

# Probabilistic channel simulation using coherence

Benchi Zhao,<sup>1,\*</sup> Kosuke Ito,<sup>2,†</sup> and Keisuke Fujii<sup>1,2,3,‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Graduate School of Engineering Science, Osaka University,  
1-3 Machikaneyama, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-8531, Japan

<sup>2</sup>Center for Quantum Information and Quantum Biology,  
Osaka University, 1-2 Machikaneyama, Toyonaka 560-8531, Japan

<sup>3</sup>RIKEN Center for Quantum Computing (RQC), Hirosawa 2-1, Wako, Saitama 351-0198, Japan

Channel simulation using coherence, which refers to realizing a target channel with coherent states and free operations, is a fundamental problem in quantum resource theory. The limitations of the accuracy of deterministic channel simulation motivate us to consider the more general probabilistic framework. In this work, we show the relation between the maximal success probability and the accuracy of channel simulation with free operations. When the chosen free operation is the maximally incoherent operation (MIO), we provide an efficiently computable semidefinite program (SDP) to calculate the maximal success probability and derive the analytic expression of success probability for some special cases. When the chosen free operation is dephasing-covariant incoherent operations (DIO), it is proved that if the target channel is not a resource nonactivating channel, then one cannot simulate it exactly both deterministically and probabilistically. The SDP for maximal success probability of simulating channel by DIO is also given correspondingly.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, many efforts have contributed to establishing the framework of quantum resource theory [1, 2] to understand the unique properties of quantum mechanical systems such as coherence [3–12], entanglement [13–17], and magic [18–23]. In general, the resource theory is defined by the free states and free operations. Free states are states that do not possess the resource under consideration, while free operations are operations that preserve the resource in the set of free states. Take the resource theory of entanglement as example [13–17], the free states are separable states, which is not entangled, and one of the free operation set is local operation and classical communication (LOCC) [24, 25], which do not generate entanglement. Similar to entanglement, coherence is another important topic in quantum resource theory [1], which refers to the property of the superposition of states. It empowers various quantum tasks, such as cryptography [26], metrology [27–29], thermodynamics [30–32], and channel simulation [33, 34].

In the resource theory of coherence [32], the free states are defined as classical states, i.e., density operators that are diagonal in a given reference orthogonal basis  $\{|i\rangle\}$ . Such states are called *incoherent states* and denoted as  $\mathcal{I}$ . The corresponding *maximally coherent state* in dimension  $m$  is the state  $|\Psi_m\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} |j\rangle$ . In this work, we denote the density matrix of a maximally coherent state with rank  $m$  as  $\Psi_m = |\Psi_m\rangle\langle\Psi_m|$  for convenience. Unlike LOCC in the entanglement resource theory, the resource theory of coherence fails to identify a single, physically motivated class of operations. Thus, it is necessary to characterize the operational properties and applications of quantum coherence under several different sets of operations, such as dephasing-covariant

incoherent operations (DIO) [35], and maximally incoherent operations (MIO) [34]. The DIO is defined as operations  $\mathcal{M}$  such that  $[\Delta, \mathcal{M}] = 0$ , or equivalently  $\mathcal{M}(|i\rangle\langle i|) \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $\Delta(\mathcal{M}(|i\rangle\langle j|)) = 0$ ,  $\forall i \neq j$ , where  $\Delta$  is the diagonal map (completely dephasing channel), i.e.,  $\Delta(\cdot) = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| \cdot |i\rangle\langle i|$ . The MIO is defined to be all operations  $\mathcal{M}$  such that  $\mathcal{M}(\rho) \in \mathcal{I}$  for any free state  $\rho \in \mathcal{I}$ . From the definition, DIO is the subset of MIO, i.e.,  $\text{DIO} \subset \text{MIO}$ . More details are shown in Appendix A.




FIG. 1. (a) Arbitrary channel  $\mathcal{N}$  is applied to given quantum state  $\rho$ . (b) Utilizing free operation  $\mathcal{M}$  and resource state  $\omega$  to implement channel  $\mathcal{L}$ . The realized channel  $\mathcal{L}$  is supposed to be as close to the target channel  $\mathcal{N}$  as possible.

Channel simulation using resource is one of the most fundamental tasks in the quantum resource theory. Specifically, the channel simulation using resources is to use a resource state  $\omega$  and a free operation  $\mathcal{M}$  to realize a quantum channel  $\mathcal{L}$  such that  $\mathcal{L}$  close to the target channel  $\mathcal{N}$  as much as possible. Such a process is shown in Fig. 1. Quantum teleportation [36] is one of the well-known channel simulations using entanglement, where the resource state is Bell state and the free operation is LOCC. Channel simulation using coherence is another important topic in the quantum resource theory, and many efforts have contributed to establishing the framework of deterministic channel simulation [33, 34, 37]. At the same

\* benchizhao@gmail.com

† kosuke.ito.qiqb@osaka-u.ac.jp

‡ fujii@qc.ee.es.osaka-u.ac.jp

time, the limitations of deterministic channel simulation are also shown. The deterministic protocol may be not sufficient to simulate the target channel within desired error tolerance. In Ref. [33, 34], it has been proved that any CPTP map can be simulated by free operations MIO deterministically with a certain resource state  $\omega$ . However, if we can only access to the resource state  $\omega$ , whose robustness of coherence is smaller than the requirement of the channel simulation, then it is impossible to simulate the target channel with no error. Besides, in Ref. [37], the authors found that any coherent unitary channel cannot be simulated by DIO exactly (e.g. the Hadamard gate) no matter what resource state  $\omega$  is provided.

The limitation of deterministic channel simulation motivates us to consider such a task in a more general probabilistic framework, in which the channel simulation will succeed only with some probability. The probabilistic framework has been applied to many quantum tasks and shown advantages over deterministic ones. For example, in Ref. [38], the author observes that one can transfer the quantum state from  $\rho$  to  $\sigma$  probabilistically, while such transformation is forbidden in the deterministic scenario. Moreover, in the task of coherence distillation [5], with the same input state, the output state by probabilistic distillation is closer to the maximal coherent state than deterministic distillation.

In this work, we focus on the probabilistic channel simulation using coherence, characterizing the relation between the maximum success probability and the distance from simulated channel  $\mathcal{L}$  and target channel  $\mathcal{N}$ . In the first part, we show three cases of channel simulation with MIO depending on the types of the resource state. (i) If the resource state is the rank- $m$  maximally coherent state  $\omega = \Psi_m$ , we provide the analytical expression of maximal success probability. (ii) If the resource state  $\omega$  is a pure coherent state, we derive the non-zero success probability. (iii) If the resource state  $\omega$  is a general coherent state, we provide an efficiently computable semidefinite programs (SDP) to achieve the maximal success probability. In the second part, we concentrate on the channel simulation with DIO. We proved that if the target channel  $\mathcal{N}$  is not a resource nonactivating channel [39], then it cannot be simulated exactly by DIO with any resource state, both deterministically and probabilistically. We then provide the efficiently computable SDP for achieving the maximal success probability of channel simulation with DIO. Our work fills an important gap in the literature by establishing the probabilistic toolbox for the key resource of quantum coherence.

## II. THE PROBLEM OF PROBABILISTIC CHANNEL SIMULATION

To quantify the coherence of a quantum channel, the robustness of coherence of a quantum channel was proposed

**Definition 1** [34] *The robustness of coherence of a quantum channel  $\mathcal{N}$ ,  $C_R(\mathcal{N})$  is defined by*

$$1 + C_R(\mathcal{N}) := \min\{\lambda : \mathcal{N} \leq \lambda\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M} \in \text{MIO}\}. \quad (1)$$

The inequality of  $\mathcal{N} \leq \lambda\mathcal{M}$  can be understood as the map  $\lambda\mathcal{M} - \mathcal{N}$  is completely positive.

