

Coherence and imaginarity of quantum states

Jianwei Xu*

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

(Dated: April 10, 2024)

Baumgratz, Cramer and Plenio established a rigorous framework (BCP framework) for quantifying the coherence of quantum states [Phys. Rev. Lett. 113, 140401 (2014)]. In BCP framework, a quantum state is called incoherent if it is diagonal in the fixed orthonormal basis, and a coherence measure should satisfy some conditions. For a fixed orthonormal basis, if a quantum state ρ has nonzero imaginary part, then ρ must be coherent. How to quantitatively characterize this fact? In this work, we show that any coherence measure C in BCP framework has the property $C(\rho) - C(\text{Re}\rho) \geq 0$ if C is invariant under state complex conjugation, i.e., $C(\rho) = C(\rho^*)$, here ρ^* is the conjugate of ρ , $\text{Re}\rho$ is the real part of ρ . If C does not satisfy $C(\rho) = C(\rho^*)$, we can define a new coherence measure $C'(\rho) = \frac{1}{2}[C(\rho) + C(\rho^*)]$ such that $C'(\rho) = C'(\rho^*)$. We also establish some similar results for bosonic Gaussian states.

I. INTRODUCTION

Coherence is a key feature of quantum states. In 2014, Baumgratz, Cramer and Plenio established a rigorous framework (BCP framework) for quantifying the coherence of quantum states [1]. Although there have been fruitful results about coherence in both theories and experiments under BCP framework [2–4], coherence is still under active research.

In BCP framework, coherence is basis dependent, we suppose the fixed orthonormal basis is $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=1}^d$, here d is the dimension of complex Hilbert space \mathbb{C}^d associating to the quantum system under study. A quantum state can be represented by a density operator ρ . Expanding ρ in the basis $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=1}^d$ leads to

$$\rho = \sum_{j,k=1}^d \rho_{jk} |j\rangle\langle k| \quad (1)$$

where $\rho_{jk} = \langle j|\rho|k\rangle$. The state ρ is called incoherent if $\rho_{jk} = 0$ for all $j \neq k$, i.e., ρ is diagonal in $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=1}^d$. ρ is called coherent if ρ has at least one nonzero off-diagonal element. A quantum operation [5] ϕ is often expressed in the form of Kraus operators $\phi = \{K_\mu\}_\mu$, where all K_μ are operators on \mathbb{C}^d and satisfy $\sum_\mu K_\mu K_\mu^\dagger \leq I_d$, here I_d is the identity operator of dimension d , $\sum_\mu K_\mu K_\mu^\dagger \leq I_d$ means that $I_d - \sum_\mu K_\mu K_\mu^\dagger \geq 0$, i.e., $I_d - \sum_\mu K_\mu K_\mu^\dagger$ is positive semidefinite. A quantum operation ϕ is called a quantum channel if $\sum_\mu K_\mu K_\mu^\dagger = I_d$. In BCP framework, a quantum operation $\phi = \{K_\mu\}_\mu$ is called incoherent if $K_\mu \rho K_\mu^\dagger$ is diagonal for all incoherent state ρ and all μ . We use K_μ^* , K_μ^T and K_μ^\dagger to denote the (complex) conjugate, transpose and conjugate transpose of K_μ , respectively. A real valued functional C defined on density operators is called a coherence measure if C satisfies the following (C1)-(C4).

(C1) Faithfulness. $C(\rho) \geq 0$ for any state ρ , and $C(\rho) = 0$ if and only if ρ is diagonal.

(C2) Monotonicity. $C(\sum_\mu K_\mu \rho K_\mu^\dagger) \leq C(\rho)$ for any incoherent channel $\phi = \{K_\mu\}_\mu$.

(C3) Probabilistic monotonicity. $\sum_\mu C\left[\frac{K_\mu \rho K_\mu^\dagger}{\text{tr}(K_\mu \rho K_\mu^\dagger)}\right] \leq C(\rho)$ for any incoherent channel $\phi = \{K_\mu\}_\mu$.

(C4) Convexity. $C(\sum_\mu p_\mu \rho_\mu) \leq \sum_\mu p_\mu C(\rho_\mu)$ for any probability distribution $\{p_\mu\}_\mu$ and any states $\{\rho_\mu\}_\mu$.

Note that (C3) and (C4) imply (C2). Condition (C5) was proposed in Ref. [6] as follows.

