

Thermodynamic laws beyond free energy relations.

Matteo Lostaglio, David Jennings, Terry Rudolph

Department of Physics, Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom

We argue that the thermodynamics of quantum systems is determined by the interplay of two abstract resources: purity and quantum asymmetry. Free energy relations constrain the former, but the latter requires a new, independent set of second laws that govern the coherent component of thermodynamic transformations. To this end we establish thermodynamic constraints that are valid in arbitrarily non-classical regimes, and applicable to non-equilibrium systems and arbitrary system-bath couplings strength. Their classical limit and some of their consequences are explored. In particular we show that energy eigenbasis coherence does not contribute to extractable work, although it can be made partially accessible as relational coherence in a multipartite scenario. The coherence conditions we introduce here are independent of free energy relations, and provide non-trivial additional constraints on the thermodynamics of quantum systems.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION.

The information-theoretic approach to thermodynamics aims to formulate a complete theory of quantum-mechanical effects within thermodynamic processes, and to elucidate the consequences for information processing. Already, a range of information-theoretic treatments of thermodynamic concepts have been developed, extending classical treatments [1–3] to both non-equilibrium and nanoscale regimes [4–9].

One conceptually striking step was the formalization of thermodynamics in the language of resource theories, which emerged from the theory of entanglement [10, 11]. In [9] non-equilibrium thermodynamics in the i.i.d., thermodynamic limit is studied starting from basic assumptions regarding the set of allowed transformations. However the same framework allows one to study single quantum systems undergoing thermodynamic transformations, the so-called single-shot scenario [4, 12]. In particular, it is shown [5] that the usual second law of thermodynamics is only a particular case of a thermo-majorization criterion, which provides a characterization of state interconversion through thermodynamic transformations for states block-diagonal in the energy eigenbasis. This work was later generalized to transformations under the aid of a catalyst, where necessary and sufficient conditions have been established [13]. This implies that the traditional thermodynamic free energy is only an asymptotic instance of a range of free energies, and a thermodynamic process is possible if and only if all of these free energies simultaneously decrease.

Despite these results the genuinely quantum-mechanical aspects of thermodynamics are only partially understood and many significant questions remain open. For example the main results of [4–6, 13] require the states to be diagonal or block-diagonal in energy. Similarly, fluctuation theorems require measurements at the beginning and end, which destroy coherences, see [14–16]. Here we address thermodynamic transformations in the presence of arbitrary quantum coherences, and establish thermodynamic constraints that are independent of any

free energy relations. Quantum coherence has been studied in relation to thermodynamics [5, 17–20] and is part of an ongoing debate regarding quantum effects in biological systems (see e.g. [21] and references therein). We argue that thermodynamics rests primarily on two abstract resources: the first is quantified by known free energies, while the second is the asymmetry of a quantum state [22, 23] and reflects the degree of coherence in the system. In a similar way to the generalized free energy second laws, we show that quantum coherences obey a parallel set of second laws. Even though we analyze the core ideas following a resource-theoretical approach, we argue this is a necessary component in any unified framework describing coherences, and generic quantum thermodynamic phenomenon with no classical counterpart.

II. QUANTUM SECOND LAWS.

A. Free energy Second Laws.

There are been several approaches coming from quantum information theory that aim to formulate generalized thermodynamic laws that are applicable in extreme quantum environments. The one most suited to our needs in this work is the resource theoretic approach [5, 8, 9], which emerged from developments in entanglement theory. The core idea is that of defining a set of “free” quantum operations, which in turn define a convex set of “free” quantum states. Anything that lies outside this set of free states is a resource state, and is considered valuable. These resource states facilitate otherwise impossible quantum operations and by studying their interconversion structure one can define measures of the abstract resource.

The resource formulation of thermodynamics defines thermodynamic transformations, or *thermal operations*, to be the set of all energy-preserving interactions between a system and arbitrary Gibbsian bath states, at a fixed temperature. More explicitly, a thermal transfor-

mation involves taking an *arbitrary* quantum system ρ , with system Hamiltonian H_s , and coupling it to a system in a thermal state $\gamma_b \propto e^{-\beta H_b}$, with Hamiltonian H_b and temperature T given by $kT = \beta^{-1}$, through an *arbitrary* energy-preserving unitary.¹ Note that we make no further assumptions as to the final state of the composite system, which can be highly entangled, or out of equilibrium, and we do not assume the interactions are weak or quasi-static. More precisely,

Definition 1 (Thermal Operations). Thermal Operations are all CP maps \mathcal{E} of the form:

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \text{Tr}_2[U(\rho \otimes \gamma_b)U^\dagger], \quad (1)$$

where $\gamma_b = \frac{e^{-\beta H_b}}{Z}$, $Z = \text{Tr}[e^{-\beta H_b}]$, $[U, H_s \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes H_b] = 0$.

The more traditional formulation of thermodynamic processes involves time-dependent Hamiltonians. However, as already noted in [5], this framework can encompass such scenarios through the inclusion of a clock degree of freedom. The allowed operations include many situations of practical interest, for example arbitrary interactions H_I satisfying $[H_I, H_s + H_b] = 0$, interactions in RWA, and interactions that are switched on and off adiabatically.

One should also include scenarios in which additional, auxiliary systems are used catalytically, in the sense that we also consider thermodynamic transformations $\rho \otimes \chi_{\text{aux}} \rightarrow \sigma \otimes \chi_{\text{aux}}$, where an auxiliary system begins and ends in the same state χ_{aux} , yet enables the otherwise forbidden transformation $\rho \rightarrow \sigma$. For this general situation, it was recently proved [13] that the traditional second law of thermodynamics must instead be replaced by a continuum of quantum second laws. Specifically, under thermal operations \mathcal{E} , the generalized free energy differences given by

$$F_\alpha(\rho) = \frac{1}{\beta} S_\alpha(\rho || \gamma), \quad (2)$$

must all decrease:

$$F_\alpha(\mathcal{E}(\rho)) \leq F_\alpha(\rho), \quad \forall \alpha \geq 0. \quad (3)$$

Here γ is the thermal state of the system, $\gamma = e^{-\beta H_s} / \text{Tr}[e^{-\beta H_s}]$, and S_α are the so-called sandwiched quantum Renyi divergences [26, 27]:

$$S_\alpha(\rho || \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \text{Tr} \left[\left(\sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \rho \sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \right)^\alpha \right]. \quad (4)$$

For $\alpha = 1$, the divergence $S_\alpha(\rho || \sigma)$ becomes simply the quantum relative entropy [27] and the constraints of Eqs. (3) reduce to the usual second law, $\Delta F \leq 0$.

Remarkably, these conditions (Eqs. (3)) turn out to be both necessary and sufficient to characterize thermal operations with the aid of a catalyst for quantum states that are block-diagonal in energy [13]. The more traditional second law of non-increasing free energy emerges only in the asymptotic regime, in which the conditions of Eqs. (3) all collapse to the more familiar one. Put another way: for thermodynamic processes far from the many-copies regime, we require the full set of second laws to describe the thermodynamics of the system.

