space.

A. Deterministic pure-to-pure state conversion

Now consider the problem of determining the conditions under which there is a DIO deterministically mapping a given pure state \( \psi \) to another, \( \phi \). We shall prove the following theorem. Say the DIO given by \( K(y, x) \) achieves the desired transformation. Then,
Theorem 1. A given initial state $|\psi\rangle = \sum_x \mu_x |x\rangle$ can be mapped deterministically to a given target state $|\phi\rangle = v_y |y\rangle$ by a DIO if and only if the majorization relation

$$p < q$$  \hspace{1cm} (A4)

holds, where $p_x := |\mu_x|^2$ and $q_y := |v_y|^2$.

Proof. Since the overall output is the pure state $\phi$, the output of each individual Kraus operator must necessarily be proportional to $\phi$. In other words, there exists a normalized $\hat{c} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that

$$\sum_{x_1} K_i(y, x_1) \mu_{x_1} = c_i v_y$$  \hspace{1cm} (A5)

for all $i, y$. Multiplying both sides by $\overline{K_i(y, x)}$ and summing over $i$,

$$\sum_{x_1} \mu_{x_1} \sum_{i=1}^n \overline{K_i(y, x)} K_i(y, x_1) = \sum_{i=1}^n \overline{K_i(y, x)} c_i v_y$$

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{x_1=1}^{d_m} \mu_{x_1} S_{y|x} \delta_{x_1} = \langle K(y, x), \hat{c} \rangle v_y$$

$$\Rightarrow \mu_x \sqrt{S_{y|x}} = \langle \hat{\kappa}(y, x), \hat{c} \rangle v_y$$

$$\Rightarrow p_x = |\mu_x|^2 = |\mu_x|^2 \sum_{y=1}^{d_{out}} S_{y|x} = \sum_{y=1}^{d_{out}} |\langle \hat{\kappa}(y, x), \hat{c} \rangle|^2 |v_y|^2 = \sum_{y=1}^{d_{out}} |\langle \hat{\kappa}(y, x), \hat{c} \rangle|^2 q_y.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A6)

The second line above follows from condition 2; the following line by dividing throughout by $\sqrt{S_{y|x}}$ and applying the definition of $\hat{\kappa}(y, x)$; in the last line we just sum the previous line’s expressions over $y$ and use the stochasticity of $S$.

Now define $T_{x|y} := |\langle \hat{\kappa}(y, x), \hat{c} \rangle|^2$. The normalization of $\hat{c}$ and orthonormality of $\{\langle \hat{\kappa}(y, x), \hat{c} \rangle\}_{y=1}^{d_{out}}$ for each $x$ and $\{\hat{\kappa}(y, x)\}_{y=1}^{d_{out}}$ for each $x$ together imply that $T$ is sub-bistochastic. This implies that $p$ is weakly majorized by $q$; normalization of the distributions implies (non-weak) majorization. Incidentally, the same normalization arguments also imply that $n = d_m$ suffices.

Thus, majorization of the input coherence distribution by the output is necessary for the existence of a DIO deterministically mapping $\psi \mapsto \phi$. Since this condition is already known to be sufficient for the existence of such an SIO, its sufficiency for the existence of such a DIO follows.

\[\blacksquare\]

B. Probabilistic pure-to-pure state conversion

A relaxed definition of probabilistic conversion of a given state $|\psi\rangle$ to an ensemble $\{(\eta_j, |\phi_j\rangle)\}$ under a class of operations is one where a channel $\Lambda \equiv \{K_i\}$ belonging to the class satisfies $K_i \psi K_i^\dagger = \eta_j \phi_j$. This definition is not easily amenable to the treatment of the previous section, owing to the lack of individual Kraus operator-based constraints in DIO. This is in contrast with IO and SIO, whose definitions constrain each Kraus operator. Extension of our results to the pure-state-to-mixed-state case is hindered by this obstacle.

Nevertheless, we can say something useful about heralded probabilistic conversion from a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ to an ensemble $\{(\eta_j, |\phi_j\rangle)\}$. This entails that a conversion to $\phi_j$ be heralded by a correlated “flag” system whose state unambiguously identifies $j$. In other words, we require a DIO to map $\psi$ to $\sum_j \eta_j \sigma_j \otimes \phi_j$, with the “flag states” $\sigma_j$ on the first subsystem unambiguously distinguishable. We might as well set these to some mutually-orthogonal $|j\rangle \langle j|$ without loss of generality. To keep the game fair, we shall require $|j\rangle$ to constitute the axiomatic incoherent basis for the flag system.

