

l_1 norm of coherence is not equal to its convex roof quantifier

Jianwei Xu*

College of Science, Northwest A&F University, Yangling, Shaanxi 712100, China

Since a rigorous framework for quantifying quantum coherence was established by Baumgratz et al. [T. Baumgratz, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. 113, 140401 (2014)], many coherence measures have been found. For a given coherence measure C , extending the values of C on pure states to mixed states by the convex roof construction, we will get a valid coherence measure \overline{C} , we call \overline{C} the corresponding convex roof quantifier of C . Whether $C = \overline{C}$ for a given coherence measure is an important question. In this work, we show that for the widely used coherence measure, l_1 norm of coherence C_{l_1} , it holds that $C_{l_1} \neq \overline{C_{l_1}}$.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Mn, 03.65.Aa

I. INTRODUCTION

Coherence is a basic ingredient for quantum physics. Since a rigorous framework for quantifying quantum coherence was established by Baumgratz et al. [1] (we call this framework BCP framework), fruitful results have been achieved both in theories and experiments (reviews see [2, 3]).

We first review the BCP framework as follows. For the d -dimensional Hilbert space H , the coherence of the states in H under BCP framework is defined with respect to a fixed orthonormal basis $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=1}^d$ of H . In this work, when we say coherence, which is always with respect to this fixed orthonormal basis $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=1}^d$. A state ρ is called incoherent if and only if $\rho_{jk} = \langle j|\rho|k\rangle = 0$ for any $j \neq k$. A channel ϕ on H is called incoherent if and only if ϕ allows for a Kraus operator decomposition $\phi = \{K_l\}_l$ which satisfying $\langle j|K_l\rho K_l^\dagger|k\rangle = 0$ for any incoherent state ρ , any l and any $j \neq k$, and $\sum_l K_l^\dagger K_l = I_d$ with I_d the identity operator on H . We call such decomposition $\phi = \{K_l\}_l$ an incoherent decomposition of ϕ . A coherence measure C for quantum states in H should satisfy (C1)-(C4) below [1].

(C1). Nonnegativity. $C(\rho) \geq 0$ for any ρ , $C(\rho) = 0$ if and only if ρ is incoherent.

(C2). Monotonicity. $C(\phi(\rho)) \leq C(\rho)$ for any ρ if ϕ is incoherent.

(C3). Strong monotonicity. $\sum_l \text{tr}(K_l \rho K_l^\dagger) C(\frac{K_l \rho K_l^\dagger}{\text{tr}(K_l \rho K_l^\dagger)}) \leq C(\rho)$ for any ρ if ϕ is incoherent and $\phi = \{K_l\}_l$ an incoherent decomposition of ϕ .

(C4). Convexity. $C(\sum_l p_l \rho_l) \leq \sum_l p_l C(\rho_l)$ for any states $\{\rho_l\}_l$ and any probability distribution $\{p_l\}_l$.

A condition (C5) was proposed in Ref. [4], and it was shown that (C3)+(C4) imply (C2), (C2)+(C5) are equivalent to (C3)+(C4).

(C5). Additivity for direct sum states.

$$C(p\rho_1 \oplus (1-p)\rho_2) = pC(\rho_1) + (1-p)C(\rho_2), \quad (1)$$

with $p \in [0, 1]$, ρ_1, ρ_2 any states.

Many coherence measures have been proposed, such as the relative entropy of coherence C_r [1], l_1 norm of coherence C_{l_1} [1, 5], coherence based on Tsallis relative entropy $C_{T,\alpha}$ [6–9], robustness of coherence C_{rob} [10, 11], geometric coherence [12] C_g , modified trace norm of coherence C'_{tr} [4], coherence weight [13, 14]. Among them, C_r and C_{l_1} are widely used, they have the explicit expressions as

$$C_r(\rho) = S(\rho_{\text{diag}}) - S(\rho), \quad (2)$$

$$C_{l_1}(\rho) = \sum_{j \neq k} |\rho_{jk}|, \quad (3)$$

where $S(\rho) = -\text{tr}(\rho \log_2 \rho)$ is the Von Neumann entropy of ρ , ρ_{diag} is the diagonal part of state ρ .