(C5) Additivity for direct sum states.

$$C[p\rho_1 \oplus (1-p)\rho_2] = pC(\rho_1) \oplus (1-p)C(\rho_2), \quad (2)$$

with $p \in [0, 1]$, ρ_1, ρ_2 any states. It is shown that [6] (C2) and (C5) are equivalent to (C3) and (C4).

Roughly speaking, coherence theory characterizes how much the off-diagonal part of a quantum state. Another feature of quantum states, imaginarity, recently receives much attention [7–18]. Under the fixed orthonormal basis $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=1}^d$ which is the same as in coherence theory, we write the state ρ in the form

$$\rho = \text{Re}\rho + i\text{Im}\rho, \quad (3)$$

where $i = \sqrt{-1}$, $\text{Re}\rho = \sum_{j,k=1}^d (\text{Re}\rho_{jk}) |j\rangle\langle k|$ is the real part of ρ , $\text{Im}\rho = \sum_{j,k=1}^d (\text{Im}\rho_{jk}) |j\rangle\langle k|$ is the imaginary part of ρ . We say that state ρ is real if $\text{Im}\rho = 0$, otherwise we say that ρ has imaginarity. Roughly speaking, imaginarity theory characterizes how much the imaginary part of a quantum state. Notice that, imaginarity also depends on the choice of the fixed orthonormal basis $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=1}^d$. Both coherence theory and imaginarity theory can be viewed as special quantum resource theories [19, 20].

Observe that, if $\text{Im}\rho \neq 0$ then ρ must be coherent. That is to say, imaginarity must imply coherence. Since $\text{Re}\rho$ is still a quantum state, then for any coherence measure C , the coherence of $\text{Re}\rho$, $C(\text{Re}\rho)$, is well defined. A natural question then arises that for a coherence measure C , whether $C(\rho) - C(\text{Re}\rho) \geq 0$ holds for all states? $C(\rho) - C(\text{Re}\rho)$ quantitatively characterizes the fact that imaginarity must imply coherence. In this work, we investigate whether $C(\rho) - C(\text{Re}\rho) \geq 0$.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In section II, we study $C(\rho) - C(\text{Re}\rho)$ for any quantum states and mainly focus on the case of finite dimensions. In section III, we study the case of bosonic Gaussian states. Section IV is a brief summary. We put some necessary details about symplectic spectrums in Appendix.

* xujianwei@nwfufu.edu.cn

II. $C(\rho) - C(\text{Re}\rho)$ FOR ANY QUANTUM STATE

A. Invariance of coherence under state complex conjugation

For a coherence measure C , we consider the condition (C6) below.

(C6) Invariance under state complex conjugation.

$$C(\rho) = C(\rho^*) \quad (4)$$

for any state ρ .

Under (C6), we have Theorem 1 below.

Theorem 1. *Suppose the coherence measure C is invariant under state complex conjugation, then $C(\rho) - C(\text{Re}\rho) \geq 0$.*

Proof. By (C4) and (C6) we have

$$C(\text{Re}\rho) = C\left(\frac{\rho + \rho^*}{2}\right) \leq \frac{1}{2}[C(\rho) + C(\rho^*)] = C(\rho). \quad \square$$

We do not know whether any coherence measure C must satisfy (C6). If a coherence measure C violates (C6), then Theorem 2 below shows that we still have a method to define a new coherence measure C' such that C' satisfies (C6).

Theorem 2. *For the coherence measure C ,*

$$C'(\rho) = \frac{1}{2}[C(\rho) + C(\rho^*)] \quad (5)$$

is still a coherence measure and C' satisfies (C6).

Before proving Theorem 2, we give the definition of the conjugate of a quantum operation.