However the above proof was only for block diagonal states and, for quantum states with coherences across energy eigenspaces, these conditions are no longer sufficient, as we shall shortly show. In other words, *additional* thermodynamic conditions are required in order to describe the thermodynamics of arbitrary quantum states.

B. The theory of asymmetry.

The idea of symmetry is powerful and wide-reaching, and has found countless applications across physics. Recent work, coming from the theory of quantum reference frames [28], has brought the concept of *asymmetry* to the fore, and shown it to be a valuable, consumable resource. This quantum resource theory of asymmetry [23, 29–31] has already found application in quantum reference frames, metrology, conservation laws and a generalized Noether’s theorem [22]. It turns out that asymmetry is in many ways more subtle than symmetry, and has a rich structure. The reason for this is a group-theoretic Anna Karenina principle: symmetric objects are essentially all alike, however every asymmetric object can be asymmetric in its own way.

The setting we consider is the familiar one of symmetry groups representations. Let G be a Lie group representing a symmetry, and consider a representation of G on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} given by $U : g \mapsto U_g$, where $g \in G$ and U_g is a unitary on \mathcal{H} . The group has an adjoint action on any linear operator $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, given by $X \mapsto U_g X U_g^\dagger$, which we denote by $\mathcal{U}_g(X)$. In order to define a resource theory for the group we must specify the allowed quantum operations. These should be ones that do not increase asymmetry, and to this end we define the set of G -covariant (or symmetric) quantum operations. More precisely, a quantum operation $\mathcal{E}_G : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is called *symmetric* if it commutes with all the elements of the adjoint representation \mathcal{U}_g of G on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ [23, 28]:

$$[\mathcal{E}_G, \mathcal{U}_g] = 0, \quad \forall g \in G, \quad (5)$$

where $[\mathcal{E}_G, \mathcal{U}_g](\rho) = \mathcal{E}_G(\mathcal{U}_g(\rho)) - \mathcal{U}_g(\mathcal{E}_G(\rho))$.

A state is *symmetric* if $\mathcal{U}_g(\rho) = \rho$ for all $g \in G$, and *asymmetric* otherwise. Asymmetric states, similar to entangled states, constitute a resource that makes possible tasks otherwise impossible under the constraint of a symmetric evolution. An intuitive example is for the $SU(2)$ representation of the rotation group in 3-dimensions. The group action defines rotational transformations of

¹ We are requiring strict energy conservation, as opposed to average energy conservation considered elsewhere [24, 25]. We address this point later.

quantum states, and those that are invariant (such as the singlet state on two spins) are rotationally symmetric, while all others are asymmetric.

Within a resource theory we generally wish to *quantify* the resources at hand. To this end, we may define an asymmetry measure M measuring how much a quantum state breaks the symmetry of the group G . Specifically, M can be any function which is monotonically decreasing under symmetric evolution:

$$M(\mathcal{E}_G(\rho)) \leq M(\rho), \quad \forall \rho. \quad (6)$$

and M is said to be an *asymmetry monotone* [29]. Recent results have shown that asymmetry monotones can capture consequences of a symmetry that go beyond the traditional conservation laws for the generators of G . While conserved charges completely characterize the consequences of a symmetry for pure states and closed system dynamics [22], more generally they tell only part of the story. Here we show that within the setting of thermodynamic transformations the free energies only partially capture the story, and we must consider the effects of asymmetry if we wish a fully quantum description.

C. Asymmetry and Thermodynamics.

The relevance of a group action to thermodynamics is at first glance a trivial one, but turns out to lead to non-trivial consequences. The Hamiltonians at play generate the one-parameter unitary group $G = U(1)$, of time translations, and it is exactly this group action that is of importance for generic states with coherences between eigenspaces, for these are precisely the asymmetric states of the theory.

We need one more simple result to formalise the relevance of asymmetry theory to thermodynamics. Specifically we observe that:

Theorem II.1. *Thermal operations are a strict subset of the symmetric quantum operations with respect to time-translations. In other words,*

$$\forall t, \quad \mathcal{E}(e^{-iH_s t} \rho e^{iH_s t}) = e^{-iH_s t} \mathcal{E}(\rho) e^{iH_s t}. \quad (7)$$

Proof. For any bath system (γ_b, H_b) this follows easily using $[H_b, \gamma_b] = 0$ and $[U, H_s + H_b] = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(e^{-iH_s t} \rho e^{iH_s t}) &= \text{Tr}_2[U e^{-iH_s t} \rho e^{iH_s t} \otimes e^{-iH_b t} \gamma_b e^{iH_b t} U^\dagger] \\ &= \text{Tr}_2[e^{-i(H_s + H_b)t} U(\rho \otimes \gamma_b) U^\dagger e^{i(H_s + H_b)t}] \\ &= e^{-iH_s t} \mathcal{E}(\rho) e^{iH_s t}. \end{aligned}$$

That these operations form a proper subset is easily seen from the fact that the shifting of the energy of the total system from one energy level to another is a symmetric operation, but not a thermally allowed operation. \square

The implication of this is that thermodynamics can be taken as a particular kind of asymmetry theory with an addition constraint of energy conservation.

In schematic form, we argue that

$$\text{Quantum Thermodynamics} \approx \text{Purity Theory} \times \text{Asymmetry Theory}.$$

Here we use “purity theory” in a slightly broader sense than in the literature, where it applies to trivial Hamiltonians: we identify it with the previously introduced framework [13] which quantifies the “thermodynamic purity” p of a quantum state, although with the caveat that the purity in this thermodynamic case appears within an embedding that takes the Gibbs state to the maximally mixed state. The mapping is effectively the same as that between the canonical and microcanonical ensembles in textbook treatments. The free energy differences are then measures of the thermodynamic purity within the thermodynamic setting.

In a similar way, we introduce measures of the asymmetry a (or coherence, the two terms will be used interchangeably). We argue that any thermodynamic process is readily understood in terms of these two separate aspects, (p, a) . Quantum thermodynamics is then governed by the interplay of two fundamental resources. Free energy relations quantify the former, while asymmetry theory provides the tools to quantify the latter.




FIG. 1: Quantum Thermodynamics as the combination of asymmetry and thermodynamic purity. Here γ is the equilibrium Gibbs state, and $\mathcal{D}_H(\rho)$ is the quantum state ρ projected onto the set of symmetric states (the red blob), i.e. decohered in energy-eigenbasis. We can analyse a state ρ in terms of a combination of thermodynamic purity and asymmetry, (p, a) . Free energy-relations measure the thermodynamic purity, and constrain transformations along the set of symmetric states, while asymmetry monotone relations constrain the remainder.

D. Coherence Second Laws.

We have shown that thermal operations are a proper subset of symmetric operations with respect to the $U(1)$ group, however we have not shown that any further laws above and beyond free energies are required. Here we establish this, and introduce free coherence relations, that extend the existing free energy ones.