**Definition 2** [34] *The smoothed version of the robustness of the channel is called  $\varepsilon$ -robustness of coherence, which is defined by*

$$C_R^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}) := \min\left\{C_R(\mathcal{L}) : \frac{1}{2}\|\mathcal{N} - \mathcal{L}\|_\diamond \leq \varepsilon\right\}. \quad (2)$$

If we consider replacement channel  $\mathcal{N}_\sigma$ , whose output is independent of the input state  $\rho$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{N}_\sigma(\rho) = \text{Tr}[\rho]\sigma$ , then the robustness of a channel (Definition 1) reduces to the robustness of states [8]. The definition of the robustness of quantum states is shown in Appendix B. Similar to the robustness of a state, the robustness of a channel quantifies the minimal mixing required to destroy all the coherence in a quantum channel  $\mathcal{N}$ . Note that the robustness of coherence of quantum channel  $C_R(\mathcal{N})$ , as well as  $\varepsilon$ -robustness of coherence can be effectively calculated by SDP [34], which are shown in the Appendix C.

The task of probabilistic channel simulation can be defined as follows. For a given target channel  $\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}$ , and resource state  $\omega$ , we aim to find a free operation  $\mathcal{M}$  such that  $\mathcal{M}(\omega \otimes \cdot)$  probabilistically outputs a channel close to  $\mathcal{N}(\cdot)$ . A single-bit classical flag register  $F$  is used to indicate if the simulation is successful. If the register  $F$  is found to be  $|0\rangle$ , then it implies the output state  $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$  simulates our target  $\mathcal{N}(\cdot)$  up to an error  $\varepsilon$ . Otherwise, the simulation fails and we discard the "rubbish" output  $\mathcal{K}(\cdot)$ . When the channel simulation fails, we can perform a replacement channel  $\mathcal{N}'_{\frac{1}{d}}$ , which replaces input state into identity, on the quantum state  $\mathcal{K}(\cdot)$  as post-operation, i.e.,  $\mathcal{N}'_{\frac{1}{d}} \circ \mathcal{K}(\cdot) = \text{Tr}[\cdot]\mathbb{I}/d$ , where  $\mathbb{I}$  is identity and  $d$  is the dimension of the system. Note that such post-operation won't change the success probability. Our goal is to maximize the success probability of channel simulation. Here, we can define the problem as follows

**Problem 1** *Given triplet  $(\mathcal{N}, \omega, \varepsilon)$ , what is the maximum probability  $P_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{N}, \omega, \varepsilon)$  to simulate channel  $\mathcal{N}$  up to error  $\varepsilon$  with the given resource state  $\omega$  and free operation class  $\mathcal{O} \in \{\text{MIO}, \text{DIO}\}$ ? Mathematically, we have*

$$P_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{N}, \omega, \varepsilon) = \max p; \quad (3a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathcal{M}_{RA \rightarrow FB}(\omega \otimes \cdot) = p|0\rangle\langle 0|_F \otimes \mathcal{L}(\cdot); \\ + (1-p)|1\rangle\langle 1|_F \otimes \text{Tr}[\cdot]\frac{\mathbb{I}}{d}; \quad (3b)$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\|\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{N}\|_\diamond \leq \varepsilon; \quad (3c)$$

$$\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{O}. \quad (3d)$$

System  $R$  is the reference system containing the resource state, and system  $F$  is the flag system, indicating if the channel simulation is successful.  $\|\cdot\|_\diamond$  is known as diamond norm [40], which has two operational meanings: First, it quantifies how well one physically discriminates between two quantum channels [41]. If we set  $\varepsilon = 0$ , it implies the exact implementation of the target channel. Second, it quantifies the cost for simulating a general hermitian preserving map with physical implementations [42, 43].

### III. PROBABILISTIC CHANNEL SIMULATION WITH MIO

In this section, we are going to prove that arbitrary quantum channels can be simulated by MIO probabilistically, and any coherent pure state is useful in this task. We also provide an expression that can compute the maximum probability efficiently. Then we take the qubit unitary channels as a study case.

**Theorem 1** *Given arbitrary channel  $\mathcal{N}$  as a target and maximally coherent state  $\Psi_m$  as a resource state, where  $m \geq 2$  is the rank, the optimal success probability of the exact channel simulation with MIO is*

$$P_{\text{MIO}}(\mathcal{N}, \Psi_m, \varepsilon = 0) = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{m-1}{C_R(\mathcal{N})} \right\} \quad (4)$$

**Proof** When we say a channel  $\mathcal{N}$  can be simulated by MIO, it means that given a maximally coherent state  $\Psi_m$  with rank  $m \geq 2$ , there exists an MIO  $\mathcal{M}$  such that

$$\mathcal{M}(\Psi_m \otimes \cdot) = p|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \mathcal{N}(\cdot) + (1-p)|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \frac{\mathbb{I}}{d}, \quad (5)$$

with  $p > 0$ . In order to simplify this proof, we can transfer the problem from probabilistic channel simulation of  $\mathcal{N}$  into deterministic channel simulation of  $\mathcal{L}$ , which is

$$\mathcal{L}(\cdot) = p|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \mathcal{N}(\cdot) + (1-p)|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \frac{\mathbb{I}}{d}. \quad (6)$$

In Ref. [34], it has been proved that if  $m-1 \geq C_R(\mathcal{L})$ , then there exist a CPTP map  $\mathcal{L}'$  such that  $(\mathcal{L} + (m-1)\mathcal{L}')/m$  is MIO. In our case, from the convexity of the robustness of the quantum channel, we have  $pC_R(\mathcal{N}) \geq C_R(\mathcal{L})$ . Since  $C_R(\mathcal{N})$  is a finite value [34], we can always find a positive probability  $p$  such that

$$m-1 \geq pC_R(\mathcal{N}). \quad (7)$$

Make the following ansatz for a channel  $\mathcal{M}$  that is feasible for the simulation

$$\mathcal{M}(\omega \otimes \cdot) = \text{Tr}[\Psi_m \omega] \mathcal{L}(\cdot) + \text{Tr}[(\mathbb{I} - \Psi_m) \omega] \mathcal{L}'(\cdot). \quad (8)$$

$\mathcal{M}$  is MIO if and only if  $\mathcal{M}(|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \cdot)$  is MIO for any diagonal elements  $|i\rangle\langle i|$ . Substitute  $\omega = |i\rangle\langle i|$  in Eq. (8), we have  $\mathcal{M}(|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \cdot) = \frac{1}{m}\mathcal{L} + \frac{m-1}{m}\mathcal{L}'$ , which is MIO by construction. From Eq. (7), the maximal success probability is taken as  $\frac{m-1}{C_R(\mathcal{N})}$ , since  $C_R(\Psi_m) = m-1$ , we can also write it as  $P(\mathcal{N}, \Psi_m, \varepsilon = 0) = \frac{C_R(\Psi_m)}{C_R(\mathcal{N})}$ . Note that the probability cannot exceed 1, the optimal success probability is

$$P(\mathcal{N}, \Psi_m, \varepsilon = 0) = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{m-1}{C_R(\mathcal{N})} \right\}. \quad (9)$$

The proof is complete.  $\blacksquare$

The robustness of quantum channel  $C_R(\mathcal{N})$  is finite, it implies the success probability of simulating a channel by using MIO and maximal coherent states is always greater than 0,

i.e.,  $P(\mathcal{N}, \Psi_m, \varepsilon = 0) > 0$  with  $m \geq 2$ . In other words, any quantum channel can be simulated by MIO probabilistically with  $\Psi_m$ .