Definition 1. *For a quantum operation $\phi = \{K_\mu\}_\mu$, we define the conjugate of $\phi = \{K_\mu\}_\mu$ as $\phi^* = \{K_\mu^*\}_\mu$.*

Since $\phi = \{K_\mu\}_\mu$ is a quantum operation, then $\sum_\mu K_\mu^\dagger K_\mu \leq I_d$. This ensures $\sum_\mu K_\mu^T K_\mu^* \leq I_d$, that is to say, $\phi^* = \{K_\mu^*\}_\mu$ is still a quantum operation. Further, if $\phi = \{K_\mu\}_\mu$ is a quantum channel, that is, $\sum_\mu K_\mu^\dagger K_\mu = I_d$, then $\sum_\mu K_\mu^T K_\mu^* = I_d$, i.e., $\phi^* = \{K_\mu^*\}_\mu$ is still a quantum channel. We can directly verify that $\phi = \{K_\mu\}_\mu$ and $\phi^* = \{K_\mu^*\}_\mu$ have the property

$$\phi^*(\rho^*) = [\phi(\rho)]^* \quad (6)$$

for any state ρ . Evidently, $\phi = \phi^*$ if and only if $K_\mu = K_\mu^*$ for all μ , namely, all K_μ are real matrices. It is shown that $\phi = \{K_\mu\}_\mu$ is incoherent if and only if for any μ , each column of K_μ has at most one nonzero element [21]. This implies that if $\phi = \{K_\mu\}_\mu$ is incoherent, then $\phi^* = \{K_\mu^*\}_\mu$ is still incoherent.

We now give a proof for Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. We prove that $C'(\rho)$ satisfies (C1), (C2) and (C5). $C'(\rho)$ satisfying (C1) and (C5) can be easily checked, we only prove that $C'(\rho)$ satisfies (C2). For any incoherent operation $\phi = \{K_\mu\}_\mu$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} C'[\phi(\rho)] &= \frac{1}{2}[C(\phi(\rho)) + C([\phi(\rho)]^*)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}[C(\phi(\rho)) + C(\phi^*(\rho^*))] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}[C(\rho) + C(\rho^*)] = C'(\rho), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used $\phi^*(\rho^*) = [\phi(\rho)]^*$, the fact that ϕ^* is incoherent, and (C2) that $C(\phi(\rho)) \leq C(\rho)$ and $C(\phi^*(\rho^*)) \leq C(\rho^*)$. \square

B. Coherence measures satisfying (C6)

With Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, it is desirable to investigate whether the existing coherence measures satisfy (C6). In this section, we address this topic. Some coherence measures have been found under BCP framework as follows. The l_1 norm of coherence is defined as [1]

$$C_{l_1}(\rho) = \sum_{j \neq k} |\rho_{jk}|. \quad (7)$$

The relative entropy of coherence is defined as [1]

$$C_r(\rho) = S(\rho_{\text{diag}}) - S(\rho), \quad (8)$$

where $\rho_{\text{diag}} = \sum_{j=1}^d \rho_{jj} |j\rangle\langle j|$ is the diagonal part of ρ , $S(\rho) = -\text{tr}(\rho \log_2 \rho)$ is the von Neumann entropy of ρ . The coherence measure based on Tsallis relative entropy is defined as [22, 23]

$$C_{T,\alpha}(\rho) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \left[\sum_{j=1}^d \langle j | \rho^\alpha | j \rangle^{1/\alpha} - 1 \right], \alpha \in [0, 1) \cup (1, 2]. \quad (9)$$

The robustness of coherence is defined as [24, 25]

$$C_R(\rho) = \min_{\tau} \left\{ s \geq 0 \mid \frac{\rho + s\tau}{1+s} \text{ incoherent} \right\}, \quad (10)$$

where \min runs over all quantum states τ . The geometric coherence is defined as [26]

$$C_g(\rho) = 1 - \max_{\sigma} [F(\rho, \sigma)]^2, \quad (11)$$

where $F(\rho, \sigma) = \text{tr} \sqrt{\sqrt{\rho} \sigma \sqrt{\rho}}$ is the quantum fidelity of state ρ and σ , \max runs over all incoherent states σ . The modified trace norm of coherence is defined as [6]

$$C_{\text{tr}}(\rho) = \min_{\lambda \geq 0, \sigma} \|\rho - \lambda\sigma\|_{\text{tr}}, \quad (12)$$

where $\|\rho - \lambda\sigma\|_{\text{tr}}$ is the trace norm of $\rho - \lambda\sigma$, \min runs over all $\lambda \geq 0$ and all incoherent states σ . The coherence weight is defined as [27]

$$C_w(\rho) = \min_{\sigma} \{s \geq 0 : \rho \geq (1-s)\sigma\}, \quad (13)$$

where \min runs over all incoherent states σ .