Since asymmetry is a resource, we can quantify it, and motivated by the generalized free energies of Eq. (2) for single-shot thermodynamics we can define measures of coherence as follows:

Definition 2 (Free coherences). For any $\alpha \geq 1/2$ we define the *free coherences* of a state ρ with respect to a Hamiltonian H as

$$A_\alpha(\rho) := S_\alpha(\rho || \mathcal{D}_H(\rho)),$$

where \mathcal{D}_H is the operation of dephasing in the energy eigenbasis,

$$\mathcal{D}_H(\rho) = \sum_E \Pi_E \rho \Pi_E^\dagger,$$

with Π_E the projectors onto the eigenspaces of H .

In the same way in which free energies measure “how far” a state is from being thermal, the free coherences measure “how far” a state is from being symmetric with respect to the group action (i.e. incoherent in energy). For $\alpha = 1$, we have $A_1(\rho) \equiv A(\rho)$ which is the asymmetry measure previously considered in [30].

With these definitions on board, and from Theorem II.1, we immediately have the following result. In Section II E we will show this provides quantum-mechanical constraints beyond free energy relations:

Theorem II.2 (Coherence Second Laws). *For all $\alpha \geq 1/2$ we necessarily have $\Delta A_\alpha \leq 0$ for any thermal operation $\rho \rightarrow \sigma$.*

Proof. By assumption there exists some thermal operation \mathcal{E} such that $\sigma = \mathcal{E}(\rho)$. Since \mathcal{E} is a thermal operation then it is $U(1)$ -covariant. From (II.1) we have

$$[\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D}_{H_s}] = 0. \quad (8)$$

Then we may use the data processing inequality for sandwiched quantum α -Renyi divergences for $\alpha \geq 1/2$ [32–34], to deduce the coherence second laws. \square

These laws can also be extended to catalytic thermal operations, when the catalyst is block-diagonal in the energy eigenbasis (see Appendix A), however whether they hold for coherent catalytic states is an open question.²

A particularly useful perspective can be gained by considering the $\alpha = 1$ measure. Since the Gibbs state γ is a symmetric state (diagonal in the energy eigenbasis), we may use a “taxi-norm” property of relative entropy [35] to deduce that the total relative entropy between a quantum state ρ and the Gibbs state precisely splits up into the following sum,

$$S(\rho || \mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho)) + S(\mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho) || \gamma) = S(\rho || \gamma),$$

² Note also that we restrict to $\alpha \geq 1/2$ for simplicity, because the data processing inequality for S_α is violated in general, see [27].

and so the standard free energy $F(\rho) := \text{Tr}[H_s \rho] + kT \text{Tr}[\rho \log \rho]$ can be written as

$$F(\rho) = kTA(\rho) + F(\mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho)). \quad (9)$$

The quantum free energy splits into a classical contribution $F(\mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho))$ plus a contribution coming from the coherences, measured by $A(\rho)$. Indeed, the above analysis allows us to say that the classical and quantum contributions (p, a) to the quantum free energy must *independently* decrease under any thermodynamic process.

The following, almost trivial, result provides a simple constraint on Landauer erasure:

Proposition II.3 (Incoherent initial states). *A thermal operation $\mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho) \rightarrow \sigma$ is possible only if $\sigma = \mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\sigma)$.*

Proof. Standard relative entropy properties imply $S(\rho || \mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho)) \geq 0$ for all ρ , and is zero if and only if $\rho = \mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho)$. Since thermal operations do not increase $A(\rho)$, we see that for any σ we must have that $\sigma = \mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\sigma)$. \square

In a Landauer erasure scenario (see [36–39] and references therein), we are required to map any ρ to a fixed pure state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ through a thermodynamic operation. The consequence of Prop. II.3 for Landauer erasure then implies that the default erasure state $|\psi\rangle$ is necessarily an energy eigenstate of H_s .

E. The incompleteness of existing second laws.

We can now establish that the above coherence second laws are both independent of the free energy relations, and more importantly, are additional non-trivial thermodynamic relations that must be obeyed in any thermodynamic process $\rho \rightarrow \sigma$.

It suffices to consider a qubit system with Hamiltonian $H_s = |1\rangle\langle 1|$, and choose an initial state $\rho = |1\rangle\langle 1|$, together with the target final state

$$\sigma = (1 - \epsilon) \frac{\gamma}{2} + \epsilon |+\rangle\langle +|.$$

Since S_α is monotone decreasing in α , it suffices to choose ϵ sufficiently small so that $S_\infty(\sigma || \gamma) \leq S_0(\rho || \gamma)$ to ensure all of the free energy conditions are obeyed. However, since the initial state is a symmetric state, and $A_\alpha(\sigma) > 0$, it follows that such a transformation is impossible to achieve via a thermodynamic transformation respecting energy conservation on a composite system, and thus the free energy relations are necessarily incomplete.

F. A work-based perspective on free energy incompleteness.

Another way of seeing that the free energy relations only provide an incomplete description of thermodynamics is through the notion of work.

One of the advantages of the resource-theoretic framework introduced in [5] is that it casts work extraction and consumption purely in terms of state transformations. Specifically work is taken to be an ordered state of elevated energy. This idealised two state system is a “work bit”, which is a two-level system with Hamiltonian $H_w = w |w\rangle \langle w|$. In its simplest form, it can be thought of as a perfectly controlled atom that gets excited (de-excited) when energy is extracted from (pumped into) a quantum system through a thermodynamic operation:

$$\sigma \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0| \leftrightarrow \rho \otimes |w\rangle \langle w|.$$

Given any two states ρ and σ , one can readily show there exists a $|w\rangle$ work bit such that for all α ,

$$F_\alpha(\rho \otimes |w\rangle \langle w|) \geq F_\alpha(\sigma \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|). \quad (10)$$

To see this we rewrite Eq. (10) as

$$S_\alpha(\rho \otimes |w\rangle \langle w| || \gamma \otimes \gamma_w) \geq S_\alpha(\sigma \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0| || \gamma \otimes \gamma_w),$$

where $\gamma_w = e^{-\beta H_w} / \text{Tr}[e^{-\beta H_w}]$. This implies

$$S_\alpha(\rho || \gamma) - S_\alpha(\sigma || \gamma) \geq S_\alpha(|0\rangle \langle 0| || \gamma_w) - S_\alpha(|w\rangle \langle w| || \gamma_w)$$

As $w \rightarrow \infty$, γ_w gets more and more peaked on $|0\rangle$, so that the right-hand-side approaches $-\infty$. Thus, given any two states ρ and σ , there exists w such that Eqs. (10) are satisfied and so, with enough work, any state transformation is allowed under the free energy relations. However it is easy to see that Theor. (II.2) implies $A_\alpha(\rho) \geq A_\alpha(\sigma)$, for all $\alpha \geq 1/2$ and so the coherence second laws provide a non trivial constraint on these transformations. In quantum thermodynamics, both the energetic and the coherent properties must be considered together.

G. Emergence of classicality.

If the second laws of coherence (II.2) constrain thermodynamic transformations, why at the macroscopic scale, in the presence of weak interactions, are coherences irrelevant? Intuitively we expect coherences to become negligible macroscopically. We formalize this in the case of qubit ensembles by showing that, in the i.i.d. thermodynamic limit, the free coherences per particle in a system of non-interacting bodies become negligible.³ This describes an emergence of classicality.