Proposition 10. There exists a DIO effecting the transformation $\psi \mapsto \sum_j \eta_j |j\rangle \langle j| \otimes \phi_j$ if and only if

$$p < \sum_j \eta_j q_j^\dagger.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A7)

where $p$ is as before and $q_j^\dagger := |v_j|^2$ for $|\phi_j\rangle = \sum_y v_y^j |y\rangle$. 

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can decompose the requisite DIO using Kraus operators of the form

\[ K_{j,m} = \sum_{x,y} K_{j,m}(j, y; x) |j\rangle \otimes |y\rangle \langle x| , \]  

(A8)

with

\[ \sum_{m} K_{j,m} \psi K_{j,m}^{\dagger} = \eta_{j} |j\rangle \langle j| \otimes \phi_{j}. \]  

(A9)

Adapting the notation of the previous section, the DIO conditions can be cast as

1. \( \langle K(j, y; x), K(j_{1}, y_{1}; x) \rangle = S_{j,y|x} \delta_{j,j_{1}} \delta_{y,y_{1}}. \)
2. \( \langle K(j, y; x), K(j, y; x_{1}) \rangle = S_{j,y|x} \delta_{xx_{1}}. \)
3. \( \sum_{j,y} S_{j,y|x} = 1 \) for all \( x. \)

In fact, considering the form (A8) allows us to strengthen condition 2 above to

\[ \langle K(j, y; x), K(j, y; x_{1}) \rangle |j\rangle \otimes \phi_{j} = S_{j,y|x} \delta_{xx_{1}}, \]  

(A10)

where \( \langle u, v \rangle_{j} := \sum_{m} \bar{u}_{j,m} v_{j,m} \) for \( u, v \) in the abstract vector space \( \mathcal{V} \) defined above. The rest of our proof to Theorem 1 can be applied as such, but with all such vectors restricted to the subspace corresponding to a specific \( j. \) This leads to

\[ p_{x} \sum_{y} S_{j,y|x} = \sum_{y} |\langle \hat{\kappa}(j, y; x), c^{j} \rangle|^{2} q^{j}_{y}, \]  

(A11)

where

\[ K_{j,m} |\psi\rangle = c^{j}_{m} |j\rangle \otimes |\phi_{j}\rangle \]  

(A12)

with \( \eta_{j} = \sum_{m} \left| c^{j}_{m} \right|^{2}. \) Thus,

\[ p_{j} \equiv \left( p_{x} \sum_{y} S_{j,y|x} \right)_{x} \leq \eta_{j} q^{j}_{j}. \]  

(A13)

From the properties of the majorization relation, we have

\[ p_{j} \leq \eta_{j} q^{j}_{j}. \]  

(A14)

Summing over \( j \) yields

\[ \sum_{j} p_{j} \leq \sum_{j} \eta_{j} q^{j}_{j}, \]  

(A15)

which strengthens under normalization considerations to non-weak majorization. But \( p = \sum_{j} p_{j} < \sum_{j} p^{j}_{j}. \) Therefore,

\[ p < \sum_{j} \eta_{j} q^{j}_{j}. \]  

(A16)

Again, the converse follows from the corresponding result about SIO.
II. $\rho$-DIO TRANSFORMATIONS

A. Distillation

Consider the rate of distillation of coherence under the operations $\rho$-DIO, i.e. channels $\Lambda$ such that $\Delta \circ \Lambda(\rho) = \Lambda \circ \Delta(\rho)$ for some fixed $\rho$. We will use $\langle A, B \rangle = \text{Tr}(A^\dagger B)$ for the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product.

**Theorem 2.** The one-shot distillable coherence under $\rho$-DIO for any input state $\rho$ is given by

$$C^{(1),\varepsilon}_{\rho, \text{DIO}}(\rho) = \log \max \{ m \in \mathbb{N} \mid F_{\rho, \text{DIO}}(\rho, m) \geq 1 - \varepsilon \}$$

where $F_{\rho, \text{DIO}}$ is the achievable fidelity of distillation, i.e.

$$F_{\rho, \text{DIO}}(\rho, m) := \max_{\Lambda \in \rho, \text{DIO}} F(\Lambda(\rho), \Psi_m)$$

(A17)

with $\Psi_m$ the $m$-dimensional maximally coherent state.