Convex roof construction [21, 28–31] provides a class of coherence measures. The convex roof construction is as follows. We first choose a concave function $f(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_d)$ defined on the probability distribution space (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_d) , $f(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_d)$ is invariant under the index permutation of $\{j\}_{j=1}^d$, $f(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_d) \geq 0$ and $f(1, 0, 0, \dots, 0) = 0$. The coherence of pure state $|\psi\rangle$ is defined as

$$C_f(|\psi\rangle) = f(|\langle 1|\psi\rangle|^2, |\langle 2|\psi\rangle|^2, |\langle 3|\psi\rangle|^2, \dots, |\langle d|\psi\rangle|^2), \quad (14)$$

the coherence of mixed state ρ is defined as

$$C_f(\rho) = \min_{\{q_\mu, |\varphi_\mu\rangle\}_\mu} \sum_\mu q_\mu C_f(|\varphi_\mu\rangle), \quad (15)$$

where \min runs over all pure state decompositions $\rho = \sum_\mu q_\mu |\varphi_\mu\rangle\langle\varphi_\mu|$.

We have reviewed some existing coherence measures. With these coherence measures, we have Theorem 3 below.

Theorem 3. Any coherence measure C defined in Eqs. (7-15) satisfies $C(\rho) = C(\rho^*)$.

Proof. One can check that coherence measures defined in Eqs. (7-13) certainly satisfy $C(\rho) = C(\rho^*)$. In Eq. (11), notice that $F(\rho, \sigma) = F(\rho^*, \sigma^*)$ for any states ρ and σ , then $C_g(\rho) = C_g(\rho^*)$.

We then only consider the convex roof coherence measures. For a convex roof coherence measure $C_f(\rho)$ defined in Eqs. (14,15), Eq. (14) implies $C_f(|\psi\rangle) = C_f(|\psi^*\rangle)$, with the fact that if $\rho = \sum_\mu q_\mu |\varphi_\mu\rangle\langle\varphi_\mu|$ is a pure state decomposition of ρ then $\rho^* = \sum_\mu q_\mu |\varphi_\mu^*\rangle\langle\varphi_\mu^*|$ is a pure state decomposition of ρ^* , Eq. (15) thus implies $C_f(\rho) = C_f(\rho^*)$. \square

Theorem 3 and Theorem 1 together imply that coherence measures defined in Eqs. (7-15) all satisfy $C(\rho) - C(\text{Re}\rho) \geq 0$.

C. Examples

Let $U = \sum_{j=1}^d e^{i\theta_j} |j\rangle\langle j|$ with $\{\theta_j\}_{j=1}^d$ real numbers, i.e., U is a diagonal unitary. Since $U\sigma U^\dagger$ is diagonal for any diagonal state σ , then U is an incoherent channel and (C2) implies $C(U\rho U^\dagger) \leq C(\rho)$ for any state ρ . Notice that $U^\dagger = \sum_{j=1}^d e^{-i\theta_j} |j\rangle\langle j|$ is also a diagonal unitary and an incoherent channel, thus $C(\rho) = C[U^\dagger(U\rho U^\dagger)U] \leq C(U\rho U^\dagger)$. As a result,

$$C(\rho) = C(U\rho U^\dagger) \quad (16)$$

for any any state ρ and any diagonal unitary U . Eq. (16) will be useful in Example 1 and Example 2.

Example 1. For any coherence measure C and any pure state $|\psi\rangle$, it holds that $C(|\psi\rangle) = C(|\psi^*\rangle)$.

Proof. Expand $|\psi\rangle$ in basis $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=1}^d$ as $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^d |\langle j|\psi\rangle| e^{i\theta_j} |j\rangle$ with $\{\theta_j\}_{j=1}^d$ real numbers. Let $U = \sum_{j=1}^d e^{-2i\theta_j} |j\rangle\langle j|$, then $U|\psi\rangle = |\psi^*\rangle$, and Eq. (16) yields $C(|\psi\rangle) = C(|\psi^*\rangle)$. \square

Example 2. For any coherence measure C and any qubit state ρ , it holds that $C(\rho) = C(\rho^*)$.