Theorem II.4 (Emergence of classicality). *Let ρ be any qubit state. The free coherences per particle vanish in the i.i.d. thermodynamic limit. More precisely,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} A_\alpha(\rho^{\otimes n}) = 0, \quad \forall \alpha \geq 1/2. \quad (11)$$

³ This generalizes the result in [30] for $\alpha = 1$.

Proof. The proof is provided in the Appendix B. In particular, one can show that for all ρ and $\alpha \geq 1/2$

$$A_\alpha(\rho^{\otimes n}) \leq \log n, \quad (12)$$

which immediately implies the claimed result. \square

We also note that various monotones satisfying Eq. (6) have been studied. These include all quantities like asymmetry [28–30], which is a known measure of coherence [22, 40] and quantumness [41, 42], but also the trace norm of $[\rho, H_s]$ and the Wigner-Yanase-Dyson skew information,

$$I_\alpha(\rho, H_s) = \text{Tr}[\rho H_s^2] - \text{Tr}[\rho^\alpha H_s \rho^{1-\alpha} H_s], \quad (13)$$

for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ [22]. All of them could be used to generate non-trivial bounds applicable to any thermodynamic transformation, although the relative entropy does have the advantage of naturally yielding the additive split in Eq. (9) of the quantum thermodynamic free energy into an essentially classical free energy part and a fully quantum part.

III. WORK AND QUANTUM COHERENCES.

The notions of work and heat are the primary concerns of thermodynamics, and with the advent of nanoscale technologies it has been necessary to revisit these time-honoured concepts (see e.g. [4, 12, 43–45] and references therein).

The analysis of Szilard [36] showed that the information one has about a system has an energetic value in terms of the ordered work one can obtain from a disordered thermal reservoir. Specifically, the possession of a single bit of information can be “burnt” to obtain $kT \ln 2$ Joules. More generally, standard thermodynamic arguments implies that given a state ρ in a d -dimensional system we can obtain $W(\rho) = kT(\ln d - S(\rho))$ amount of work. Within the single-shot resource formulation this maximum work output has been generalized for states ρ with zero coherences across energy eigenspaces in the case of deterministic [5] and non-deterministic [4] extraction. However, as mentioned for quantum states containing coherences we must necessarily take into account the asymmetry constraints. One might think that the work relation extends without alteration to these cases, but this is not the case – the purity due to quantum coherences cannot be simply converted into ordered energy, and so the standard Szilard result no longer holds. However we show how this work can be “unlocked”, provided we possess (and consume) other asymmetry resources.

In other words, we should associate to a state both purity and asymmetry measures, abstractly denoted (p, a) , where p measures the deviation of the decohered state $\mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho)$ from the thermal state γ , and a measures the asymmetry of ρ relative to $\mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho)$. We shall show that asymmetry on its own does not yield work,

$$(0, a) \not\rightarrow W, \quad (14)$$

however *relational* asymmetry provides extractable work,

$$(0, a_1) + (0, a_2) \rightarrow W. \quad (15)$$

We begin by first showing that on their own coherences do not contribute to work output.

A. Quantum Szilard: Work is locked in coherences.

Given an initial state ρ and a final state σ , we define the maximum extractable work under all thermal operations $\{\mathcal{E}\}$ taking $\rho \rightarrow \sigma$ as

$$W[\rho, \sigma] = \max_{w \geq 0} w : \exists \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}(\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|) = \sigma \otimes |w\rangle\langle w|.$$

Since we only care about the quantity of work we extract and not on the ‘‘burnt’’ final state σ we need only consider $W_{\max}[\rho] := \max_{\sigma} W[\rho, \sigma]$. From this we obtain,

Theorem III.1 (Symmetry implies work-locking). *Under $U(1)$ -symmetric operations coherences do not have energetic value. Specifically,*

$$W_{\max}[\rho] = W_{\max}[\mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho)], \quad (16)$$

for all states ρ .

Proof. We use the notation $\rho_d = \mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho)$. For the sake of simplicity, we assume that maximisations are attained within the set of quantum operations, and consider any $U(1)$ -covariant map \mathcal{E} for which

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|) = \sigma \otimes |W[\rho, \sigma]\rangle\langle W[\rho, \sigma]|.$$

Since the $U(1)$ -covariant map $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{D}_{(H_s+H_w)} \circ \mathcal{E}$ achieves

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|) = \sigma_d \otimes |W[\rho, \sigma]\rangle\langle W[\rho, \sigma]|,$$

it follows that $W[\rho, \sigma] \leq W[\rho, \sigma_d]$, and we may limit ourselves to final states with zero asymmetry. For any $U(1)$ -covariant quantum operation \mathcal{F} that performs the previous transformation it is follows from Eq. (8) that the same operation achieves

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho_d \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|) = \sigma_d \otimes |W[\rho, \sigma_d]\rangle\langle W[\rho, \sigma_d]|.$$

This implies $W[\rho, \sigma_d] = W[\rho_d, \sigma_d]$. Hence

$$W_{\max}[\rho] = \max_{\sigma_d} W[\rho, \sigma_d] = \max_{\sigma_d} W_{\max}[\rho_d, \sigma_d] \quad (17)$$

and so $W_{\max}[\rho_d] = W_{\max}[\rho]$ as claimed. \square

Notice that this result does not prevent exploiting coherence within degenerate eigenspaces, see for example [17, 36]. We also note that thermal operations in the presence of block-diagonal catalysts are $U(1)$ -covariant operations (see Appendix A, Prop. A.1). Hence the argument in Theorem III.1 also implies that the maximum amount of extractable work from ρ in such a scenario is also not affected by coherences between energy

eigenspaces. The only case not accounted for is when both state and catalyst are coherent. We address this case in section IV A.

If we only require the expectation values of energy to be conserved [24], then we can easily draw work from coherences on average. However this is undesirable both in that it does not, on its own, demand that the extracted energy is sufficiently ordered to be considered work [6] and, more importantly, allows quantum operations that violate energy conservation on the full set of systems and create coherence.

This work-locking phenomenon can be argued with less rigor as follows. Suppose that a thermodynamic transformation existed that allowed the sole conversion of quantum coherences of a state ρ into some quantity of work w : $\mathcal{E}(\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|) = \mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho) \otimes |w\rangle\langle w|$. This would imply, from the previous analysis, that one could perform the following transformation:

$$\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho) \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|) = \mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho) \otimes |w\rangle\langle w|,$$

which in turn allows the construction of a *perpetuum mobile* of the first kind.