In the proof of Theorem. 1, if given enough resource, i.e.,  $C_R(\Psi_m) = m-1 \geq C_R(\mathcal{N})$ , it implies the success probability equals to one, thus we can simulate channel deterministically. Otherwise, if we can only access the quantum states with a limited amount of coherence, i.e.,  $C_R(\Psi_m) = m-1 < C_R(\mathcal{N})$ , then the channel can only be simulated probabilistically, which is the ratio between the robustness of resource state  $\Psi_m$  and the robustness of coherent channel  $\mathcal{N}$ , i.e.,

$$p = \frac{m-1}{C_R(\mathcal{N})}. \quad (10)$$

If the robustness of coherence of the given quantum state is less than the requirement of channel simulation, it is impossible to realize the target exactly [34]. However, in the probabilistic scenario, such a task can be realized with a certain success probability.

If we are allowed to simulate target channel  $\mathcal{N}$  up to error  $\varepsilon$ , it is equivalent to simulate channel  $\mathcal{L}$  exactly with the constraint  $\frac{1}{2}\|\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{N}\|_{\diamond} \leq \varepsilon$ . From the definition of  $\varepsilon$ -robustness of coherence, we have  $\min_{\mathcal{L}} C_R(\mathcal{L}) = C_R^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{N})$ , which leads to the following corollary directly.

**Corollary 2** *Given arbitrary channel  $\mathcal{N}$  as target and maximally coherent state  $\Psi_m$  as resource state, the optimal success probability of channel simulation with MIO up to error  $\varepsilon$  is*

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{MIO}}(\mathcal{N}, \Psi_m, \varepsilon) &= \max_{\mathcal{L}} P_{\text{MIO}}(\mathcal{L}, \Psi_m, 0) \\ &= \min \left\{ 1, \frac{m-1}{\min_{\mathcal{L}} C_R(\mathcal{L})} \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ 1, \frac{m-1}{C_R^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{N})} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

From Corollary 2, we can approximately simulate the target channel. If more error we are allowed, the higher the success probability we can simulate it.

For a further step, instead of using a maximally coherent state, we consider a general pure coherent state and arrive at a new corollary, which is shown in the following.

**Corollary 3** *Given target channel  $\mathcal{N}$  and coherent pure state  $\psi = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ , where  $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i |i\rangle$ ,  $\psi_i \neq 0, n \geq 2$ , the maximal success probability of channel simulation with MIO up to error  $\varepsilon$  is lower bounded by*

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{MIO}}(\mathcal{N}, \psi, \varepsilon) &\geq P_{\text{MIO}}(\mathcal{N}, \Psi_m, 0) \times P_{\text{MIO}}^{\text{distill}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \rightarrow \Psi_m), \\ &\geq \frac{n^2}{m(\sum_{i=1}^n |\psi_i|^{-2})} \times \min \left\{ 1, \frac{m-1}{C_R^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{N})} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

$$\geq \frac{n^2}{m(\sum_{i=1}^n |\psi_i|^{-2})} \times \min \left\{ 1, \frac{m-1}{C_R^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{N})} \right\}, \quad (13)$$

where  $P_{\text{MIO}}^{\text{distill}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \rightarrow \Psi_m)$  is the success probability of coherence distillation with MIO from input state  $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$  to the rank- $m$  maximally coherent state.

**Proof** Before starting the proof, we need to note that arbitrary coherent pure state  $|\psi\rangle$  can be distilled into maximal coherent state  $\Psi_m$  by MIO with non-zero probability [5], which is

$$P_{\text{MIO}}^{\text{distill}}(\psi \rightarrow \Psi_m) \geq \frac{n^2}{m(\sum_{i=1}^n |\psi_i|^{-2})} > 0, \quad (14)$$

where  $m \geq 2$  is an integer.

In order to simulate channel  $\mathcal{N}$  using a given coherent pure state  $\psi$ , one feasible method is to probabilistically distill the maximally coherent state  $\Psi_m$  from  $\psi$  first, then probabilistically implement the target channel using the distilled maximally coherent state. Therefore, the maximum success probability is lower bounded as

$$P_{\text{MIO}}(\mathcal{N}, \psi, \varepsilon) \geq P_{\text{MIO}}(\mathcal{N}, \Psi_m, 0) \times P_{\text{MIO}}^{\text{distill}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \rightarrow \Psi_m). \quad (15)$$

By considering Eq. (14) and Corollary 2, we arrive at the lower bound of the maximal success probability as

$$P_{\text{MIO}}(\mathcal{N}, \psi, \varepsilon) \geq \frac{n^2}{m(\sum_{i=1}^n |\psi_i|^{-2})} \times \min \left\{ 1, \frac{m-1}{C_R^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N})} \right\}. \quad (16)$$

The proof is completed.  $\blacksquare$

This corollary implies that if we take an arbitrary coherent pure state as a resource state, we can simulate an arbitrary channel by MIO with non-zero probability. In other words, any coherent pure state is "useful" in the task of channel simulation with MIO. Even if only having a few resources, coherent pure states  $\psi$  possess the potential to simulate the target channel, albeit with a small probability of success  $P_{\text{MIO}}(\mathcal{N}, \psi, \varepsilon) > 0$ .

So far, we have analytically researched the success probability of channel simulation using pure coherent states. However, the given resource state can be arbitrary. In the general case, the analytical description of channel simulation will be hard. Here we try to convert the probabilistic channel simulation problem to an SDP problem, which could help us to calculate the success probability. Due to the non-linearity of Eq. (3b), we cannot formulate Problem 1 into an SDP directly. Thus, we consider a generalization of the set of free operation  $\mathcal{O}$  to the class of subnormalized quantum operation  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub}}$ , which is completely positive and traces non-increasing maps. By adopting this generalization, we convert the probability optimization into the following expression. A similar technique is also applied in Ref. [44, 45].

**Lemma 4** For any triplet  $(\mathcal{N}, \omega, \varepsilon)$  and operation class  $\mathcal{O}$ , the maximal success probability of coherence channel simulation  $P_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{N}, \omega, \varepsilon) = \max\{p \in \mathbb{R}_+ | \mathcal{E}(\omega \otimes \cdot) = p\mathcal{L}(\cdot), \frac{1}{2}\|\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{N}\|_{\diamond} \leq \varepsilon, \mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{O}_{\text{sub}}\}$

**Proof** For any quantum operation  $\Lambda(\omega \otimes \rho) = |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \mathcal{E}_0(\omega \otimes \rho) + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \mathcal{E}_1(\omega \otimes \rho)$ , where  $\mathcal{E}_0$  and  $\mathcal{E}_1$  are two subnormalized operations, we can check that  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{O}$  if and only if  $\mathcal{E}_0, \mathcal{E}_1 \in \mathcal{O}_{\text{sub}}$ , and  $\mathcal{E}_0 + \mathcal{E}_1$  is trace preserving. Thus, the optimization in Eq. (3) is equivalent to find the optimal subnormalized operations  $\mathcal{E}_0$  and  $\mathcal{E}_1$  such that  $\mathcal{E}_0(\omega \otimes \rho) = p\mathcal{L}(\rho)$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_1(\omega \otimes \rho) =$

$(1-p)\mathbb{I}/d$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}\|\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{N}\|_{\diamond} \leq \varepsilon$ , and  $\mathcal{E}_0 + \mathcal{E}_1$  is trace preserving. Since we can take  $\mathcal{E}_1(\omega \otimes \rho) = (1 - \text{Tr}[\mathcal{E}_0(\omega \otimes \rho)])\frac{\mathbb{I}}{d}$ , without compromising the success probability, the maximal success probability of coherence channel simulation is only dependent on  $\mathcal{E}_0$ , which complete the proof.  $\blacksquare$

By generalizing the free operation into the subnormalized version, Lemma 4 simplifies the optimization of the maximal success probability. For further steps, we formulate the success probability optimization as an efficiently computable SDP, which is shown as follows.