There is a useful way of constructing some coherence measures by the convex roof construction via the concave functions [15–17]. This construction first specifies the coherence for pure states, and then extends to mixed states by

*Electronic address: xxujianwei@nwfau.edu.cn

taking the convex roof over all pure state decompositions of the given mixed state. Specifically, suppose $f(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_d)$ is a nonnegative function on the d -dimensional probability space, and also, $f(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_d)$ is concave, invariant under the index permutation of $\{j\}_{j=1}^d$, and $f(1, 0, \dots, 0) = 0$. Then we can get the coherence measure C_f induced by f defined as

$$C_f(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = f(|\langle\psi|1\rangle|^2, |\langle\psi|2\rangle|^2, \dots, |\langle\psi|d\rangle|^2), \quad (4)$$

$$C_f(\rho) = \min_{\{p_j, |\psi_j\rangle\}} \sum_j p_j C_f(|\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|), \quad (5)$$

where $|\psi\rangle$ is a normalized pure state, \min runs over all pure state decompositions of $\rho = \sum_j p_j |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|$ with $\{p_j\}_j$ a probability distribution and $\{|\psi_j\rangle\}_j$ normalized pure states.

Evidently, there are many such functions $\{f\}$, and then there are many corresponding coherence measures $\{C_f\}$ using the convex roof construction. However, it is hard to calculate $C_f(\rho)$ in general because of the definition of minimization.

There is another way to construct a new coherence measure via a given coherence measure also using the convex roof construction. For a given coherence measure C , define the coherence measure \overline{C} as

$$\overline{C}(\rho) = \min_{\{p_j, |\psi_j\rangle\}} \sum_j p_j C(|\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|), \quad (6)$$

where \min runs over all pure state decompositions of $\rho = \sum_j p_j |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|$. We see that $\overline{C}(\rho) = C(\rho)$ for any pure state ρ and $\overline{C}(\rho) = C(\rho) = 0$ for any incoherent state ρ . We call \overline{C} the corresponding convex roof coherence measure (or coherence quantifier) of C . It is shown in Ref. [15] that \overline{C}_r is a valid coherence measure, i.e. \overline{C}_r fulfills (C1)-(C4). In fact, it can be proven in the similar way as in Ref. [15] that for any coherence measure C , \overline{C} is indeed a coherence measure, i.e. \overline{C} fulfills (C1)-(C4). \overline{C}_r was studied in Refs. [5, 15, 18], \overline{C}_{l_1} was studied in Ref. [19]. Since $\overline{C}(\rho) = C(\rho)$ for any pure state, then

$$\overline{\overline{C}} = \overline{C}. \quad (7)$$

An important question arises that whether $C = \overline{C}$. Note that here $C = \overline{C}$ means $C(\rho) = \overline{C}(\rho)$ for any state with any dimension d , while we say $C \neq \overline{C}$ when there exists one state ρ such that $C(\rho) \neq \overline{C}(\rho)$. From the convexity of coherence measure and the definition of \overline{C} , we see that

$$C \leq \overline{C}, \quad (8)$$

and $C = \overline{C}$ if and only if for any state ρ there exists a pure state decomposition $\rho = \sum_j p_j |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|$ such that

$$C(\rho) = \sum_j p_j C(|\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|). \quad (9)$$

This means the pure state decomposition $\rho = \sum_j p_j |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|$ realizes the state ρ , meanwhile achieves the coherence $C(\rho)$.

We see that the coherence measure C_f defined by Eqs. (4,5) via the function f satisfies $C_f = \overline{C}_f$. Since there is an infinite number of such functions $\{f\}$, hence there exists an infinite number of coherence measures satisfying $C = \overline{C}$.

The geometric coherence, C_g , satisfies $C_g = \overline{C}_g$. This fact was pointed out in Ref. [2]. For C_r , it is shown that for qubit system [15],



$$\overline{C}_r(\rho) = h\left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{1 - r^2 + z^2}}{2}\right), \quad (10)$$

where $h(x) = -x \log_2 x - (1-x) \log_2 (1-x)$ is the binary entropy, and we have used the Bloch ball representation that any qubit state ρ can be expressed as $\rho = \frac{1}{2}(I_2 + \vec{r} \cdot \vec{\sigma})$ with $\vec{r} = (x, y, z)$ real vector satisfying $r = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2 + z^2} \leq 1$, $\vec{\sigma} = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$ the Pauli matrices. From Eq. (2), for qubit system, we have

$$C_r(\rho) = h\left(\frac{1+z}{2}\right) - h\left(\frac{1+r}{2}\right). \quad (11)$$