In the thermodynamic limit work-locking is of course undetectable [5, 19]. In this regime, the standard free energy suffices and from Theorem II.4 and Eq. (9), we have

$$F(\rho^{\otimes n}) \approx F(\mathcal{D}_{\sum_i H_s^i}(\rho^{\otimes n})),$$

when $n \gg \log n$. The free energy is effectively classical, and the maximum extractable work per system approaches the quantum free energy

$$\frac{W(\rho^{\otimes n})}{n} \approx F(\rho), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (18)$$

Equation (12) provides an estimate of the rate of this suppression, and we find for n qubits,

$$\frac{A(\rho^{\otimes n})}{F(\rho^{\otimes n})} \leq \frac{\log n}{n \log 2},$$

independently of the temperature. For example, a naive application of the asymptotic result to the case of 2 qubits would imply that up to 50% of the free energy can be locked in coherences, whereas this number falls to 1% for a system of 1000 qubits.⁴

IV. COHERENT PROCESSES WITHIN QUANTUM THERMODYNAMICS.

We have introduced coherence second laws that are required to further constrain the thermodynamics gov-

⁴ A related computation, within a slightly different framework [19] finds that the maximum average work extractable from a quantum system is $W(\rho) \leq F(\mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho))$. Notice that with Eq. (9), this implies $W(\rho) \leq F(\rho) - \frac{1}{\beta} A(\rho)$.

erning quantum systems, and have argued that one must keep track of two independent properties – the thermodynamic purity p of the state and the asymmetry a of the state with respect to the $U(1)$ group action. As stated, previous work has provided necessary and sufficient conditions for the interconversion of symmetric states. Schematically, the scenario of $(p, 0) \rightarrow (p', 0)$ is properly understood, however the more general case of $(p, a) \rightarrow (p', a')$ is not properly understood where the introduction of coherences results in a complex partial order of allowed transformations. We have already shown that if $(p, a) \rightarrow W$ then $(p, 0) \rightarrow W$ also, and so it would seem that the asymmetry of the state has no effect on the classical work output of a thermodynamic process. We next show that this is not the case, and coherences can contribute non-trivially to work extraction.

A. Coherence activation.

In the case of states block-diagonal in energy eigenspaces, any state that cannot be prepared under thermal operations can be converted into mechanical work. In the full quantum-mechanical setting this is no longer the case. There are states that cannot be prepared through thermal operations, but from which it is impossible to draw any useful work. They are precisely the coherent states ρ for which $\mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho) = \gamma$. An extreme case is the pure state

$$|\psi_c\rangle = Z^{-1/2} \sum_k e^{-\beta E_k/2} |E_k\rangle, \quad (19)$$

where $|E_k\rangle$ are eigenstates of H_s . However, while $(0, a) \rightarrow (W = 0)$, it turns out coherences can be activated in the presence of other coherent quantum systems, and so

$$(0, a_1) + (0, a_2) \rightarrow (W \neq 0). \quad (20)$$

The analysis shows that if one directly extends $W = kT \ln d$ to a state such as (19) then one implicitly smuggles in an external system containing essentially an infinite amount of coherence from which to draw. In the quantum regime this is a problematic assumption.

The way in which coherence in a state ρ can be utilized to obtain mechanical work is readily seen from asymmetry theory and the theory of quantum reference frames [28]. If we have *two* quantum systems in states ρ_1 and ρ_2 respectively, for which $\mathcal{D}_{H_1}(\rho_1) = \gamma_1$ and $\mathcal{D}_{H_2}(\rho_2) = \gamma_2$, then individually no mechanical work can be obtained in the presence of a thermal reservoir, however the two systems can instead encode relational coherence that is accessible. Specifically the introduction of the second system gives $\mathcal{D}_H(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2) = \sigma_{12} \neq \gamma_1 \otimes \gamma_2$, where $H = H_1 \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes H_2$ on the joint Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$. For this we may extract up to $W = F_0(\sigma_{12})$ of mechanical work in the presence of a thermal reservoir. The two systems act as quantum reference frames for each other.

More generally, collective actions on multiple copies can extract work in a situation in which operations on single copies would be useless [19].

Alternatively, we can distinguish one of the systems as being the dominant reference. This perspective admits a different physical interpretation. We take the dimension of \mathcal{H}_2 to be much larger than \mathcal{H}_1 , and the state ρ_2 to be highly asymmetric compared to ρ_1 , $A_\alpha(\rho_2) \gg A_\alpha(\rho_1)$. The function of ρ_2 is now to allow the simulation of a non- $U(1)$ -covariant operation $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ on the first system. The problem thus reduces to determining the covariant/thermal operation \mathcal{E} on the systems such that

$$F_\alpha[\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(\rho_1)] = F_\alpha[\text{Tr}_2[\mathcal{E}(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2)]] \quad (21)$$

is maximized. Such a process requires initial asymmetry in the second system, which is necessarily reduced in the process. Any process that respects some form of energy conservation, and yet freely takes a state like $|\psi_c\rangle$ to one where work is extractable, must necessarily be consuming resources elsewhere, which should be factored into the thermodynamic accounting.

B. Thermally accessible states.

The question of which specific thermodynamic processes can, or cannot be attained is hard problem, which has not been solved in fully generality. We know that the non-increasing free divergences, and non-increasing free coherences are necessary conditions, but at present it is not known if these are also sufficient to classify the allowed transformations $\rho \rightarrow \sigma$ under catalytic thermal operations (for diagonal catalyst).

First note that there exist non-trivial transformations $\rho \rightarrow \sigma$ in which both the basic resources (p, a) remain unaltered – for example unitary free evolution of the system. It is also clear that $(p, a) \rightarrow (p, a')$ is possible only if a' has a smaller asymmetry measure than a , and it is also clear that $(p, a) \rightarrow (p', 0)$ occurs if and only if the free energy relations hold, however the trade-off that occurs when we transform both is non-trivial. We postpone a more general analysis of this to a later work, and instead we quickly illustrate the basic situation for the toy model in which $\dim \mathcal{H}_s = \dim \mathcal{H}_b = 2$, $H_s = H_b = Z$.

Observe that rotations of the system about the z axis commute with thermodynamic transformations, and so the initial state ρ can be chosen to have Bloch vector $(x, 0, z)$. The final states σ reachable from ρ under pairwise energy conserving interactions with a reservoir composed of a 2-dimensional system is readily found to be the region enclosed by the surface obtained through rotation about the Z -axis of

$$x' = x \cos(2a), \quad z' = \sin^2(2a) \tanh(\beta) + z \cos^2(2a),$$

and the plane $Z = z$ (see Fig. 2).




FIG. 2: Thermally accessible states from the pure state $x = 3/4$, $z = \sqrt{7}/4$ (all states inside the paraboloid) or from its incoherent version (blue line) for $\beta = 0.75$, through thermal operations.

C. Coherence distillation

While normally one wishes to distill out order, via a thermodynamic process, we could equally ask to obtain a high degree of coherence in the final output state under the allowed quantum operations. For this one could wish to obtain a maximally coherent state $|\mathbb{1}\rangle := d^{-1/2} \sum_k |k\rangle$ for a d -dimensional system.

It is straightforward to provide quantitative constraints on such a process, and in the appendices we show that if $\rho \rightarrow |\mathbb{1}\rangle\langle\mathbb{1}|$ under thermal operations then

$$[\mathcal{F}(\rho, \mathcal{D}(\rho))]^2 \leq d^{-1},$$

where $\mathcal{F}(\rho, \sigma) = \text{Tr}[(\sigma^{1/2} \rho \sigma^{1/2})^{1/2}]$ is the quantum fidelity measure.