Proof. Expand ρ in basis $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=1}^2$ as $\rho = \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \rho_{jk} |j\rangle\langle k|$. For clarity we write $\rho = \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \rho_{jk} |j\rangle\langle k|$ in the matrix form

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{11} & |\rho_{12}| e^{i\theta} \\ |\rho_{12}| e^{-i\theta} & \rho_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

with θ a real number. Let $U = \text{diag}(1, e^{2i\theta})$, then $U\rho U^\dagger = \rho^*$ and Eq. (16) yields $C(\rho) = C(\rho^*)$. \square

Example 3. For the coherence measure C_{l_1} defined in Eq. (7), one has

$$C_{l_1}(\rho) - C_{l_1}(\text{Re}\rho) = \sum_{j,k=1}^d (|\rho_{jk}| - |\text{Re}\rho_{jk}|). \quad (17)$$

We see that $C_{l_1}(\rho) - C_{l_1}(\text{Re}\rho) \geq 0$ and $C_{l_1}(\rho) - C_{l_1}(\text{Re}\rho) = 0$ if and only if ρ is real. When $d = 2$, we express state $\rho = \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \rho_{jk} |j\rangle\langle k|$ in the Bloch representation as

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1+z & x-iy \\ x+iy & 1-z \end{pmatrix}, \quad (18)$$

with $\{x, y, z\}$ real numbers satisfying $x^2 + y^2 + z^2 \leq 1$. For this case, Eq. (17) reads

$$C_{l_1}(\rho) - C_{l_1}(\text{Re}\rho) = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2} - |x|. \quad (19)$$

We depict Eq. (19) in Fig. 1.




Figure 1. $C_{l_1}(\rho) - C_{l_1}(\text{Re}\rho)$ versus x and y in Eq. (19).

III. COHERENCE AND IMAGINARITY OF GAUSSIAN STATES

A. Background of (bosonic) Gaussian states

Gaussian states in bosonic systems are widely used in quantum physics such as quantum optics and quantum information science [32–38]. Coherence theory and imaginarity theory are all dependent on an orthonormal basis. Fock basis is the orthonormal basis of the Hilbert space for Gaussian states, then it is natural to establish the coherence theory and imaginarity theory of Gaussian states with respect to Fock basis. However, by the definition of Gaussian states in Eq. (30), it is convenient to express Gaussian states by the means and covariance matrices, but difficult to express general Gaussian states in Fock basis (some explorations about expressing general Gaussian states in Fock basis see for examples [17, 39–42]). Therefore, for coherence theory and imaginarity theory of Gaussian states, a great challenge is to find coherence measures or

imaginarity measures which can be expressed by the means and covariance matrices.

We first review some basics of Gaussian states and introduce the notation we will use. Let $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=0}^{\infty}$ be an orthonormal basis with $j \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=0}^{\infty}$ spans the complex Hilbert space H over complex numbers. $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=0}^{\infty}$ is called the one-mode Fock basis. The n -mode Fock basis is $\{|j\rangle\}_j^{\otimes n}$, the n -fold tensor product of $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=0}^{\infty}$, and $\{|j\rangle\}_j^{\otimes n}$ spans the complex Hilbert space $\otimes_{l=1}^n H_l = H^{\otimes n}$ over complex numbers with each $H_l = H$. Below we discuss the coherence and imaginarity of Gaussian states under the Fock basis $\{|j\rangle\}_j^{\otimes n}$.

On each H_l , the annihilation operator and creation operator are defined as

$$\widehat{a}_l|0\rangle = 0, \quad \widehat{a}_l|j\rangle = \sqrt{j}|j-1\rangle \text{ for } j \geq 1; \quad (20)$$

$$\widehat{a}_l^\dagger|j\rangle = \sqrt{j+1}|j+1\rangle \text{ for } j \geq 0. \quad (21)$$

From $\{\widehat{a}_l, \widehat{a}_l^\dagger\}_{l=1}^n$ we define $\{\widehat{q}_l, \widehat{p}_l\}_{l=1}^n$ as

$$\widehat{q}_l = \widehat{a}_l + \widehat{a}_l^\dagger, \quad \widehat{p}_l = -i(\widehat{a}_l - \widehat{a}_l^\dagger), \quad (22)$$

We arrange $\{\widehat{q}_l, \widehat{p}_l\}_{l=1}^n$ as a vector as

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{X} &= (\widehat{q}_1, \widehat{p}_1, \widehat{q}_2, \widehat{p}_2, \dots, \widehat{q}_n, \widehat{p}_n)^T \\ &= (\widehat{X}_1, \widehat{X}_2, \widehat{X}_3, \widehat{X}_4, \dots, \widehat{X}_{2n-1}, \widehat{X}_{2n})^T. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