Figure 1(a) and Figure 1(b) show $\overline{C}_r(\rho) \geq C_r(\rho)$ and $\overline{C}_r(\rho) - C_r(\rho)$ for $0 \leq z \leq r \leq 1$. We see that $\overline{C}_r(\rho) - C_r(\rho) > 0$ for most states. For example let $z = 0, r = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, we have $C_r(\rho) = 1 - h\left(\frac{1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}}{2}\right) < \overline{C}_r(\rho) = h\left(\frac{1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}}{2}\right)$. This shows

$$C_r \neq \overline{C}_r. \quad (12)$$

Fig.1(a): $\overline{C_r} \geq C_r$ Fig.1(b): $\overline{C_r} - C_r$

In Ref. [19], it is shown that $\overline{C_{l_1}} = C_{l_1}$ for $d = 2$, whether $\overline{C_{l_1}} = C_{l_1}$ for $d > 2$ is still an open question. In this work, we show that $\overline{C_{l_1}} \neq C_{l_1}$. This work is organized as follows. In section II we establish a criterion for $\overline{C_{l_1}} = C_{l_1}$. In section III we show that $\overline{C_{l_1}} = C_{l_1}$ for $d = 2$. In section IV we show that $\overline{C_{l_1}} \neq C_{l_1}$ for $d = 3$. Section V is a brief summary.

II. A CRITERION FOR $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$

We establish a criterion when a state ρ satisfies $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$.

Theorem 1. For d -dimensional state $\rho = \sum_{j,k=1}^d \rho_{jk} |j\rangle\langle k|$ with $\rho_{jk} = |\rho_{jk}| e^{i\theta_{jk}}$ its polar form, then $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$ if and only if there exists a pure state decomposition $\rho = \sum_l p_l |\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|$ such that

$$\langle j|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|k\rangle = |\langle j|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|k\rangle| e^{i\theta_{jk}}, \forall j, k, l. \quad (13)$$

Proof. When $j = k$, we have $\langle j|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|j\rangle \geq 0$ and $\rho_{jj} \geq 0$, then Eq. (13) obviously holds. Suppose the pure state decomposition $\rho = \sum_l p_l |\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|$ achieves $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$, i.e., $C_{l_1}(\rho) = \sum_l p_l C_{l_1}(|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|)$. $\rho = \sum_l p_l |\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|$ implies

$$\langle j|\rho|k\rangle = \sum_l p_l \langle j|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|k\rangle, \quad (14)$$

$$|\langle j|\rho|k\rangle| = \left| \sum_l p_l \langle j|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|k\rangle \right| \leq \sum_l p_l |\langle j|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|k\rangle|, \quad (15)$$

$$\sum_{j \neq k} |\langle j|\rho|k\rangle| = \sum_{j \neq k} \left| \sum_l p_l \langle j|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|k\rangle \right| \leq \sum_{j \neq k} \sum_l p_l |\langle j|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|k\rangle|, \quad (16)$$

$C_{l_1}(\rho) = \sum_l p_l C_{l_1}(|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|)$ implies

$$\sum_{j \neq k} |\langle j|\rho|k\rangle| = \sum_{j \neq k} \sum_l p_l |\langle j|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|k\rangle|. \quad (17)$$

We know that for complex numbers $\{z_j\}_j$, $|\sum_j z_j| = \sum_j |z_j|$ if and only if there exists a constant real number θ such that $z_j = |z_j| e^{i\theta}$ for all j . With this fact, we then obtain Eq. (13). ■

We provide three lemmas below which will be useful in following sections.

Lemma 1. For any coherence measure C , any state ρ and any incoherent unitary transformation U in d -dimensional system,

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\theta_1} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\theta_2} & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & e^{i\theta_d} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (18)$$

it holds that U preserves $C(\rho)$, i.e., $C(\rho) = C(U\rho U^\dagger)$. Where $\{\theta_j\}_{j=1}^d$ are all real numbers. Further, $\overline{C}(\rho) = C(\rho)$ if and only if $\overline{C}(U\rho U^\dagger) = C(U\rho U^\dagger)$.

Proof. We can check that U and U^\dagger are all incoherent channels, i.e., $U\sigma U^\dagger$ and $U^\dagger\sigma U$ are diagonal for any diagonal state σ . From the monotonicity (C2) of coherence measure, we have $C(U\rho U^\dagger) \leq C(\rho) = C(U^\dagger U\rho U^\dagger U) \leq C(U\rho U^\dagger)$. Hence $C(\rho) = C(U\rho U^\dagger)$. For the pure state decomposition $\rho = \sum_l p_l |\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|$, we have $U\rho U^\dagger = \sum_l p_l U|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|U^\dagger$; if further $C(\rho) = \sum_l p_l C(|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|)$ then $C(U\rho U^\dagger) = \sum_l p_l C(U|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|U^\dagger)$. That is to say, $\overline{C}(\rho) = C(\rho)$ if and only if $\overline{C}(U\rho U^\dagger) = C(U\rho U^\dagger)$. ■

Lemma 2. (See Corollary 7.1.5 and Theorem 7.2.5 in Ref. [20]) Let A be a Hermitian matrix, then A is positive semidefinite if and only if every principal minor of A (including $\det A$) is nonnegative.