**Proposition 5** For a given triplet  $(\mathcal{N}, \omega, \varepsilon)$ , the maximal probability to simulate the target channel with MIO is given by  $P_{\text{MIO}}(\mathcal{N}, \omega, \varepsilon) = 1/t_{\min}$ , where  $t_{\min}$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\min} &= \min t; \\ \text{s.t. } \text{Tr}_R[J_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}(\omega^T \otimes \mathbb{I}_A \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)] &= J_{\mathcal{L}_{AB}}; & (17a) \\ J_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}} &\geq 0, \text{Tr}_B[J_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}] \leq t\mathbb{I}_{RA}; & (17b) \\ \text{Tr}_{RA}[J_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}(|i\rangle\langle i|_{RA}^T \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)] & \\ &= \Delta(\text{Tr}_{RA}[J_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}(|i\rangle\langle i|_{RA}^T \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)]), \forall i; & (17c) \\ \text{Tr}_B[J_{\mathcal{L}}] &= \mathbb{I}_A; & (17d) \\ Z &\geq 0, Z \geq J_{\mathcal{L}} - J_{\mathcal{N}}, \text{Tr}_B[Z] \leq \varepsilon\mathbb{I}_A. & (17e) \end{aligned}$$

**Proof** To get rid of the non-linearity, we consider the map  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} = t\mathcal{E}$ , where  $t = 1/p$ , the inverse of success probability, and  $\mathcal{E}$  is the subnormalized MIO. The notations of  $J_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}$  and  $J_{\mathcal{L}}$  are the Choi-Jamiołkowski matrix of maps  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}$ , respectively.  $J_{\mathcal{N}}$  is the Choi-Jamiołkowski matrix of the target channel  $\mathcal{N}$ . Eq. (17a) corresponds to the constraint  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(\omega \otimes \cdot) = \mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ . Eq. (17b) and Eq. (17c) implies that  $\mathcal{E}$  is a subnormalized MIO. From the result of Ref. [40], Eq. (17d) and Eq. (17e) guarantee that the simulated channel  $\mathcal{L}$  is the target channel  $\mathcal{N}$  up to error  $\varepsilon$ , which is  $\frac{1}{2}\|\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{N}\|_{\diamond} \leq \varepsilon$ .  $\blacksquare$

A general qubit unitary possesses four real parameters. However, we can transform unitaries into each other without any additional cost by incorporating coherent unitaries before or after them. This observation implies the existence of an equivalence relation among qubit unitaries up to coherent unitaries. A unique representative of each equivalence class [33, 34] is given in Eq. (18).

$$U_{\theta} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad (18)$$

Here we choose the unitary channel  $\mathcal{U}_{\theta}^l, \mathcal{U}_{\theta}^l(\cdot) = U_{\theta}^{\otimes l} \cdot U_{\theta}^{\dagger \otimes l}$ , as the target channel to simulate. The success probability of unitary channel simulation  $\mathcal{U}_{\theta}^l$  can be derived from the robustness of the channel. The specific statement is shown in the following.

**Proposition 6** Given the triplet  $(\mathcal{U}_{\theta}^l, \Psi_m, \varepsilon = 0)$ , the optimal success probability of channel simulation is

$$P_{\text{MIO}}(\mathcal{U}_{\theta}^l, \Psi_m, \varepsilon = 0) = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{m-1}{(1 + \sin 2\theta)^l - 1} \right\}. \quad (19)$$

**Proof** The cohering power [46, 47] of a channel  $P_R(\mathcal{N})$  is defined as

$$P_R(\mathcal{N}) = \max_i \log(1 + C_R(\mathcal{N}(|i\rangle\langle i|))). \quad (20)$$

We denote  $i^*$  to be the optimal solution, i.e.,  $P_R(\mathcal{N}) = \log(1 + C_R(\mathcal{N}(|i^*\rangle\langle i^*|)))$ . In [34], it has been proved that the cohering power of a channel  $P_R(\mathcal{N})$  is equivalent to the log-robustness of the channel, which is  $P_R(\mathcal{N}) = \log(1 + C_R(\mathcal{N}))$ . It is straightforward to have

$$C_R(\mathcal{N}) = C_R(\mathcal{N}(|i^*\rangle\langle i^*|)). \quad (21)$$

If we replace the unitary channel  $\mathcal{U}_\theta^{l=1}$  into the equation, we can deduce  $C_R(\mathcal{U}_\theta^1) = C_R(\mathcal{U}_\theta^1(|i^*\rangle\langle i^*|))$  directly. For single qubit, the robustness of a state is equal to its  $l_1$ -norm of coherence [8], which is the summation of the absolute value of all non-diagonal elements [9]. Then, we have

$$C_R(\mathcal{U}_\theta^1) = C_R(\mathcal{U}_\theta^1(|i^*\rangle\langle i^*|)) = C_{l_1}(\mathcal{U}_\theta^1(|i^*\rangle\langle i^*|)) = \sin 2\theta. \quad (22)$$

Note that the robustness is multiplicative under the tensor product of states [48], specifically

$$1 + C_R(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2) = (1 + C_R(\rho_1))(1 + C_R(\rho_2)). \quad (23)$$

We correspondingly have

$$C_R(\mathcal{U}_\theta^l) = (1 + \sin 2\theta)^l - 1. \quad (24)$$

Recall Theorem 1, the optimal success probability is the ratio between the robustness of the resource state and the robustness of the target coherent channel, also the success probability  $p$  cannot exceed 1. Then we have

$$P_{\text{MIO}}(\mathcal{U}_\theta^l, \Psi_m, \varepsilon = 0) = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{m-1}{(1 + \sin 2\theta)^l - 1} \right\}, \quad (25)$$

which completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

In previous, we discussed the exact probabilistic channel simulation with MIO and provided the success probability. We also conduct numerical experiments to show the approximate probabilistic channel simulation. We consider 2-qubit unitary channels  $\mathcal{U}_\theta^{l=2}$  ( $0 \leq \theta \leq \pi/4$ ) as the target channels. The resource state used is the rank-2 maximally coherent state  $\Psi_2$ . For different error tolerance  $\varepsilon \in \{0, 0.05, 0.1, 0.15, 0.2\}$ , the success probability of channel simulation with MIO is displayed in Fig. 2.

The robustness of the unitary channel  $C_R(\mathcal{U}_\theta^2)$  increases with respect to the increase of the rotation angle  $\theta$ . When the angle is small, the resource state  $\Psi_2$  has more resources than the required resource of the task, so we can simulate such a channel deterministically. When the rotation angle exceeds some threshold, the coherence of the resource state  $\Psi_2$  is not enough for its deterministic implementation. Thus, one can never implement the target channel exactly in the deterministic scenario, and can only realize it approximately. While in the probabilistic scenario, one can exactly implement the target channel with a probability.




FIG. 2. Success probability  $p$  of unitary channel simulation with coherent state  $\Psi_2$  and MIO. The rotation angle  $\theta$  is the parameter of target unitary channel  $\mathcal{U}_\theta^2$ , which is chosen from 0 to  $\pi/4$ . The resource state is the rank-2 maximally coherent state  $\Psi_2$ . The five curves from bottom to top correspond to the error tolerance  $\varepsilon$  equaling to  $\{0, 0.05, 0.1, 0.15, 0.2\}$ , respectively.