A quantum state ρ in $\overline{H}^{\otimes n}$ can be characterized by its characteristic function

$$\chi(\rho, \xi) = \text{tr}[\rho D(\xi)], \quad (24)$$

where $D(\xi)$ is the displacement operator

$$D(\xi) = \exp(i\widehat{X}^T \Omega \xi), \quad (25)$$

$$\Omega = \oplus_{l=1}^n \omega, \quad \omega = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

$$\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_{2n})^T \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}.$$

For state ρ in $\overline{H}^{\otimes n}$, the mean of ρ is

$$\overline{X} = \text{tr}(\rho \widehat{X}) = (\overline{X}_1, \overline{X}_2, \dots, \overline{X}_{2n})^T; \quad (27)$$

the covariance matrix V is defined by its elements

$$V_{lm} = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\rho \{\Delta \widehat{X}_l, \Delta \widehat{X}_m\}) \quad (28)$$

where $\Delta \widehat{X}_l = \widehat{X}_l - \overline{X}_l$, and $\{\Delta \widehat{X}_l, \Delta \widehat{X}_m\} = \Delta \widehat{X}_l \Delta \widehat{X}_m + \Delta \widehat{X}_m \Delta \widehat{X}_l$ is the anticommutator of $\Delta \widehat{X}_l$ and $\Delta \widehat{X}_m$. The covariance matrix $V = V^T$ is a $2n \times 2n$ real and symmetric matrix satisfying the uncertainty principle [43]

$$V + i\Omega \geq 0. \quad (29)$$

Note that $V + i\Omega \geq 0$ implies $V > 0$ meaning that V is positive definite.

A quantum state ρ in $\overline{H}^{\otimes n}$ is called an n -mode Gaussian state if its characteristic function has the Gaussian form

$$\chi(\rho, \xi) = \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2} \xi^T (\Omega V \Omega^T) \xi - i(\Omega \overline{X})^T \xi\right], \quad (30)$$

where \overline{X} is the mean of ρ and V is the covariance matrix of ρ . \overline{X} and V with Eq. (29) completely determine the Gaussian state ρ [43], thus we write ρ as $\rho(\overline{X}, V)$.

A Gaussian channel ϕ on $\overline{H}^{\otimes n}$ can be represented by $\phi = (b, T, N)$, here $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{2n})^T \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$, T and $N = N^T$ are $2n \times 2n$ real matrices. $\phi = (b, T, N)$ maps the Gaussian state $\rho(\overline{X}, V)$ to the Gaussian state with mean and covariance matrix

$$\overline{X} \rightarrow T\overline{X} + b, \quad V \rightarrow TVT^T + N, \quad (31)$$

and $\phi = (b, T, N)$ fulfils the complete positivity condition

$$N + i\Omega - iT\Omega T^T \geq 0. \quad (32)$$

After introducing the notation of Gaussian states and Gaussian channels, we turn to the imaginarity and coherence of Gaussian states.

The (complex) conjugate of the Gaussian state $\rho(\overline{X}, V)$ is still a Gaussian state $\rho^*(O\overline{X}, OVO)$ with [17]

$$O = \oplus_{l=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (33)$$

As a result, a Gaussian state $\rho(\overline{X}, V)$ is real if and only if $\rho(\overline{X}, V) = \rho^*(O\overline{X}, OVO)$, that is, $\overline{X} = O\overline{X}$ and $V = OVO$. From Gaussian state $\rho(\overline{X}, V)$, we can define the real Gaussian state $\rho' \left(\frac{\overline{X} + O\overline{X}}{2}, \frac{V + OVO}{2} \right)$. Obviously, for Gaussian state $\rho(\overline{X}, V)$, it holds that

$$\rho' = (\rho')^* = (\rho^*)', \quad (34)$$

and ρ is real (i.e., $\rho = \text{Re}\rho$) if and only if $\rho = \rho'$. In general, $\text{Re}\rho \neq \rho'$ for Gaussian state $\rho(\overline{X}, V)$.

It is shown [39] that a Gaussian state $\rho(\overline{X}, V)$ is diagonal if and only if $\rho(\overline{X}, V)$ is a thermal state, that is, $\rho(\overline{X}, V) = \rho(0, \oplus_{l=1}^n \nu_j I_2)$ with $\nu_j \geq 1$ for all j . A Gaussian channel ϕ is called incoherent if $\phi(\sigma)$ is still diagonal for any thermal state σ .