A matrix A is called a positive (nonnegative) matrix if all its elements are positive (nonnegative). For positive matrix, we have Lemma 3 below.

Lemma 3. (See Theorem 8.2.8 in Ref. [20]). For the d -dimensional positive matrix A , the largest eigenvalue of A , $\lambda_{\max}(A)$, is positive and algebraically simple, and corresponds to a normalized eigenvector $|\chi\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j |j\rangle$ with $\{\chi_j > 0\}_{j=1}^d$.

III. $\overline{C}_{l_1} = C_{l_1}$ FOR $d = 2$

In Ref. [19], it is shown that $\overline{C}_{l_1} = C_{l_1}$ for $d = 2$. We derive this result in a different way. For any qubit state ρ , we write it in the Bloch representation as

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}(I_2 + \vec{r} \cdot \vec{\sigma}) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1+z & x-iy \\ x+iy & 1-z \end{pmatrix}, \quad (19)$$

with $\vec{r} = (x, y, z)$ real vector, $r = |\vec{r}| \leq 1$, and $\vec{\sigma} = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$ the Pauli matrices.

A pure state decomposition $\rho = \sum_l p_l |\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|$ can be expressed in the Bloch representation as

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}(I_2 + \sum_l p_l \vec{n}_l \cdot \vec{\sigma}), \quad (20)$$

where $|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l| = \frac{1}{2}(I_2 + \vec{n}_l \cdot \vec{\sigma})$, $\vec{n}_l = (n_{lx}, n_{ly}, n_{lz})$ real vector, $|\vec{n}_l| = 1$, and

$$\sum_l p_l \vec{n}_l = \vec{r}. \quad (21)$$

Suppose $\rho = \sum_l p_l |\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|$ achieves $\overline{C}_{l_1}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$, applying Theorem 1, we get that there exist $\{\mu_l \geq 0\}_l$ such that

$$\vec{n}_l = (\mu_l x, \mu_l y, n_{lz}), \forall l. \quad (22)$$

We stress that when $r = 1$, $\rho(x, y, z)$ is pure, we have $\overline{C}_{l_1}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$. When $\rho(x, y, z) = \rho(0, 0, z) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1+z & 0 \\ 0 & 1-z \end{pmatrix}$, we see that $\overline{C}_{l_1}(\rho) = 0$ and $\frac{I_2}{2} = \frac{1+z}{2}|1\rangle\langle 1| + \frac{1-z}{2}|2\rangle\langle 2|$ achieves $\overline{C}_{l_1}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$. Then we only consider mixed states $|z| < r < 1$.

We depict Eqs. (21,22) in Figure 2(a). Suppose the state $\rho(x, y, z)$ with $r \in (0, 1)$ and $\sqrt{x^2 + y^2} > 0$, corresponds to the point $E(x, y, z)$ in the Bloch representation. The points $O(0, 0, 0)$, $D(0, 0, 1)$, and $E(x, y, z)$ determine a plane ODE, this plane intersects the x-O-y plane at the points $A(-\frac{x}{\sqrt{x^2+y^2}}, -\frac{y}{\sqrt{x^2+y^2}}, 0)$, $B(\frac{x}{\sqrt{x^2+y^2}}, \frac{y}{\sqrt{x^2+y^2}}, 0)$. If $\rho = \sum_{l=1}^m p_l |\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|$ achieves $\overline{C}_{l_1}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$, this fact corresponds to that there is a polygonal Line $OO_1O_2...O_m$ in ODE plane such that $\vec{O}_{l-1}O_l = p_l \vec{n}_l$ with $O_0 = O$, $O_m = E$ and $\vec{n}_l = (\mu_l x, \mu_l y, n_{lz})$, $\{\mu_l \geq 0\}_l$. From Figure 2(a), we see that there is an infinite number of pure state decompositions $\rho = \sum_{l=1}^m p_l |\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|$ achieving $\overline{C}_{l_1}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$.

We provide an explicit pure state decomposition $\rho = \sum_l p_l |\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|$ achieving $\overline{C}_{l_1}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$ as follows. When $\sqrt{x^2 + y^2} + |z| \leq 1$, let

$$p_1 \vec{n}_1 = (x, y, 0), \quad (23)$$

$$p_2 \vec{n}_2 = (0, 0, -sz), \quad (24)$$

$$p_3 \vec{n}_3 = (0, 0, (1+s)z), \quad (25)$$






Fig.2(a):Depiction of Eqs. (21,22)

Fig.2(b): $\sqrt{x^2 + y^2} + |z| \leq 1$ Fig.2(c): $\sqrt{x^2 + y^2} + |z| \leq 1$

$$0 \leq s = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}}{|z|} - 1 \right). \quad (26)$$

We can check that this pure state decomposition achieves $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$, we depict this pure state decomposition in Figure 2(b). When $\sqrt{x^2 + y^2} + |z| \geq 1$, let

$$p_1 \vec{n}_1 = s(x, y, 0), \quad (27)$$

$$p_2 \vec{n}_2 = ((1-s)x, (1-s)y, z), \quad (28)$$

$$0 \leq s = \frac{1 - r^2}{2\sqrt{x^2 + y^2}(1 - \sqrt{x^2 + y^2})}. \quad (29)$$

We can check that this pure state decomposition achieves $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$, we depict this pure state decomposition in Figure 2(c).