#### IV. PROBABILISTIC CHANNEL SIMULATION WITH DIO

In this section, we show if the target channel is not a resource nonactivating channel [39], then it cannot be simulated by DIO exactly both deterministically and probabilistically. Also, SDP for calculating the success probability of the channel simulation is provided. The replacement channel is considered a case study.

In the previous part, we discussed that arbitrary channels can be simulated by using an appropriate resource state and MIO. But for DIO, it is not the same story. Explicitly, we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 7** For some resource state  $\omega$ , if a quantum channel  $\mathcal{N}$  can be implemented by a DIO channel  $\mathcal{M}$  using  $\omega$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{M}(\omega \otimes \cdot) = \mathcal{N}(\cdot)$ , then  $\mathcal{N}$  satisfies  $\Delta \circ \mathcal{N} = \Delta \circ \mathcal{N} \circ \Delta$ .

**Proof** Since  $\mathcal{N}(\rho) = \mathcal{M}(\omega \otimes \rho)$  holds for any quantum state, we directly have  $\Delta \circ \mathcal{N}(\cdot) = \Delta \circ \mathcal{M}(\omega \otimes \cdot)$ . Considering  $\mathcal{M}$  is a DIO channel, which means  $\Delta \circ \mathcal{M}(\omega \otimes \cdot) = \mathcal{M} \circ \Delta(\omega \otimes \cdot)$ . We arrive

$$\Delta \circ \mathcal{N}(\cdot) = \mathcal{M} \circ \Delta(\omega \otimes \cdot). \quad (26)$$

Apply the completely dephasing channel on both sides,

$$\Delta \circ \Delta \circ \mathcal{N}(\cdot) = \Delta \circ \mathcal{M} \circ \Delta(\omega \otimes \cdot) \quad (27)$$

$$\Rightarrow \Delta \circ \mathcal{N}(\cdot) = \Delta \circ \mathcal{N} \circ \Delta(\cdot). \quad (28)$$

Eq. (28) holds for any quantum state, which implies  $\Delta \circ \mathcal{N} = \Delta \circ \mathcal{N} \circ \Delta$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{N}$  is resource nonactivating channel. The proof is complete.  $\blacksquare$

In other words, this theorem implies that if a quantum channel  $\mathcal{N}$  satisfies the condition  $\Delta \circ \mathcal{N} = \Delta \circ \mathcal{N} \circ \Delta$  (also known

as resource nonactivating channel [39]), then it can be simulated by DIO. Besides, it is straightforward to extend this theorem to the probabilistic scenario, which is shown in the following.

**Corollary 8** *For some resource state  $\omega$ , if a quantum channel  $\mathcal{N}$  can be simulated by a DIO channel  $\mathcal{M}$  using  $\omega$  with non-zero probability  $p$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{M}(\omega \otimes \cdot) = p|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \mathcal{N}(\cdot) + (1-p)|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \text{Tr}[\cdot] \frac{\mathbb{I}}{d}$ , where  $\mathbb{I}$  is the identity,  $d$  is the dimension, then  $\mathcal{N}$  satisfies  $\Delta \circ \mathcal{N} = \Delta \circ \mathcal{N} \circ \Delta$ .*

**Proof** Denote  $\mathcal{N}'(\cdot) = p|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \mathcal{N}(\cdot) + (1-p)|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \text{Tr}[\cdot] \frac{\mathbb{I}}{d}$ . From Theorem 7,  $\mathcal{N}'$  is a nonactivating channel, then we directly have  $\Delta \circ \mathcal{N}' = \Delta \circ \mathcal{N}' \circ \Delta$ , which complete the proof. ■

Theorem 7 and its corollary tell us that not all quantum channels can be simulated by DIO, even probabilistically. Take single-qubit unitary channel  $\mathcal{U}_\theta^1$  and quantum state  $|+\rangle$  as an example. One can easily obtain

$$\Delta \circ \mathcal{U}_\theta^1(|+\rangle) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} - \cos \theta \sin \theta & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} + \cos \theta \sin \theta \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\Delta \circ \mathcal{U}_\theta^1 \circ \Delta(|+\rangle) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}$$

$\Delta \circ \mathcal{U}_\theta^1 \neq \Delta \circ \mathcal{U}_\theta^1 \circ \Delta$  represents a single qubit unitary channel  $\mathcal{U}_\theta^1$  is not a resource nonactivating channel, which cannot be simulated by DIO even probabilistically. A similar result was also discovered in Ref. [37].

If a quantum channel  $\mathcal{N}$  can be simulated by DIO, then the success probability can be efficiently computed by the SDP as shown in Proposition 9.

**Proposition 9** *For a given triplet  $(\mathcal{N}, \omega, \varepsilon)$ , where  $\mathcal{N}$  is DIO-simulatable channel, the maximal probability to simulate the target channel with DIO is given by  $P_{\text{DIO}}(\mathcal{N}, \omega, \varepsilon) = 1/t_{\min}$ , where  $t_{\min}$  is given by*

$$t_{\min} = \min t;$$

$$\text{s.t. } \text{Tr}_R[J_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}(\omega^T \otimes \mathbb{I}_A \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)] = J_{\mathcal{L}_{AB}}; \quad (29a)$$

$$J_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}} \geq 0, \text{Tr}_B[J_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}] \leq t\mathbb{I}_{RA}; \quad (29b)$$

$$\text{Tr}_{RA}[J_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}(|i\rangle\langle i|_{RA}^T \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)] \\ = \Delta(\text{Tr}_{RA}[J_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}(|i\rangle\langle i|_{RA}^T \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)]), \forall i; \quad (29c)$$

$$\Delta(\text{Tr}_{RA}(J_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}(|i\rangle\langle j|_{RA}^T \otimes \mathbb{I}_B))) = 0, \forall i \neq j; \quad (29d)$$

$$\text{Tr}_B[J_{\mathcal{L}}] = \mathbb{I}_A; \quad (29e)$$

$$Z \geq 0, Z \geq J_{\mathcal{L}} - J_{\mathcal{N}}, \text{Tr}_B[Z] \leq \varepsilon\mathbb{I}_A; \quad (29f)$$

Compared with the SDP for success probability of channel simulation with MIO Eq. (17), the SDP in Eq. (29) has one more constraint as Eq. (29d), which corresponds to  $\Delta(\mathcal{M}(|i\rangle\langle j|)) = 0, \forall i \neq j$ .

We conduct a numerical experiment to simulate qubit reset [49], characterized by a replacement channel, which is one of the most important quantum processes as shown in Fig. 3. Such an operation is widely used in quantum algorithms to reduce the width of quantum circuits [50]. In this experiment,

we set the target channel as replacement channel  $\mathcal{N}_{|+\rangle}$ , which outputs the  $|+\rangle$  state no matter what the input state is, i.e.,  $\mathcal{N}_{|+\rangle}(\rho) = \text{Tr}[\rho]|+\rangle$  for arbitrary quantum state  $\rho$ . The resource state is coherent pure state,  $|\psi\rangle = \sqrt{\alpha}|0\rangle + \sqrt{1-\alpha}|1\rangle$  for  $\alpha \in [0, 0.5]$ . The coherence of the state increases as the increase of parameter  $\alpha$ . When  $\alpha = 0.5$ , the resource state is a rank-2 maximally coherent state  $\Psi_2$ . We accept different error tolerance,  $\varepsilon \in \{0, 0.02, 0.04, 0.06\}$ , and compare the corresponding success probability of the channel simulation. The results are shown in the Fig. 3.