Defining the twirling $T(\cdot) = \frac{1}{d!} \sum_{i=1}^{d!} U_{\pi(i)} \cdot U_{\pi(i)}^\dagger$ where each $\pi(i)$ is a permutation of the basis vectors, we have that

$$F_{\rho, \text{DIO}}(\rho, m) = \max_{\Lambda \in \rho, \text{DIO}} F(\Lambda(\rho), T(\Psi_m)) = \max_{\Lambda \in \rho, \text{DIO}} F(T(\Lambda(\rho)), \Psi_m),$$

(A19)

that is, it suffices to optimise over twirled maps of the form $\Lambda = T \circ \Lambda$, which take the form

$$\Lambda(Q) = \langle X, Q \rangle \Psi_m + \langle 1 - X, Q \rangle \frac{1 - \Psi_m}{m-1}$$

(A20)

for some operator $X$. The complete positivity of $\Lambda$ is equivalent to the condition $0 \leq X \leq 1$, and to further impose that $\Lambda \in \rho$-DIO, we need that

$$\frac{1}{m} = \Lambda \circ \Lambda(\rho)$$

$$= \Lambda \circ \Delta(\rho)$$

$$= \text{Tr} X \Delta(\rho) \Psi_m + (1 - \text{Tr} X \Delta(\rho)) \frac{1 - \Psi_m}{m-1}$$

(A21)

which is satisfied if and only if $\langle X, \Delta(\rho) \rangle = \frac{1}{m}$. Altogether, we have

$$F_{\rho, \text{DIO}}(\rho, m) = \max \left\{ \langle X, \rho \rangle \mid 0 \leq X \leq 1, \langle X, \Delta(\rho) \rangle = \frac{1}{m} \right\}.$$  

(A22)

The one-shot rate of distillation is then

$$C^{(1),\varepsilon}_{\rho, \text{DIO}}(\rho) = \log \max \{ m \in \mathbb{R} \mid F_{\rho, \text{DIO}}(\rho, m) \geq 1 - \varepsilon \}$$

$$= \log \min \{ \text{Tr} X \Delta(\rho) \mid \langle X, \rho \rangle \geq 1 - \varepsilon, 0 \leq X \leq 1 \}$$

$$= [D^\varepsilon_H(\rho, \Lambda(\rho))]_{\log}$$

(A23)

where $D^\varepsilon_H$ is the hypothesis testing relative entropy.

By considering the asymptotic scenario, we then have

$$C_{\rho, \text{DIO}}^\infty(\rho) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} C^{(1),\varepsilon}_{\rho, \text{DIO}}(\rho^\otimes n)$$

$$= D(\rho \| \Delta(\rho))$$

(A24)
by quantum Stein’s lemma [47].
Recall from [19] that for DIO, we have
\[
C^{(1),\epsilon}_{d,DIO}(\rho) = \min_{X=\Delta(X)} \left| D^\epsilon_H(\rho\|X) \right| \log \frac{1}{\Tr X=1} \tag{A25}
\]
and
\[
C^\infty_{d,DIO}(\rho) = D(\rho\|\Lambda(\rho)) \tag{A26}
\]
which shows that, although \(\rho\)-DIO can have a larger rate of one-shot distillation than DIO, asymptotically the operations have the same capabilities in distillation.