IV. $\overline{C_{l_1}} \neq C_{l_1}$ FOR $d = 3$

For $d = 3$, we consider the states in different situations.

(1). $\rho_{11}\rho_{22}\rho_{33} = 0$. For this case, at least one of $\{\rho_{jj}\}_{j=1}^3$ is zero. For example $\rho_{11} = 0$, from Lemma 2 we then have $\{\rho_{1j} = 0\}_{j=1}^3$ and $\{\rho_{j1} = 0\}_{j=1}^3$, ρ degenerates to a 2-dimensional state, from the fact $\overline{C_{l_1}} = C_{l_1}$ for $d = 2$ obtained in section III we then have $C_{l_1}(\rho) = \overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho)$.

(2). $\rho_{11}\rho_{22}\rho_{33} > 0$, $\Pi_{j \neq k} \rho_{jk} = 0$. For this case, at least one of $\{\rho_{jk}\}_{j \neq k}$ is zero. For example $\rho_{13} = 0$, then

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{11} & |\rho_{12}|e^{i\theta_{12}} & 0 \\ |\rho_{12}|e^{-i\theta_{12}} & \rho_{22} & |\rho_{23}|e^{i\theta_{23}} \\ 0 & |\rho_{23}|e^{-i\theta_{23}} & \rho_{33} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (30)$$

If further $\rho_{12}\rho_{23} = 0$, then ρ can be expressed as a direct sum of two states with dimensions at most 2. According to (C5) and $\overline{C_{l_1}} = C_{l_1}$ for $d = 2$, we get that $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$. So we assume $|\rho_{11}\rho_{22}\rho_{33}\rho_{12}\rho_{23}| > 0$.

We decompose ρ as

$$\rho = p\rho_1 + (1-p)\rho_2, \quad (31)$$

$$p\rho_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{11} & |\rho_{12}|e^{i\theta_{12}} & 0 \\ |\rho_{12}|e^{-i\theta_{12}} & \frac{|\rho_{12}|^2}{\rho_{11}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (32)$$

$$(1-p)\rho_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_{22} - \frac{|\rho_{12}|^2}{\rho_{11}} & |\rho_{23}|e^{i\theta_{23}} \\ 0 & |\rho_{23}|e^{-i\theta_{23}} & \rho_{33} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (33)$$

with $p \in (0, 1)$ such that $\text{tr}\rho_1 = \text{tr}\rho_2 = \text{tr}\rho = 1$. Notice that for $(1-p)\rho_2$ and ρ , because

$$\det\rho = \rho_{11}\rho_{22}\rho_{33} - |\rho_{12}|^2\rho_{33} - |\rho_{23}|^2\rho_{11} \geq 0, \quad (34)$$

then

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{22} - \frac{|\rho_{12}|^2}{\rho_{11}} & |\rho_{23}|e^{i\theta_{23}} \\ |\rho_{23}|e^{-i\theta_{23}} & \rho_{33} \end{pmatrix} = (\rho_{22} - \frac{|\rho_{12}|^2}{\rho_{11}})\rho_{33} - |\rho_{23}|^2 \geq 0, \quad (35)$$

and $(1-p)\rho_2$ is positive semidefinite. Using Lemma 1, we get that $p\rho_1$ and $(1-p)\rho_2$ are all positive semidefinite, and then ρ_1 and ρ_2 are all quantum states. Since $\overline{C_{l_1}} = C_{l_1}$ for $d = 2$, we then get that $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$.