V. OUTLOOK AND CONCLUSIONS

We now know of numerous relationships between entanglement theory and thermodynamics [46–48]. In [49]

it was shown that all pure bipartite entanglement monotones may be converted into $U(1)$ -covariant monotones. Combined with the analysis presented here, this implies that all pure bipartite entanglement monotones can be mapped into coherence second laws, providing another link between entanglement theory and thermodynamics which deserves further exploration.

Loosely speaking, there are at least two ways in which quantum thermodynamics differs from its classical counterpart. On one hand we know [4] that at the nanoscale regime the second law must be generalized. The new law requires that a family of free energies (containing the usual free energy as a particular case) must all decrease under thermodynamic transformations. The usual second law is recovered only in the i.i.d., thermodynamic limit [12, 13].

In this work we have highlighted a second major difference between classical and quantum thermodynamics, which disappears entirely in the $n \rightarrow \infty$ i.i.d. limit. Coherence/asymmetry is found to be an equally important property of thermodynamics, and is not captured by free energies. We have introduced new second laws governing these coherences under thermodynamical processes. However a major outstanding question is to determine whether the present constraints on F_α and A_α constitute both a necessary and sufficient characterization of thermal processes for quantum systems and the generalization of these results to non-deterministic scenarios.

Acknowledgements: ML would like to thank K. Korzekwa, J. Oppenheim and F. Mintert for useful discussions. DJ is supported by the Royal Society. TR is supported by the Leverhulme Trust. ML is supported in part by EPSRC and by COST Action MP1209.

-
- [1] H. Callen, *Thermodynamics and an Introduction to Thermostatistics* (John Wiley & Sons, 1985).
 - [2] R. Pathria, *Statistical Mechanics* (Elsevier, 1996).
 - [3] J. Gemmer, M. Michel, and G. Mahler, *Quantum Thermodynamics* (Springer, 2010).
 - [4] D. Egloff, O. C. O. Dahlsten, R. Renner, and V. Vedral, ArXiv e-prints (2012), 1207.0434.
 - [5] M. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim, Nat. Commun. **4**, 2059 (2013), 1111.3834.
 - [6] J. Aberg, Nat. Comm. **4** (2013).
 - [7] S. Lloyd, Nat. Phys. **9** (2013).
 - [8] D. Janzing, P. Wocjan, R. Zeier, R. Geiss, and T. Beth, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **39**, 2717 (2000).
 - [9] F. G. S. L. Brandão, M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, J. M. Renes, and R. W. Spekkens, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 250404 (2013).
 - [10] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).
 - [11] M. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **27**, 1345019 (2013), 1209.2162.
 - [12] O. Dahlsten, R. Renner, E. Rieper, and V. Vedral, New Journal of Physics **13**, 053015 (2011).
 - [13] F. G. S. L. Brandao, M. Horodecki, N. H. Y. Ng, J. Oppenheim, and S. Wehner, ArXiv (2013), 1305.5278.
 - [14] C. Jarzynski and D. K. Wójcik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 230602 (2004), URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.92.230602>.
 - [15] C. Jarzynski, Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys. **2**, 329 (2011).
 - [16] D. Jennings, T. Rudolph, Y. Hirono, S. Nakayama, and M. Murao, ArXiv e-prints (2012), 1204.3571.
 - [17] M. O. Scully, M. S. Zubairy, G. S. Agarwal, and H. Walther, **299**, 862 (2003).
 - [18] C. A. Rodríguez-Rosario, T. Frauenheim, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, ArXiv (2013), 1308.1245.
 - [19] P. Skrzypczyk, A. J. Short, and S. Popescu, ArXiv

- (2013), 1302.2811.
- [20] J. Aberg, ArXiv (2013), 1304.1060.
- [21] N. Lambert, Y.-N. Chen, Y.-C. Cheng, C.-M. Li, G.-Y. Chen, and F. Nori, Nat. Phys. **9** (2013).
- [22] I. Marvian and R. W. Spekkens, ArXiv (2014), 1404.3236. To appear on Nat. Comm.
- [23] I. Marvian and R. W. Spekkens, New J. Phys. **15**, 033001 (2013), 1104.0018.
- [24] S. Jevtic, D. Jennings, and T. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 110403 (2012), 1110.2371.
- [25] P. Skrzypczyk, A. J. Short, and S. Popescu, ArXiv (2013), 1307.1558.
- [26] M. M. Wilde, A. Winter, and D. Yang, ArXiv (2013), 1306.1586.
- [27] M. Müller-Lennert, F. Dupuis, O. Szehr, S. Fehr, and M. Tomamichel, J. Math. Phys. **54**, 122203 (2013), 1306.3142.
- [28] S. D. Bartlett, T. Rudolph, and R. W. Spekkens, Rev. Mod. Phys. **79**, 555 (2007).
- [29] G. Gour and R. W. Spekkens, New J. Phys. **10**, 033023 (2008), 0711.0043.
- [30] G. Gour, I. Marvian, and R. W. Spekkens, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 012307 (2009).
- [31] I. Marvian and R. W. Spekkens, ArXiv e-prints (2013), 1312.0680.
- [32] R. L. Frank and E. H. Lieb, J. Math. Phys. **54**, 122201 (2013), 1306.5358.
- [33] S. Beigi, J. of Math. Phys. **54**, 122202 (2013).
- [34] N. Datta and F. Leditzky, J. Phys. A **47**, 045304 (2014), 1308.5961.
- [35] F. Herbut, ArXiv (2003), quant-ph/0309211.
- [36] K. Maruyama, F. Nori, and V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 1 (2009).
- [37] L. del Rio, J. Aberg, R. Renner, O. Dahlsten, and V. Vedral, Nature **474** (2011).
- [38] A. Berut, A. Arakelyan, A. Petrosyan, S. Ciliberto, R. Dillenschneider, and E. Lutz, Nature **483** (2012).
- [39] D. Reeb and M. M. Wolf, ArXiv (2013), 1306.4352.
- [40] T. Baumgratz, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, ArXiv (2013), 1311.0275.
- [41] J. Aberg, ArXiv (2006), quant-ph/0612146.
- [42] K. Korzekwa, M. Lostaglio, D. Jennings, and T. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 042122 (2014).
- [43] A. E. Allahverdyan, R. Balian, and T. M. Nieuwenhuizen, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **67**, 565 (2004), cond-mat/0401574.
- [44] R. Alicki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Open Syst. Inf. Dyn. **11**, 205 (2004).
- [45] R. Alicki and M. Fannes, Phys. Rev. E **87**, 042123 (2013).
- [46] S. Popescu, A. J. Short, and A. Winter, ArXiv (2005), quant-ph/0511225.
- [47] F. G. S. L. Brandão and M. B. Plenio, Nat. Phys. **4** (2008).
- [48] D. Jennings and T. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. E **81**, 061130 (2010), 1002.0314.
- [49] B. Toloui, G. Gour, and B. C. Sanders, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 022322 (2011).