FIG. 3. Success probability of simulating a replacement channel  $\mathcal{N}_{|+\rangle}$  with DIO and pure coherent state  $|\psi\rangle = \sqrt{\alpha}|0\rangle + \sqrt{1-\alpha}|1\rangle$ ,  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . The curves correspond to different error tolerances  $\varepsilon \in \{0, 0.02, 0.04, 0.06\}$  (from bottom to top), respectively.

We also analyze the high-dimension replacement channel simulation with a low-dimension resource state. The details refer to Appendix D.

## V. CONCLUSION

We have focused on the probabilistic channel simulation with MIO and DIO, respectively. For the MIO part, we talked about three cases: If the resource state is the maximally coherent state, we provide an analytical expression for the maximal success probability. If we select any pure coherent state as the resource state, the maximal success probability is guaranteed to be greater than zero. If the resource state  $\omega$  is a general coherent state, we offer an efficiently computable semidefinite program (SDP) for achieving the maximal success probability. For the DIO part, we prove that if a target channel  $\mathcal{N}$  can be realized by DIO with a certain resource state  $\omega$ , it implies that  $\mathcal{N}$  is a resource nonactivating channel. Furthermore, we present an efficiently computable SDP for attaining the maximal success probability of channel simulation with DIO.

For further research, it would be interesting to find out the necessary and sufficient conditions for a DIO-simulatable channel. Another interesting direction is to apply the framework of probabilistic channel simulation to other important

quantum resource such as entanglement and magic.

**Acknowledgements.**— B. Zhao would like to thank Xin Wang and Xuanqiang Zhao, Zhiping Liu for their fruitful discussion. This work is supported by MEXT Quantum

Leap Flagship Program (MEXT Q-LEAP) Grant No. JP-MXS0118067394 and JPMXS0120319794, JST COINEXT Grant No. JPMJPF2014.

- 
- [1] E. Chitambar and G. Gour, *Reviews of modern physics* **91**, 025001 (2019).
- [2] M. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim, *International Journal of Modern Physics B* **27**, 1345019 (2013).
- [3] A. Streltsov, G. Adesso, and M. B. Plenio, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **89**, 041003 (2017).
- [4] J. Aberg, *arXiv preprint quant-ph/0612146* (2006).
- [5] K. Fang, X. Wang, L. Lami, B. Regula, and G. Adesso, *Physical review letters* **121**, 070404 (2018).
- [6] B. Regula, K. Fang, X. Wang, and G. Adesso, *Physical review letters* **121**, 010401 (2018).
- [7] Q. Zhao, Y. Liu, X. Yuan, E. Chitambar, and X. Ma, *Physical review letters* **120**, 070403 (2018).
- [8] C. Napoli, T. R. Bromley, M. Cianciaruso, M. Piani, N. Johnston, and G. Adesso, *Physical review letters* **116**, 150502 (2016).
- [9] T. Baumgratz, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, *Physical review letters* **113**, 140401 (2014).
- [10] E. Chitambar and G. Gour, *Physical Review A* **94**, 052336 (2016).
- [11] M. Piani, M. Cianciaruso, T. R. Bromley, C. Napoli, N. Johnston, and G. Adesso, *Physical Review A* **93**, 042107 (2016).
- [12] H. Tajima and R. Takagi, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03479* (2024).
- [13] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, *Reviews of modern physics* **81**, 865 (2009).
- [14] V. Vedral, M. B. Plenio, M. A. Rippin, and P. L. Knight, *Physical Review Letters* **78**, 2275 (1997).
- [15] X. Wang and M. M. Wilde, *Physical Review Letters* **125**, 040502 (2020).
- [16] R. Chen, B. Zhao, and X. Wang, *Physical Review Applied* **20**, 024071 (2023).
- [17] C. Zhu, C. Zhu, and X. Wang, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07228* (2023).
- [18] M. Howard and E. Campbell, *Physical review letters* **118**, 090501 (2017).
- [19] S. Bravyi, G. Smith, and J. A. Smolin, *Physical Review X* **6**, 021043 (2016).
- [20] X. Wang, M. M. Wilde, and Y. Su, *New Journal of Physics* **21**, 103002 (2019).
- [21] X. Wang, M. M. Wilde, and Y. Su, *Physical review letters* **124**, 090505 (2020).
- [22] S. Bravyi and J. Haah, *Physical Review A* **86**, 052329 (2012).
- [23] C. Zhu, Z. Liu, C. Zhu, and X. Wang, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11323* (2023).
- [24] E. Chitambar, D. Leung, L. Mančinska, M. Ozols, and A. Winter, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **328**, 303 (2014).
- [25] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information* (Cambridge university press, 2010).
- [26] P. J. Coles, E. M. Metodiev, and N. Lütkenhaus, *Nature communications* **7**, 11712 (2016).
- [27] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, *Nature photonics* **5**, 222 (2011).
- [28] F. Fröwis and W. Dür, *Physical review letters* **106**, 110402 (2011).
- [29] G. Tóth and I. Apellaniz, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **47**, 424006 (2014).
- [30] M. Lostaglio, D. Jennings, and T. Rudolph, *Nature communications* **6**, 6383 (2015).
- [31] F. G. Brandao, M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, J. M. Renes, and R. W. Spekkens, *Physical review letters* **111**, 250404 (2013).
- [32] G. Gour, M. P. Müller, V. Narasimhachar, R. W. Spekkens, and N. Y. Halpern, *Physics Reports* **583**, 1 (2015).
- [33] K. B. Dana, M. G. Díaz, M. Mejatty, and A. Winter, *Physical Review A* **95**, 062327 (2017).
- [34] M. G. Díaz, K. Fang, X. Wang, M. Rosati, M. Skotiniotis, J. Calsamiglia, and A. Winter, *Quantum* **2**, 100 (2018).
- [35] E. Chitambar and G. Gour, *Physical review letters* **117**, 030401 (2016).
- [36] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, *Physical review letters* **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [37] B. D. Jones, P. Skrzypczyk, and N. Linden, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.03515* (2023).
- [38] B. Regula, *Physical Review Letters* **128**, 110505 (2022).
- [39] Z.-W. Liu, X. Hu, and S. Lloyd, *Physical review letters* **118**, 060502 (2017).
- [40] J. Watrous, *arXiv preprint arXiv:0901.4709* (2009).
- [41] M. F. Sacchi, *Physical Review A* **71**, 062340 (2005).
- [42] X. Zhao, L. Zhang, B. Zhao, and X. Wang, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.09963* (2023).
- [43] B. Regula, R. Takagi, and M. Gu, *Quantum* **5**, 522 (2021).
- [44] F. Buscemi and G. Gour, *Physical Review A* **95**, 012110 (2017).
- [45] S. Ishizaka and M. B. Plenio, *Physical Review A* **71**, 052303 (2005).
- [46] A. Mani and V. Karimipour, *Physical Review A* **92**, 032331 (2015).
- [47] K. Bu, A. Kumar, L. Zhang, and J. Wu, *Physics Letters A* **381**, 1670 (2017).
- [48] H. Zhu, M. Hayashi, and L. Chen, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **50**, 475303 (2017).
- [49] D. J. Egger, M. Werninghaus, M. Ganzhorn, G. Salis, A. Fuhrer, P. Müller, and S. Filipp, *Physical Review Applied* **10**, 044030 (2018).
- [50] Y. Wang, B. Zhao, and X. Wang, *Physical Review Applied* **19**, 044041 (2023).
- [51] A. Winter and D. Yang, *Physical review letters* **116**, 120404 (2016).