(3). $\Pi_{j,k=1}^3 |\rho_{jk}| > 0, \theta_{23} = \theta_{13} - \theta_{12}$. For this case,

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{11} & |\rho_{12}|e^{i\theta_{12}} & |\rho_{13}|e^{i\theta_{13}} \\ |\rho_{12}|e^{-i\theta_{12}} & \rho_{22} & |\rho_{23}|e^{i(\theta_{13}-\theta_{12})} \\ |\rho_{13}|e^{-i\theta_{13}} & |\rho_{23}|e^{-i(\theta_{13}-\theta_{12})} & \rho_{33} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (36)$$

Let the unitary matrix U be

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\theta_{12}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\theta_{13}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (37)$$

Then

$$U\rho U^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{11} & |\rho_{12}| & |\rho_{13}| \\ |\rho_{12}| & \rho_{22} & |\rho_{23}| \\ |\rho_{13}| & |\rho_{23}| & \rho_{33} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (38)$$

We see that all elements $\{|\rho_{jk}|\}_{j,k=1}^3$ of $U\rho U^\dagger$ are positive, then $U\rho U^\dagger$ is a positive matrix and also a positive semidefinite matrix.

Since $U\rho U^\dagger$ and ρ have the same eigenvalues, applying Lemma 3, we get that $U\rho U^\dagger$ has the largest eigenvalue $\lambda_{\max}(U\rho U^\dagger) = \lambda_{\max}(\rho)$ which corresponds to the positive normalized eigenvector $|\chi\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^3 \chi_j |j\rangle$ with $\{\chi_j > 0\}_{j=1}^3$. Consider the state

$$\rho(t) = U\rho U^\dagger - t|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|. \quad (39)$$

We see that $|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|$ is positive and positive semidefinite, $\rho(0) = U\rho U^\dagger$ is positive and positive semidefinite, $\rho(\lambda_{\max}(\rho))$ is positive semidefinite.

If $\rho(\lambda_{\max}(\rho))$ is no longer positive, then there must exist $0 < t_0 < \lambda_{\max}(\rho)$ such that $\rho(t_0) = U\rho U^\dagger - t_0|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|$ is nonnegative and at least one element $\langle j|\rho(t_0)|k\rangle = 0$. Hence $\rho(t_0)$ turns to situation (1) or (2), and there exists a pure state decomposition $U\rho U^\dagger - t_0|\chi\rangle\langle\chi| = \sum_l q_l |\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|$ such that $\{q_l > 0\}_l$, $\sum_l q_l = 1 - t_0$, $\{|\psi_l\rangle > 0\}_l$ are all normalized pure states and $\{\langle j|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|k\rangle \geq 0\}_{l,j,k}$. Employing Theorem 1 and Lemma 1, we see that $U\rho U^\dagger = t_0|\chi\rangle\langle\chi| + \sum_l q_l |\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|$ is a pure state decomposition which achieves $C_{l_1}(U\rho U^\dagger) = t_0 C_{l_1}(|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|) + \sum_l q_l C_{l_1}(|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|)$. That is to say, $\overline{C_{l_1}}(U\rho U^\dagger) = C_{l_1}(U\rho U^\dagger)$ and $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$.

If $\rho(\lambda_{\max}(\rho))$ is still positive, then let

$$\rho_1(t) = U\rho U^\dagger - \lambda_{\max}(\rho)|\chi\rangle\langle\chi| - t'|\chi'\rangle\langle\chi'|, \quad (40)$$

where $|\chi'\rangle$ is the normalized eigenvector associated with the largest eigenvalue of $\rho(\lambda_{\max}(\rho))$, denoted by $\lambda_{\max}(\rho(\lambda_{\max}(\rho)))$. Discuss $\rho_1(t)$ similarly to $\rho(t)$, and repeat this process with a finite number of repetitions, we will finally arrive at $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$.

(4). $\Pi_{j,k=1}^3 |\rho_{jk}| > 0, \theta_{23} \neq \theta_{13} - \theta_{12}$. For this case,

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{11} & |\rho_{12}|e^{i\theta_{12}} & |\rho_{13}|e^{i\theta_{13}} \\ |\rho_{12}|e^{-i\theta_{12}} & \rho_{22} & |\rho_{23}|e^{i\theta_{23}} \\ |\rho_{13}|e^{-i\theta_{13}} & |\rho_{23}|e^{-i\theta_{23}} & \rho_{33} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (41)$$

Let the unitary matrix U be

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\theta_{12}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\theta_{13}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (42)$$

Then

$$U\rho U^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{11} & |\rho_{12}| & |\rho_{13}| \\ |\rho_{12}| & \rho_{22} & |\rho_{23}|e^{i\theta} \\ |\rho_{13}| & |\rho_{23}|e^{-i\theta} & \rho_{33} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (43)$$

with $\theta = \theta_{12} + \theta_{23} - \theta_{13}$ and $e^{i\theta} \neq 1$.