1. Exact distillation
Consider now the case of zero-error distillation, that is, exact transformations \(\rho \rightarrow \Psi_m\) under \(\rho\)-DIO. From the above, we have that the rate of zero-error distillation is given by
\[
C^{(1),0}_{d,\rho\text{-DIO}}(\rho) = \log \frac{1}{\langle \Pi_\rho, \Delta(\rho) \rangle} \tag{A27}
\]
where \(\Pi_\rho\) is the projection onto the support of \(\rho\).
This simplifies in particular for the case of a pure state \(|\psi\rangle = \sum_i \psi_i |i\rangle\):
\[
C^{(1),0}_{d,\rho\text{-DIO}}(|\psi\rangle) = \log \left( \frac{1}{\langle \Pi_\rho, \Delta(\rho) \rangle} \right) \tag{A28}
\]
Explicitly, we have that
\[
\psi \mapsto \Psi_m \iff \sum_i |\psi_i|^4 \leq \frac{1}{m}. \tag{A29}
\]
Notice that the state \(|\psi\rangle := \left( \sqrt{\frac{3}{8}}, \sqrt{\frac{2}{16}}, \sqrt{\frac{1}{16}} \right)^T\) from the main text gives an explicit example of a case where coherence monotonies under IO and DIO can increase in the \(\rho\)-DIO transformation: specifically, consider the monotone
\[
C_2(|\psi\rangle) = \sum_{i=2}^d |\psi_i|^4 \text{ where } |\psi_i|^4 \text{ denote coefficients of } |\psi\rangle \text{ arranged in non-increasing order by magnitude [32, 57]. For this monotone, with } |\psi\rangle \text{ as above, we have } C_2(|\psi\rangle) = \frac{3}{8} \text{ but } C_2(|+\rangle) = \frac{1}{2}.
\]
Finally, we remark the additivity of \(-\log \Tr \Pi_\rho \Delta(\rho)\) in the sense that
\[
-\log \langle \Pi_\rho^{\otimes n}, \Delta(\rho^{\otimes n}) \rangle = -\log \langle \Pi_{\rho}^{\otimes n}, \Delta(\rho)^{\otimes n} \rangle = -n \log \langle \Pi_\rho, \Delta(\rho) \rangle \tag{A30}
\]
which in particular gives the asymptotic zero-error distillable coherence as
\[
C^\infty_{d,\rho\text{-DIO}}(\rho) = -\log \langle \Pi_\rho, \Delta(\rho) \rangle \tag{A31}
\]
B. Dilution

**Theorem 4.** The one-shot coherence cost under $\Psi_m$-DIO operations is given by

$$C^{(1), \varepsilon}_{c, \Psi_m}$$(DIO)$ (\rho) = \left[ \log \min \left\{ R(\omega) + 1 \mid \omega \in \mathbb{D}, \ F(\rho, \omega) \geq 1 - \varepsilon \right\} \right]_{\log}.$$  

**Proof.** Using a twirling argument similar to the distillation case, we can without loss of generality limit ourselves to operations of the form $\Lambda = \Lambda \circ T$, which take the form

$$\Lambda(Q) = \langle \Psi_m, Q \rangle X + \langle 1 - \Psi_m, Q \rangle Z$$  

(A32)

for some operators $X, Z$. The completely positivity and trace preservation of $\Lambda$ impose that $X, Z$ are valid quantum states. To impose that $\Lambda \in \Psi_m$-DIO, we have that

$$\Delta(X) = \Delta \circ \Lambda(\Psi_m)$$  

$$= \Lambda \circ \Delta(\Psi_m)$$  

$$= \frac{1}{m} X + \frac{m - 1}{m} Z.$$  

(A33)

Noticing that $\Lambda(\Psi_m) = X$, this means that the set of states $\omega$ such that $\omega = \Lambda(\Psi_m)$ for some $\Psi_m$-DIO protocol $\Lambda$ is precisely the set of states for which there exists a state $\sigma$ such that $\frac{1}{m} \omega + \frac{m - 1}{m} \sigma = \Delta(\omega)$. It is easy to see that this is only possible if $\Delta(\sigma) = \Delta(\rho)$. Defining the function

$$g(\omega) := \min \left\{ \lambda \left| \frac{\omega + \lambda \sigma}{1 + \lambda} \in \mathbb{I}, \ \sigma \in \mathbb{D}, \ \Delta(\sigma) = \Delta(\rho) \right. \right\}$$  

(A34)

it is not difficult to show that, in fact, $g(\omega) = R(\Delta(\omega))$ [13]. We then have that the one-shot coherence cost under $\Psi_m$-DIO is

$$C^{(1), \varepsilon}_{c, \Psi_m}$$(DIO)$ (\rho) = \left[ \log \min \left\{ m \in \mathbb{R} \mid \omega \in \mathbb{D}, \ F(\rho, \omega) \geq 1 - \varepsilon, \ R(\Delta(\omega)) \leq m - 1 \right\} \right]_{\log}$$  

(A35)

as required. 

\[\square\]

1. **Exact dilution**

Zero-error dilution can be characterised straightforwardly as the required coherence cost is simply

$$C^{(1), 0}_{c, \Psi_m}$$(DIO)$ (\rho) = \left[ \log (R(\Delta(\rho)) + 1) \right]_{\log}.$$  

(A36)