For Gaussian states ρ and σ , the convex combination $p\rho + (1-p)\sigma$ in general is not Gaussian, here $p \in (0, 1)$. This fact makes troubles to adopt (C3) and (C4) as necessary conditions for coherence measures of Gaussian states. With this consideration, we abandon (C3) and (C4), and modify (C1) and (C2) for Gaussian states as (CG1) and (CG2) below. A real valued functional C_G defined on Gaussian states is called a coherence measure if C_G satisfies the following (CG1) and (CG2).

(CG1) Faithfulness. $C_G(\rho) \geq 0$ for any Gaussian state ρ , and $C_G(\rho) = 0$ if and only if ρ is diagonal.

(CG2) Monotonicity. $C_G[\phi(\rho)] \leq C_G(\rho)$ for any incoherent Gaussian channel ϕ .

Coherence measures, incoherent channels and state transformations for Gaussian states were investigated recently [44–47].

B. Coherence and imaginarity of Gaussian states

To study the relationship between coherence and imaginarity of Gaussian states, we propose the conditions (CG4) and (CG6) below, (CG6) can be viewed as the counterpart of (C6).

(CG4) $C_G(\rho') \leq \frac{1}{2}[C_G(\rho) + C_G(\rho^*)]$ for any Gaussian state ρ .

(CG6) $C_G(\rho) = C_G(\rho^*)$ for any Gaussian state ρ .

It is easy to see that if a coherence measure $C_G(\rho)$ for Gaussian states satisfies (CG4) and (CG6), then $C_G(\rho) - C_G(\rho') \geq 0$.

Similar to definition 1, we give the definition of the conjugate of a Gaussian channel.

Definition 2. For the Gaussian channel $\phi = (b, T, N)$, we define the conjugate of $\phi = (b, T, N)$ as $\phi^* = (Ob, OTO, ONO)$.

From Eqs. (32,33), we have

$$O(N + i\Omega - iT\Omega T^T)O \geq 0.$$

Using the facts $O\Omega = -\Omega O$, $O^T = O$ and $O^2 = I_{2n}$, we obtain

$$ONO - i\Omega + i(OTO)\Omega(OTO)^T \geq 0.$$

Taking the conjugate of the left side of above equation and using the facts $N^T = N$ and $\Omega^T = -\Omega$ yield

$$ONO + i\Omega - i(OTO)\Omega(OTO)^T \geq 0.$$

This show that $\phi^* = (Ob, OTO, ONO)$ satisfies the complete positivity condition, then ϕ^* is a Gaussian channel.

With the definition of $\phi^* = (Ob, OTO, ONO)$ and Eq. (31), one can check that

$$\phi^*(\rho^*) = [\phi(\rho)]^*. \quad (35)$$

When a Gaussian channel $\phi = (d, T, N)$ is incoherent, we have Corollary 1 as follows.

Corollary 1. If the Gaussian channel $\phi = (b, T, N)$ is incoherent, then its conjugate $\phi^* = (Ob, OTO, ONO)$ is also incoherent, and $\phi^*(\sigma) = \phi(\sigma)$ for any thermal state σ .

Proof. For any thermal state σ , we have $\sigma = \sigma^*$. Since ϕ is incoherent, then $\phi(\sigma)$ is thermal. From Eq. (35) one has $\phi^*(\sigma) = \phi^*(\sigma^*) = [\phi(\sigma)]^* = \phi(\sigma)$. \square

For $p \in (0, 1)$, Gaussian states ρ and σ , the convex combination of ρ and σ , $p\rho + (1-p)\sigma$ is not Gaussian in general. Here we define a Gaussian state by the convex combinations of the means and covariance matrices of ρ and σ .