Appendix A: Coherence second laws with diagonal catalysts

The coherence second laws presented in Theor. II.2 holds also for more general operations, in which we allow the aid of a diagonal catalyst, as in [13]:

Definition 3 (Catalytic thermal operations). We say that a state ρ in \mathcal{H}_s is transformed into state σ through a catalytic thermal operation

$$\rho \xrightarrow{cat} \sigma, \quad (\text{A1})$$

if there are a quantum state ρ_c in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_c with Hamiltonian H_c and a thermal operation \mathcal{E} on $\mathcal{H}_s \otimes \mathcal{H}_c$:

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho \otimes \rho_c) = \sigma \otimes \rho_c. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Proposition A.1. *Catalytic thermal operations with a block-diagonal catalyst are $U(1)$ -covariant operations.*

Proof. A state ρ is sent to ρ' through a catalytic thermal operation with diagonal catalyst if there exists a state σ , s.t. $[\sigma, H_c] = 0$, and a thermal operation \mathcal{E} : $\mathcal{E}(\rho \otimes \sigma) = \rho' \otimes \sigma$. We show that the quantum map $\mathcal{C}(\rho) = \text{Tr}_2 \mathcal{E}(\rho \otimes \sigma) = \rho'$ is $U(1)$ -covariant. Define $H_{tot} = H_s + H_c + H_b$, sum of the Hamiltonians of system, catalyst and bath. Notice that $\sigma = e^{-iH_c t} \rho e^{iH_c t}$, $\gamma_b = e^{-iH_b t} \gamma_b e^{iH_b t}$. It follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(e^{-iH_s t} \rho e^{iH_s t}) &= \text{Tr}_2 \mathcal{E}(e^{-iH_s t} \rho e^{iH_s t} \otimes \sigma) \\ &= \text{Tr}_{23} [U e^{-iH_s t} \rho e^{iH_s t} \otimes \sigma \otimes \gamma_b U^\dagger] \\ &= \text{Tr}_{23} [e^{-iH_{tot} t} U \rho \otimes \sigma \otimes \gamma_b U^\dagger e^{-iH_{tot} t}] \\ &= e^{-iH_s t} \text{Tr}_2 [e^{-iH_c t} \mathcal{E}(\rho \otimes \sigma) e^{iH_c t}] e^{iH_s t} \\ &= e^{-iH_s t} \text{Tr}_2 [\rho' \otimes \sigma] e^{iH_s t} \\ &= e^{-iH_s t} \mathcal{C}(\rho) e^{iH_s t}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem A.2 (Coherence Second Laws with diagonal catalysts). *If $[\rho_c, H_c] = 0$,*

$$\rho \xrightarrow{cat} \sigma \Rightarrow A_\alpha(\sigma) \leq A_\alpha(\rho), \quad \forall \alpha \geq 1/2. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Proof. It follows in the same way as Theor. II.2, from the fact that catalytic thermal operations with a diagonal catalyst are $U(1)$ -covariant. □

Appendix B: Emergence of classicality

1. Proof of Eq. (12)

We prove this result in two steps. First we show that it is sufficient to prove Eq. (12) only for n copies of a maximally coherent state. Without loss of generality we can fix $H_s = Z$.

Lemma B.1 (Reduction of the problem). *Take ρ a general qubit state and $H_s = Z$. Then*

$$A_\alpha(\rho^{\otimes n}) \leq A_\alpha(|+\rangle\langle+|^{\otimes n}),$$

where $A_\alpha(\rho^{\otimes n}) = S_\alpha(\rho^{\otimes n} || \mathcal{D}_{\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i}(\rho^{\otimes n}))$.

Proof. To prove the statement we show that the state $|+\rangle\langle+|$ can be deterministically converted to any other pure state by means of $U(1)$ -covariant operations. This is similar to a proof presented in [40]. Let us consider the Krauss operators

$$K_0 = c_0 |0\rangle\langle 0| + c_1 |1\rangle\langle 1|, \quad K_1 = c_0 |0\rangle\langle 1| + c_1 |1\rangle\langle 0|,$$

where $|c_0|^2 + |c_1|^2 = 1$. From $e^{i\phi Z} K_s^\dagger e^{-i\phi Z} = e^{2is\phi} K_s$, it is easy to see that the transformations $\mathcal{E}(\rho) = K_0 \rho K_0^\dagger + K_1 \rho K_1^\dagger$ are $U(1)$ -covariant, i.e.

$$\mathcal{E}(e^{-i\phi Z} \rho e^{i\phi Z}) = e^{-i\phi Z} \mathcal{E}(\rho) e^{i\phi Z},$$

and computing $\mathcal{E}(|+\rangle\langle+|)$ we see they deterministically transform $|+\rangle$ to any other pure state. However any mixed state can be obtained from a correspondent pure state through mixing with $\mathbb{1}/2$:

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = p\rho + (1-p)\mathbb{1}/2$$

which is also easily seen to be a $U(1)$ -covariant operation. The composition of two covariant operations is still covariant. We have just shown that it is possible to map $|+\rangle\langle+|$ to any ρ through a covariant operation (and so $|+\rangle\langle+|^{\otimes n}$ to $\rho^{\otimes n}$). Using the data processing inequality for S_α it is easy to conclude that all A_α will decrease under covariant operations for all $\alpha \geq 1/2$. Thus,

$$A_\alpha(\rho^{\otimes n}) \leq A_\alpha(|+\rangle\langle+|^{\otimes n}), \quad \forall \alpha \geq 1/2, \forall \rho, \forall n. \quad \square$$

The estimate $A_\alpha(\rho^{\otimes n}) \leq \log n$ will immediately follow from the previous result using the following

Lemma B.2. *Take $\rho = |+\rangle\langle+|$ a maximally coherent state w.r.t. $H_s = Z$. Then*

$$A_\alpha(|+\rangle\langle+|^{\otimes n}) \leq \log n, \quad \forall \alpha. \quad (\text{B1})$$

Proof. We will use the shortcut $\mathcal{D}_{\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i}(\rho^{\otimes n}) \equiv \mathcal{D}$. Expanding $|+\rangle\langle+|^{\otimes n}$ in the computational basis,

$$|+\rangle\langle+|^{\otimes n} = \frac{1}{2^n} |\mathbb{1}\rangle\langle\mathbb{1}|, \quad |\mathbb{1}\rangle = \underbrace{(1, \dots, 1)}_{2^n \text{ elements}}.$$

By definition,

$$\mathcal{D}(\rho^{\otimes n}) = \frac{1}{2^n} \bigoplus_{h=0}^n |\mathbb{1}_h\rangle\langle\mathbb{1}_h|, \quad |\mathbb{1}_h\rangle = \underbrace{(1, \dots, 1)}_{\binom{n}{h} \text{ elements}}.$$