Suppose the pure state decomposition $U\rho U^\dagger = \sum_l p_l |\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|$ achieves $\overline{C_{l_1}}(U\rho U^\dagger) = C_{l_1}(U\rho U^\dagger)$. Let $|\psi_l\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^3 \psi_{lj}|j\rangle$ with $\psi_{lj} = |\psi_{lj}|e^{i\theta_{l,j}}$ its polar form, then

$$|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l| = \sum_{j,k=1}^3 |\psi_{lj}\psi_{lk}|e^{i(\theta_{l,j}-\theta_{l,k})}. \quad (44)$$

If $|\psi_{l1}\psi_{l2}\psi_{l3}| > 0$, applying Theorem 1, Eq. (44) and the first row of $U\rho U^\dagger$ imply $\theta_{l,1} = \theta_{l,2} = \theta_{l,3}$ while Eq. (44) and the second row of $U\rho U^\dagger$ imply $\theta_{l,1} = \theta_{l,2} \neq \theta_{l,3}$. This contradiction implies that $|\psi_{l1}\psi_{l2}\psi_{l3}| = 0$, and then any $|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|$ of $\{|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|\}_l$ has one of the forms

$$|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l| = \begin{pmatrix} |\psi_{l1}|^2 & |\psi_{l1}\psi_{l2}| & 0 \\ |\psi_{l1}\psi_{l2}| & |\psi_{l2}|^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \psi_{l3} = 0, \quad (45)$$

$$|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l| = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & |\psi_{l2}|^2 & |\psi_{l2}\psi_{l3}|e^{i\theta} \\ 0 & |\psi_{l2}\psi_{l3}|e^{-i\theta} & |\psi_{l3}|^2 \end{pmatrix}, \psi_{l1} = 0, \quad (46)$$

$$|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l| = \begin{pmatrix} |\psi_{l1}|^2 & 0 & |\psi_{l1}\psi_{l3}| \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ |\psi_{l1}\psi_{l3}| & 0 & |\psi_{l3}|^2 \end{pmatrix}, \psi_{l2} = 0. \quad (47)$$

Consequently, $U\rho U^\dagger = \sum_l p_l |\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|$ achieving $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$ results in the decomposition

$$U\rho U^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & |\rho_{12}| & 0 \\ |\rho_{12}| & x_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_{22} - x_2 & |\rho_{23}|e^{i\theta} \\ 0 & |\rho_{23}|e^{-i\theta} & x_3 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{11} - x_1 & 0 & |\rho_{13}| \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ |\rho_{13}| & 0 & \rho_{33} - x_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (48)$$

with $0 < x_1 < \rho_{11}, 0 < x_2 < \rho_{22}, 0 < x_3 < \rho_{33}$, and each matrix of the right side of Eq. (48) is positive definite. Since the first matrix of the right side of Eq. (48) is positive definite, then $x_1 x_2 \geq |\rho_{12}|^2$, and we decompose

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1 & |\rho_{12}| & 0 \\ |\rho_{12}| & x_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & |\rho_{12}| & 0 \\ |\rho_{12}| & \frac{|\rho_{12}|^2}{x_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & x_2 - \frac{|\rho_{12}|^2}{x_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (49)$$

As a result, we get

$$U\rho U^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & |\rho_{12}| & 0 \\ |\rho_{12}| & \frac{|\rho_{12}|^2}{x_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \overline{\rho}, \quad (50)$$

$$\overline{\rho} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{11} - x_1 & 0 & |\rho_{13}| \\ 0 & \rho_{22} - \frac{|\rho_{12}|^2}{x_1} & |\rho_{23}|e^{i\theta} \\ |\rho_{13}| & |\rho_{23}|e^{-i\theta} & \rho_{33} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (51)$$

Combining with situation (2), we see that $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$ if and only if there exists $0 < x_1 < \rho_{11}$ such that $\overline{\rho}$ is positive definite. Now we exemplify that for some states $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$, but for some states $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) > C_{l_1}(\rho)$.

Example 1. Let

$$\rho(|\rho_{13}|) = \begin{pmatrix} 0.1 & 0.01 & |\rho_{13}| \\ 0.01 & 0.1 & 0.2i \\ |\rho_{13}| & -0.2i & 0.8 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & 0.01 & 0 \\ 0.01 & \frac{0.0001}{x_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \overline{\rho(|\rho_{13}|)}, \quad (52)$$

$$\overline{\rho(|\rho_{13}|)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.1 - x_1 & 0 & |\rho_{13}| \\ 0 & 0.1 - \frac{0.0001}{x_1} & 0.2i \\ |\rho_{13}| & 0.2i & 0.8 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (53)$$

When $|\rho_{13}| = 0.17$, with direct calculation, we get that the eigenvalues of $\rho(|\rho_{13}| = 0.17)$ approximate $\{0.887506, 0.101004, 0.0114902\}$. Then $\overline{\rho(|\rho_{13}| = 0.17)}$ is positive semidefinite and is a density matrix. Let $x_1 = 0.0113$, the eigenvalues of $\overline{\rho(|\rho_{13}| = 0.17)}$ approximate $\{0.886515, 0.089743, 0.00359217\}$. Then when $x_1 = 0.0113$, $\overline{\rho(|\rho_{13}| = 0.17)}$ is positive definite, and $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho(|\rho_{13}| = 0.17)) = C_{l_1}(\rho(|\rho_{13}| = 0.17))$.