Note that

$$R(\Delta(\rho)) = \left\| \Delta(\rho)^{-1/2} \rho \Delta(\rho)^{-1/2} \right\|_{\infty} - 1$$  

(A37)

which makes this quantity easy to express and compute. In particular, noting that for every state we have $\rho \leq \rank(\Delta(\rho))\Delta(\rho)$, this means that the maximally coherent state $\Psi_m$ can be transformed into any other state with $\rank(\Delta(\rho)) \leq m$, and it acts as a “golden unit” under the operations $\Psi_m$-DIO. For a pure state, we have exactly [13]

$$R(\Delta(\psi)) = \rank(\Delta(\rho)) - 1$$  

(A38)

which further simplifies the characterisation.

We remark the additivity of $\log(R(\Delta(\rho)) + 1)$, immediately establishing that the asymptotic zero-error coherence cost under $\Psi_m$-DIO is given by

$$C^{(\infty), 0}_{c, \Psi_m}$$(DIO)$ (\rho) = \log (R(\Delta(\rho)) + 1).$$  

(A39)
C. General transformations

We can generalise the approach of coherence dilution to give a simple sufficient condition for transformations to general states. For any \( \omega \in \mathbb{D} \), we have the following.

**Proposition 6.** If \( R_{A}(\omega) + 1 \leq \frac{1}{\langle \Lambda_{\rho}, \Lambda(\rho) \rangle} \), then there exists a \( \rho \)-DIO map such that \( \Lambda(\rho) = \omega \).

**Proof.** Recalling that \( R_{A}(\omega) = \min \left\{ \lambda \mid \omega \leq (\lambda + 1)\Lambda(\omega) \right\} \), it is easy to see that for any \( \lambda \geq R_{A}(\omega) + 1 \), there exists a state \( \sigma \) such that \( \omega + (\lambda - 1)\sigma = \Lambda(\omega) \). By assumption, there exists in particular \( \sigma \in \mathbb{D} \) which satisfies

\[
\omega + \left( \frac{1}{\langle \Pi_{\rho}, \Delta(\rho) \rangle} - 1 \right) \sigma = \frac{1}{\langle \Pi_{\rho}, \Delta(\rho) \rangle} \Delta(\omega) \tag{A40}
\]

With this choice of \( \sigma \), define the map

\[
\Lambda(X) = \langle \Pi_{\rho}, X \rangle \omega + \langle 1 - \Pi_{\rho}, X \rangle \sigma. \tag{A41}
\]

This map is clearly CPTP, and we have

\[
\Lambda(\rho) = \omega,
\]

\[
\Lambda(\Delta(\rho)) = \langle \Pi_{\rho}, \Delta(\rho) \rangle \omega + (1 - \langle \Pi_{\rho}, \Delta(\rho) \rangle)\sigma
\]

\[
= \langle \Pi_{\rho}, \Delta(\rho) \rangle \left( \omega + \left( \frac{1}{\langle \Pi_{\rho}, \Delta(\rho) \rangle} - 1 \right) \sigma \right) \tag{A42}
\]

as required. \( \blacksquare \)

The above condition is in general not necessary for \( \rho \)-DIO transformations, and indeed in general \( R_{\Lambda}(\rho) + 1 > \frac{1}{\langle \Pi_{\rho}, \Lambda(\rho) \rangle} \) which means that even the trivial transformation \( \rho \rightarrow \rho \) might not satisfy the condition of the Proposition.

When the input state is a qubit, however, the transformations can be characterized exactly (see also [58, 59]). We will in particular establish an equivalence between \( \rho \)-DIO and DIO in such transformations.

**Proposition 7.** For any single-qubit states \( \rho \) and \( \sigma \), the transformation \( \rho \rightarrow \sigma \) is possible under \( \rho \)-DIO if and only if it possible under DIO.

**Proof.** Clearly, if a DIO transformation \( \rho \rightarrow \sigma \) exists, then so does a \( \rho \)-DIO transformation by the inclusion DIO \( \subseteq \rho \)-DIO. By [13, Thm. 30], the DIO transformation is possible if and only if \( R_{\Lambda}(\rho) \geq R_{\Lambda}(\sigma) \) and \( \|\rho\|_{\ell_{1}} \geq \|\sigma\|_{\ell_{1}} \cdot \) Since \( R_{\Lambda} \) is trivially a \( \rho \)-DIO monotone as discussed earlier, it suffices to show that \( \|\cdot\|_{\ell_{1}} \) is a \( \rho \)-DIO monotone, which will mean that the existence of a \( \rho \)-DIO transformation implies the existence of a DIO transformation.