From $\langle\mathbb{1}_h|\mathbb{1}_h\rangle = \binom{n}{h}$, for all $\alpha \neq 1$ such that $\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha} \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(|\mathbb{1}_h\rangle\langle\mathbb{1}_h|)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} = \binom{n}{h}^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}-1} |\mathbb{1}_h\rangle\langle\mathbb{1}_h|,$$

so that

$$\mathcal{D}(\rho^{\otimes n})^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} = 2^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}n} \bigoplus_{h=0}^n \binom{n}{h}^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} |\mathbb{1}_h\rangle\langle\mathbb{1}_h| \quad (\text{B2})$$

We want to compute

$$A_\alpha(\rho^{\otimes n}) = \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \text{Tr}[P^\alpha], \quad (\text{B3})$$

where we defined

$$P = \mathcal{D}(\rho^{\otimes n})^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \rho^{\otimes n} \mathcal{D}(\rho^{\otimes n})^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}}.$$

Using Eq. (B2) we obtain

$$P = 2^{-\frac{n}{\alpha}} \bigoplus_{h=0}^n \binom{n}{h}^{\frac{1-3\alpha}{2\alpha}} |\mathbb{1}_h\rangle\langle\mathbb{1}_h| |\mathbb{1}\rangle\langle\mathbb{1}| \bigoplus_{s=0}^n \binom{n}{s}^{\frac{1-3\alpha}{2\alpha}} |\mathbb{1}_s\rangle\langle\mathbb{1}_s|.$$

We can compute the product

$$v := \bigoplus_{h=0}^n \binom{n}{h}^{\frac{1-3\alpha}{2\alpha}} |\mathbb{1}_h\rangle\langle\mathbb{1}_h| |\mathbb{1}\rangle. \quad (\text{B4})$$

This is the product of a block-diagonal matrix with a vector of ones $|\mathbb{1}\rangle$. The block diagonal matrix has $n+1$ square blocks of dimensions $\binom{n}{h}$, $h = 0, \dots, n$ and each block is given by a matrix whose elements are all $\binom{n}{h}^{\frac{1-3\alpha}{2\alpha}}$. The result is v , given by

$$v^t = \left(\underbrace{1, \binom{n}{1}^{\frac{1-3\alpha}{2\alpha}}, \dots, \binom{n}{1}}_{\binom{n}{1} \text{ times}}, \dots, \underbrace{\binom{n}{h}^{\frac{1-3\alpha}{2\alpha}}, \dots, \binom{n}{h}}_{\binom{n}{h} \text{ times}}, \dots, \dots, 1 \right).$$

Then P can be compactly rewritten as

$$P = 2^{-\frac{n}{\alpha}} v v^t,$$

and we need to compute

$$\text{Tr}[P^\alpha] = 2^{-n} \text{Tr}[(v v^t)^\alpha] = 2^{-n} \text{Tr}[(v^t v)^\alpha]. \quad (\text{B5})$$

From Eq. (B4),

$$v^t v = \sum_{h=0}^n \binom{n}{h}^3 \binom{n}{h}^{\frac{1-3\alpha}{\alpha}} = \sum_{h=0}^n \binom{n}{h}^{1/\alpha}$$

Substituting in Eq. (B5),

$$\text{Tr}[P^\alpha] = 2^{-n} \left(\sum_{h=0}^n \binom{n}{h}^{1/\alpha} \right)^\alpha := 2^{-n} \|x(n)\|_{1/\alpha}, \quad (\text{B6})$$

where we defined the sequence

$$x(n) = \left\{ \binom{n}{0}, \binom{n}{1}, \dots, \binom{n}{n} \right\},$$

and we used the usual definition of ℓ^p -norm

$$\|x\|_p = \left(\sum_i |x_i|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Substituting Eq. (B6) in Eq. (B3) we conclude

$$A_\alpha(\rho^{\otimes n}) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log(2^{-n} \|x(n)\|_{1/\alpha}). \quad (\text{B7})$$

The functions A_α are monotonically increasing with α , so we can without loss of generality assume $\alpha > 1$. Then $\|x(n)\|_{1/\alpha} \geq \|x(n)\|_1 = 2^n$, so that the term inside the logarithm in Eq. (B6) is bigger when $\|x(n)\|_{1/\alpha}$ is bigger. We use then the following identity concerning p -norms: for all $p > r > 0$, if y is a sequence of n elements,

$$\|y\|_r \leq n^{\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{p}} \|y\|_p.$$

Choose $p = 1$, $r = 1/\alpha$,

$$\|x(n)\|_{1/\alpha} \leq n^{\alpha-1} \|x(n)\|_1 = 2^n n^{\alpha-1}.$$

Hence,

$$A_\alpha(\rho^{\otimes n}) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log(n^{\alpha-1}) = \log n,$$

for all integer $\alpha > 1$. From the monotonicity in α of A_α (see [27]), it is easy to see that this implies the result for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. \square

2. Coherence distillation

Coherence is a useful resource in thermodynamics, hence we might want to distill it. Coherence is a non-extensive quantity, so we will not try to distill multiple copies of a “golden standard”, like $|+\rangle\langle+|$. To capture the idea of coherence distillation we look for a large and coherent final state σ . More precisely we require σ to be diagonal in an eigenbasis mutually unbiased with respect to H_s (like $|+\rangle$) if $H_s = Z$) and we also require it

to be pure enough that not all coherence is destroyed by classical mixedness.

We provide here quantitative constraints on such a process, showing that $\rho \rightarrow |\mathbb{1}\rangle\langle\mathbb{1}|$ under thermal operations only provided that

$$\mathcal{F}^2(\rho, \mathcal{D}(\rho)) \leq d^{-1},$$

where \mathcal{F} is the quantum fidelity measure.

We expect inequalities relating the coherence of the initial state with “purity” and dimension d of the final coherent state:

Theorem B.3 (Coherence extraction). *Let ρ be a quantum state in a n -dimensional Hilbert space and σ a quantum state with support in a d -dimensional subspace. Assume $\mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\sigma) = \mathbb{1}/d$. Then for the thermal transformation $\rho \rightarrow \sigma$ to be possible,*

$$\frac{\log \text{Tr}[\sigma^\alpha]}{\alpha - 1} + \log d \leq S_\alpha(\rho || \mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho)), \quad \forall \alpha \geq 1/2. \quad (\text{B8})$$

Proof. It is a straightforward application of Theor. II.2. \square

Let us show an application of this result. Assume σ to be the maximally coherent state $\sigma = |m(d)\rangle\langle m(d)|$, where in the energy eigenbasis

$$|m(d)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=1}^d |i\rangle$$

Eq. (B8) imposes $S_\alpha(\rho || \mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho)) \geq \log d$ for all $\alpha \geq 1/2$. A necessary and sufficient condition for this to hold is

$$S_{1/2}(\rho || \mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho)) = -2 \log \mathcal{F}(\rho, \mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho)) \geq \log d,$$

which gives

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{F}^2(\rho, \mathcal{D}_{H_s}(\rho))} \geq d,$$

where \mathcal{F} denotes the fidelity. This relation is very intuitive: if the distillation of a maximally coherent state is possible, then the initial state must be distinguishable enough from its dephased version and the relation becomes stricter as the dimension d of the distilled state grows. A geometric interpretation can be obtained using the relation between fidelity and trace norm.