When $|\rho_{13}| = 0.19$, with direct calculation, we get that the eigenvalues of $\rho(|\rho_{13}| = 0.19)$ approximate $\{0.895659, 0.100911, 0.00342989\}$. Then $\overline{\rho(|\rho_{13}| = 0.19)}$ is positive semidefinite and is a density matrix. We approximately calculate $\det \overline{\rho(|\rho_{13}| = 0.19)}$ as

$$\det \overline{\rho(|\rho_{13}| = 0.19)} \quad (54)$$

$$\approx 0.00047 - \left(\frac{4.39 \times 10^{-6}}{x_1} + 0.04x_1 \right) \quad (55)$$

$$\leq 0.00047 - 2\sqrt{4.39 \times 10^{-6} \times 0.04} \quad (56)$$

$$\approx -3.68 \times 10^{-4}, \quad (57)$$

in the inequality we have used $a + b \geq 2\sqrt{ab}$ for $a > 0$ and $b > 0$. This shows $\overline{\rho(|\rho_{13}| = 0.19)}$ is not positive semidefinite for any $0 < x_1 < 0.1$, then $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho(|\rho_{13}| = 0.19)) > C_{l_1}(\rho(|\rho_{13}| = 0.19))$. This example shows $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) \neq C_{l_1}(\rho)$.

V. SUMMARY

For a given coherence measure C , extending the values of C on pure states to mixed states by the convex roof construction, we will get a valid coherence measure \overline{C} . In this work, we showed that $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) \neq C_{l_1}(\rho)$ for the widely used coherence measure, l_1 norm of coherence C_{l_1} . To this aim, we first established a criterion for $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$ which lays a foundation for the subsequent discussions. We proved $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$ for $d = 2$ and provided a geometric interpretation in Bloch representation. We investigated $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho)$ for $d = 3$ in different situations, in three situations we proved $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$ and in last situation we showed that both $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$ and $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) > C_{l_1}(\rho)$ are all possible. An explicit example is given to show $\overline{C_{l_1}}(\rho) \neq C_{l_1}(\rho)$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Chinese Universities Scientific Fund under Grant No. 2452021067.

-
- [1] T. Baumgratz, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 140401 (2014).
 - [2] A. Streltsov, G. Adesso, and M. B. Plenio, Rev. Mod. Phys. **89**, 041003 (2017).
 - [3] M.-L. Hu, X. Hu, J. Wang, Y. Peng, Y.-R. Zhang, and H. Fan, Physics Reports **762-764**, 1 (2018).
 - [4] X.-D. Yu, D.-J. Zhang, G. F. Xu, and D. M. Tong, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 060302 (2016).
 - [5] A. Winter and D. Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 120404 (2016).
 - [6] A. E. Rastegin, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 032136 (2016).
 - [7] C.-s. Yu, Phys. Rev. A **95**, 042337 (2017).
 - [8] H. Zhao and C.-s. Yu, Scientific Reports **8**, 299 (2018).
 - [9] C. Xiong, A. Kumar, and J. Wu, Phys. Rev. A **98**, 032324 (2018).
 - [10] C. Napoli, T. R. Bromley, M. Cianciaruso, M. Piani, N. Johnston, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 150502 (2016).
 - [11] M. Piani, M. Cianciaruso, T. R. Bromley, C. Napoli, N. Johnston, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 042107 (2016).
 - [12] A. Streltsov, U. Singh, H. S. Dhar, M. N. Bera, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 020403 (2015).
 - [13] K. Bu, N. Anand, and U. Singh, Phys. Rev. A **97**, 032342 (2018).
 - [14] Y. Yao, D. Li, and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A **102**, 032406 (2020).
 - [15] X. Yuan, H. Zhou, Z. Cao, and X. Ma, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 022124 (2015).
 - [16] S. Du, Z. Bai, and Y. Guo, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 052120 (2015).
 - [17] S. Du, Z. Bai, and X. Qi, Quantum Information and Computation **15**, 1307 (2015).
 - [18] J. Åberg, arXiv:quant-ph/0612146 (2006).
 - [19] X. Qi, T. Gao, and F. Yan, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **50**, 285301 (2017).
 - [20] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis, second edition* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013).