## Appendix for Probabilistic channel simulation of coherence

### Appendix A: Relations between different free operations

- *maximally incoherent operations (MIO)* [4], is defined to be all operations  $\mathcal{M}$  such that  $\mathcal{M}(\rho) \in \mathcal{I}$  for any free state  $\rho \in \mathcal{I}$ .
- *dephasing-covariant incoherent operations (DIO)* [10, 35], is defined as operations  $\mathcal{M}$  such that  $[\Delta, \mathcal{M}] = 0$ , or equivalently  $\mathcal{M}(|i\rangle\langle i|) \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $\Delta(\mathcal{M}(|i\rangle\langle j|)) = 0$ ,  $\forall i \neq j$ , where  $\Delta$  is the diagonal map (completely dephasing channel), i.e.,  $\Delta(\cdot) = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| \cdot |i\rangle\langle i|$ .
- *incoherent operations (IO)* [9], admits a set of incoherent Kraus operators  $\{K_l\}$  such that  $\frac{K_l \rho K_l^\dagger}{\text{Tr}[K_l \rho K_l^\dagger]} \in \mathcal{I}$  for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{I}$
- *strictly incoherent operations (SIO)*[51], if the Kraus operators  $K_l$  and  $K_l^\dagger$  of the channel are IOs, then such channel is called SIO.
- *physical incoherent operations (PIO)*[35], has the following processes: (1) a joint unitary  $U_{AB}$  is applied on the input state  $\rho_A$  and some fixed incoherent state  $\rho_B$ , (2) an incoherent projective measurement is applied with system  $B$  encoding the measurement outcome as a classical index, and (3) classical processing channel is applied to the measurement outcomes. Equivalently, a CPTP map is said to be PIO if and only if it can be expressed as a convex combination of maps each having Kraus operators  $\{K_j\}_{j=1}^r$  of the form

$$K_j = U_j P_j = \sum_x e^{i\theta_x} |\pi_j(x)\rangle\langle x| P_j, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where  $P_j$  forms an orthogonal and complete set of incoherent projectors on system  $A$  and  $\pi_i$  are permutations.




FIG. 4. Relations between different free operations

### Appendix B: Robustness of a state

**Definition 3** Robustness of state Given an arbitrary quantum state  $\rho$ , the robustness of a state is defined as [8, 11]

$$C_R(\rho) = \min_{\tau} \left\{ s \geq 0 \mid \frac{\rho + s\tau}{1+s} = \sigma \in \mathcal{I} \right\}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where  $\mathcal{I}$  refers to the set of free states.



The robustness of the state quantifies the minimum amount of another state  $s$  required such that its mixed state  $(\rho + s\rho')/(1 + \lambda)$  is the incoherent state. We need to note that the added state  $\tau$  is not necessarily a free state. Let's denote the  $s^*$  to be the optimal value of  $s$ , and the corresponding state is denoted as  $\tau^*$  and  $\sigma^*$ . then  $C_R(\rho) = s^*$ , and

$$\rho = (1 + C_R(\rho))\sigma^* - C_R(\rho)\tau^*, \quad (\text{B2})$$

is said to realize an optimal pseudo mixture for  $\rho$ . It can be characterized by [11]

$$1 + C_R(\rho) = \min\{\lambda | \rho \leq \lambda\sigma, \sigma \in \mathcal{I}\}, \quad (\text{B3})$$

where  $\mathcal{I}$  is denoted as an incoherent state. Note the robustness is multiplicative under the tensor product of states [48]:

$$1 + C_R(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2) = (1 + C_R(\rho_1))(1 + C_R(\rho_2)). \quad (\text{B4})$$

### Appendix C: SDP for robustness of coherence

**Definition 1** [34] *The robustness of coherence of a quantum channel  $\mathcal{N}$ ,  $C_R(\mathcal{N})$  is defined by*

$$1 + C_R(\mathcal{N}) := \min\{\lambda : \mathcal{N} \leq \lambda\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M} \in \text{MIO}\}. \quad (\text{C1})$$

The robustness of coherence can be computed efficiently by SDPs which is shown as follows.

$$1 + C_R(\mathcal{N}) = \min \quad \lambda \quad (\text{C2a})$$

$$\text{s.t. } J_{\mathcal{N}} \leq J_{\mathcal{M}}, \quad (\text{C2a})$$

$$\text{Tr}_B[J_{\mathcal{M}}] = \lambda\mathbb{I}_A, \quad (\text{C2b})$$

$$\text{Tr}_A[J_{\mathcal{M}}(|i\rangle\langle i|^T \otimes \mathbb{I})] = \Delta(\text{Tr}_A[J_{\mathcal{M}}(|i\rangle\langle i|^T \otimes \mathbb{I})]), \quad \forall |i\rangle\langle i|. \quad (\text{C2c})$$

where  $J_{\mathcal{N}}$  and  $J_{\mathcal{M}}$  are Choi-Jamiołkowski matrix of channel  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$ , respectively. Eq. (C2a) corresponding to  $\mathcal{N} \leq \lambda\mathcal{M}$ . Note that  $\mathcal{N}$  is completely positive, which implies  $J_{\mathcal{M}'} \geq J_{\mathcal{N}} \geq 0$ , implies  $\mathcal{M}'$  is a completely positive map. Eq. (C2b) implies the channel  $\mathcal{M}'$  is a trace scaling map. Eq. (C2c) comes from the definition of MIO, which is  $\mathcal{M}(\rho) \in \mathcal{I}$ , for any free state  $\rho$ .

**Definition 2** [34] *The smoothed version of robustness of channel is called  $\varepsilon$ -robustness of coherence, which is defined by*

$$C_R^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}) := \min \left\{ C_R(\mathcal{L}) : \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{N} - \mathcal{L}\|_\diamond \leq \varepsilon \right\}. \quad (\text{C3})$$

The  $\varepsilon$ -robustness of coherence can be computed efficiently by SDPs which is shown as follows.

$$1 + C_R^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}) = \min \quad \lambda \quad (\text{C4a})$$

$$\text{s.t. } J_{\mathcal{M}} \geq J_{\mathcal{L}} \quad (\text{C4a})$$

$$\text{Tr}_B[J_{\mathcal{M}}] = \lambda\mathbb{I}_A, \quad (\text{C4b})$$

$$\text{Tr}_A[J_{\mathcal{M}}(|i\rangle\langle i|^T \otimes \mathbb{I})] = \Delta(\text{Tr}_A[J_{\mathcal{M}}(|i\rangle\langle i|^T \otimes \mathbb{I})]), \quad \forall |i\rangle\langle i|, \quad (\text{C4c})$$

$$V \geq J_{\mathcal{L}} - J_{\mathcal{N}}, \quad (\text{C4d})$$

$$\text{Tr}_B[V] \leq \varepsilon\mathbb{I}_A, \quad (\text{C4e})$$

$$\text{Tr}_B[J_{\mathcal{L}}] = \mathbb{I}_A, \quad (\text{C4f})$$

$$J_{\mathcal{L}} \geq 0, V \geq 0. \quad (\text{C4g})$$

Eq. (C4a), Eq. (C4b) and Eq. (C4c) are the same as Eq. (C2). The rest of the constraints, i.e., Eq. (C4d), Eq. (C4e), Eq. (C4f), Eq. (C4g) corresponds to  $\frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{N} - \mathcal{L}\|_\diamond \leq \varepsilon$ .