To see that this is indeed true, note that \( \|\rho - \Delta(\rho)\|_{1} \) is clearly a \( \rho \)-DIO monotone due to the contractivity of the trace distance under CPTP maps. But for a single-qubit state \( \rho = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{00} & \rho_{01} \\ \rho_{01} & \rho_{11} \end{pmatrix} \), we have \( \|\rho - \Delta(\rho)\|_{1} = 2|\rho_{01}| = \|\rho\|_{\ell_{1}} - 1 \), which means that \( \|\rho\|_{\ell_{1}} \) is also a \( \rho \)-DIO monotone for all single-qubit states. \( \blacksquare \)

1. **Sufficient condition based on channels mapping one pure ensemble to another**

Let \( |\psi_{k}\rangle := \sum_{x} \sqrt{p_{x}} e^{i k x (\frac{2\pi}{m})} |x\rangle \), where \( m = \text{rank} \left( \psi_{D} \equiv \Delta(\psi) \right) \). We have \( \psi_{D} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k} \psi_{k} = \frac{1}{m} \psi + \frac{m - 1}{m} \rho \), where

\[
\rho := \frac{m \psi_{D} - \psi}{m - 1}. \tag{A43}
\]

Define \( \phi_{k} \) and \( \sigma \) (counterpart to \( \rho \)) similarly for a desired final state \( \phi \), but still using \( m = \text{rank} \left( \psi_{D} \right) \); if rank \( \left( \psi_{D} \right) < m \), some of the \( \phi_{k} \) are identical, which is fine. One sufficient condition for a \( \psi \)-DIO mapping \( \psi \rightarrow \phi \) is the existence of a channel mapping the pure states \( \psi_{k} \) one-to-one to \( \phi_{k} \).
A stronger condition can be obtained as follows: Let $\Phi$ and $\tilde{\Phi}$ be purifications of $\phi$ and $\sigma$, such that $\langle \Phi | \tilde{\Phi} \rangle = \sqrt{F(\phi, \sigma)} =: \eta$; such purifications exist by Uhlmann’s theorem. Now, a sufficient condition is the existence of a channel that maps $\psi \mapsto \Phi$ and $\psi_k \mapsto \tilde{\Phi}$ for $k > 0$. The Gramian $G$ of $\{|\psi_k\rangle\}$ is given by

$$G_{jk} = \sum_x p_x e^{i(k-j)x(\frac{2\pi}{m})}, \tag{A44}$$

a circulant matrix. Meanwhile, the Gramian $H$ of $\{|\Phi\rangle, |\tilde{\Phi}\rangle, \ldots, |\tilde{\Phi}\rangle\}$ is given (up to a global phase) by $H_{1j} = H_{j1} = \eta$ for $j > 1$ and all other $H_{jk} = 1$. The condition for the existence of a channel mapping the one set to the other is that the matrix

$$R_{jk} := \frac{G_{jk}}{H_{jk}} \tag{A45}$$

be positive-semidefinite. Define $b$ and $\tilde{G}$ through

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & b^t \\ b & \tilde{G} \end{pmatrix} \tag{A46}$$

We have

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{\eta} b^t \\ \frac{1}{\eta} b & \tilde{G} \end{pmatrix} \tag{A47}$$

Since $\tilde{G}$ is already guaranteed to be positive-semidefinite, so is $R$, provided that the scalar-valued Schur complement of $\tilde{G}$ in $R$ is nonnegative:

$$c_G = 1 - \frac{b^t \tilde{G}^{-1} b}{\eta^2} \geq 0. \tag{A48}$$

Note that

$$\det G = \det \tilde{G} \left(1 - b^t \tilde{G}^{-1} b\right) \tag{A49}$$

and that

$$\eta^2 = \left(\phi \mid m\psi_D - \psi \mid \phi\right) = m \frac{\|q\|_2^2 - \psi}{m - 1}, \tag{A50}$$

where $q_x \equiv \langle x | \phi | x \rangle$. Our sufficient condition then becomes

$$\frac{\det G}{\det \tilde{G}} \geq \frac{m}{m - 1} \left(1 - \|q\|_2^2\right). \tag{A51}$$