### Appendix D: Simulation replacement channel with DIO

We also conduct numerical experiments of channel simulation with DIO. For simplicity, the target channel is chosen as replacement channel  $\mathcal{N}_{\Psi_4}$ , which outputs a fixed quantum state no matter what is the input. Specifically  $\mathcal{N}_{\Psi_4}(\cdot) = \text{Tr}[\cdot]\Psi_4$ , where  $\Psi_4$  is the rank-4 maximally coherent state. In the simulation, the resource state is set as rank-2 maximally coherent state  $\Psi_2$ . With different error tolerance of channel simulation, the results are shown in Fig. 5.

In this experiment, we observe that the more errors are allowed, the higher the success probability is. In the simulation with MIO, the success probability increases gradually as the error tolerance increases. However, in the channel simulation with DIO, an interesting phenomenon appears the success probability of DIO jumps suddenly from 0 to 1 when the error tolerance surpasses some threshold. The threshold is  $1 - m/n$  and the details are shown in the following proposition.




FIG. 5. Success probability of channel simulation by MIO and DIO with different error tolerances. The target channel is set as replacement channel  $\mathcal{N}_{\Psi_4}(\cdot) = \Psi_4$ , and the resource state is chosen as  $\Psi_2$ . The discontinuity of the DIO curve occurs at error tolerance  $\varepsilon = 1/2$ .

**Proposition 10** With given triplet  $(\mathcal{N}_{\Psi_n}, \Psi_m, \varepsilon)$ , where  $\mathcal{N}_{\Psi_n}(\cdot) = \Psi_n$  refers to replacement channel, and any integer  $m \leq n$ , it holds that

$$P_{\text{DIO}}(\mathcal{N}_{\Psi_n}, \Psi_m, \varepsilon) = \begin{cases} 1, & \varepsilon \geq 1 - \frac{m}{n}, \\ 0, & \varepsilon < 1 - \frac{m}{n}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{D1})$$

**Proof** For  $\varepsilon \geq 1 - \frac{m}{n}$ , It is straightforward to check that the constraints in Eq. (29) are satisfied with the following feasible solution

$$J_{\tilde{\varepsilon}} = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{I}_R \otimes \mathbb{I}_A \otimes \mathbb{I}_B + \frac{1}{n(n-1)} (m\Psi_m - \mathbb{I})_R \otimes \mathbb{I}_A \otimes (n\Psi_n - \mathbb{I})_B \quad (\text{D2})$$

$$Z = (1 - \frac{m}{n}) \mathbb{I}_A \otimes \Psi_n, \quad (\text{D3})$$

which gives us the success probability 1. Note that the prime problem minimizes the value  $t$ . However, the  $t$  is the inverse of success probability, thus Eq. (29) maximizes the probability  $p$ . In maximizing a problem, a feasible solution is usually smaller than the optimal value. But in this case, we are dealing with probability, which cannot exceed 1. Therefore, the feasible solution of  $J$  and  $Z$  is the optimal solution for  $\varepsilon \geq 1 - \frac{m}{n}$ .

For  $\varepsilon < 1 - \frac{m}{n}$ , remind the original problem first

$$P_{\text{DIO}}(\mathcal{N}_{\Psi_n}, \Psi_m, \varepsilon) = \max \left\{ p \left| \mathcal{M}(\Psi_m \otimes \cdot) = p|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \mathcal{L}(\cdot) + (1-p)|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \frac{\mathbb{I}}{d}, \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{N}_{\Psi_n}\|_{\diamond} \leq \varepsilon, \mathcal{M} \in \text{DIO} \right\} \quad (\text{D4})$$

For the diamond norm, we can rewrite it into

$$\varepsilon \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{N}_{\Psi_n}\|_{\diamond} \quad (\text{D5})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \max_{\rho_{RA}} \|I_R \otimes \mathcal{L}_A(\rho_{RA}) - I_R \otimes \mathcal{N}_{\Psi_n}(\rho_{RA})\|_1 \quad (\text{D6})$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \max_{\rho} \|\mathcal{L}(\rho) - \mathcal{N}_{\Psi_n}(\rho)\|_1 \quad (\text{D7})$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\omega - \Psi_n\|_1, \quad \forall \rho, \quad (\text{D8})$$

where  $\omega = \mathcal{L}(\rho)$ . The second equality comes from the definition of the diamond norm. The third inequality is caused by removing the ancillary system  $R$ . The last inequality is because every possible quantum state is smaller than the maximal value.

For an arbitrary state  $\rho$  and a pure state  $\psi$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \psi\|_1 \geq 1 - F(\rho, \psi), \quad (\text{D9})$$

where  $F(\rho, \sigma) = \|\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\sigma}\|_1^2$  is the fidelity between states  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$ , and  $\|\cdot\|_1$  denotes the trace norm. Because the state  $\Psi_n$  is pure, combining Eqs. (D8) and (D9), we obtain

$$\varepsilon \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\omega - \Psi_n\|_1 \geq 1 - F(\omega, \Psi_n), \quad \forall \rho \quad (\text{D10})$$

At this stage, the original problem is converted to

$$P_{\text{DIO}}^{\text{simulate}}(\mathcal{N}_{\Psi_n}, \Psi_m, \varepsilon) = \max \left\{ p \left| \mathcal{M}(\Psi_m \otimes \rho) = p|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \omega + (1-p)|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \frac{\mathbb{I}}{d}, F(\omega, \Psi_n) \geq 1 - \varepsilon, \mathcal{M} \in \text{DIO} \right. \right\} \quad (\text{D11})$$

Here we can add one more constraint that the input state  $\rho$  is a free state, i.e., an incoherent state. This problem reduces to probabilistic coherence distillation with DIO [5].

$$P_{\text{DIO}}^{\text{distill}}(\Psi_m \rightarrow \Psi_n, \varepsilon) = \max \left\{ p \left| \mathcal{M}(\Psi_m) = p|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \omega + (1-p)|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \frac{\mathbb{I}}{d}, F(\omega, \Psi_n) \geq 1 - \varepsilon, \mathcal{M} \in \text{DIO} \right. \right\} \quad (\text{D12})$$

Due to the relaxations,  $P_{\text{DIO}}^{\text{distill}}(\Psi_m \rightarrow \Psi_n, \varepsilon) \geq P_{\text{DIO}}^{\text{simulate}}(\mathcal{N}_{\Psi_n}, \Psi_m, \varepsilon)$ . From [5], they proved that for any integer  $m \geq n$ , it holds that

$$P_{\text{DIO}}^{\text{distill}}(\Psi_m \rightarrow \Psi_n, \varepsilon) = \begin{cases} 0, & \varepsilon < 1 - \frac{m}{n}, \\ 1, & \varepsilon \geq 1 - \frac{m}{n}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{D13})$$

Thus, when  $\varepsilon < 1 - \frac{m}{n}$ ,  $P_{\text{DIO}}^{\text{simulate}}(\mathcal{N}_{\Psi_n}, \Psi_m, \varepsilon) \leq P_{\text{DIO}}^{\text{distill}}(\Psi_m \rightarrow \Psi_n, \varepsilon) \leq 0$ . Note that probability cannot be negative, it is natural to get  $P_{\text{DIO}}^{\text{simulate}}(\mathcal{N}_{\Psi_n}, \Psi_m, \varepsilon) = 0$ , which completes the proof. ■

A similar appearance is also witnessed in Ref. [5], where they noticed that the success probability drops to 0 discontinuously when the infidelity exceeds a threshold in the task of probabilistic coherence distillation. They characterized such phenomenon as ‘‘sudden death’’. From the success probability gap between MIO and DIO, we are confident to conclude that MIO is much more powerful than DIO in the task of channel simulation.