Definition 3. For $p \in (0, 1)$, Gaussian states $\rho(\bar{X}, V)$ and $\sigma(\bar{Y}, W)$, we define the Gaussian state $\tau(p\bar{X} + (1-p)\bar{Y}, pV + (1-p)W)$, and denote

$$\begin{aligned} & p\rho(\bar{X}, V) \boxplus (1-p)\sigma(\bar{Y}, W) \\ &= \tau(p\bar{X} + (1-p)\bar{Y}, pV + (1-p)W). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Under Definition 3, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \rho' \left(\frac{\bar{X} + O\bar{X}}{2}, \frac{V + OVO}{2} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\rho(\bar{X}, V) \boxplus \frac{1}{2}\rho^*(O\bar{X}, OVO). \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Since Gaussian states $\rho(\bar{X}, V)$ and $\sigma(\bar{Y}, W)$ satisfy the uncertainty principle $V + i\Omega \geq 0$ and $W + i\Omega \geq 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & [pV + (1-p)W] + i\Omega \\ &= p(V + i\Omega) + (1-p)(W + i\Omega) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This says $pV + (1-p)W$ satisfies the uncertainty principle and $\tau(p\bar{X} + (1-p)\bar{Y}, pV + (1-p)W)$ indeed is a Gaussian state.

Similar to Theorem 2, we have Theorem 4 below.

Theorem 4. If $C_G(\rho)$ is a coherence measure for Gaussian states, then

$$C'_G(\rho) = \frac{1}{2}[C_G(\rho) + C_G(\rho^*)] \quad (38)$$

is also a coherence measure for Gaussian states, and $C'_G(\rho)$ satisfies $C'_G(\rho) = C'_G(\rho^*)$.

Proof. $C'_G(\rho)$ satisfying (CG1) is easy to prove. We now prove that $C'_G(\rho)$ satisfies (CG2). For any Gaussian state ρ and any incoherent Gaussian channel ϕ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} C'_G[\phi(\rho)] &= \frac{1}{2}[C_G(\phi(\rho)) + C_G([\phi(\rho)]^*)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}[C_G(\phi(\rho)) + C_G(\phi^*(\rho^*))] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}[C_G(\rho) + C_G(\rho^*)] = C'_G(\rho), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used $\phi^*(\rho^*) = [\phi(\rho)]^*$, the fact that ϕ^* is incoherent, and (CG2) that $C_G(\phi(\rho)) \leq C_G(\rho)$ and $C_G(\phi^*(\rho^*)) \leq C_G(\rho^*)$. \square

In Ref. [39], the author introduced the Gaussian relative entropy $C_{Gr}(\rho)$ for Gaussian state ρ as

$$C_{Gr}(\rho) = S(\rho|\bar{\rho}) = S(\bar{\rho}) - S(\rho), \quad (39)$$

$$\bar{v}_j = \frac{1}{2}(V_{2j-1, 2j-1} + V_{2j, 2j} + \bar{X}_{2j-1}^2 + \bar{X}_{2j}^2), \quad (40)$$

where $\rho = \rho(\bar{X}, V)$ is any Gaussian state, $\bar{\rho} = \bar{\rho}(0, \oplus_{j=1}^n \bar{v}_j I_2)$ is a thermal state induced by $\rho(\bar{X}, V)$, $S(\rho) = -\text{tr}(\rho \log_2 \rho)$ is the von Neumann entropy of ρ , $S(\rho|\bar{\rho}) = \text{tr}(\rho \log_2 \rho) - \text{tr}(\rho \log_2 \bar{\rho})$ is the relative entropy of ρ to $\bar{\rho}$. The defining property of the thermal state $\bar{\rho}(0, \oplus_{j=1}^n \bar{v}_j I_2)$ is $\text{tr}(\bar{a}_1^\dagger \bar{a}_1 \rho) = \text{tr}(\bar{a}_1^\dagger \bar{a}_1 \bar{\rho})$ for all $\{j\}_{j=1}^n$, namely, ρ and $\bar{\rho}$ have the same mean particle numbers for all modes.

$S(\bar{\rho})$ and $S(\rho)$ in Eq. (39) can be computed by [48]

$$S(\rho) = \sum_{j=1}^n g(v_j), \quad (41)$$

$$S(\bar{\rho}) = \sum_{j=1}^n g(\bar{v}_j), \quad (42)$$

$$g(x) = \frac{x+1}{2} \log_2 \frac{x+1}{2} - \frac{x-1}{2} \log_2 \frac{x-1}{2}, \quad (43)$$

where $\{v_j\}_{j=1}^n$ is the symplectic eigenvalues of V (see Appendix for more details).

It is shown that [39] $C_{Gr}(\rho)$ satisfies (CG1) and (CG2), i.e., $C_{Gr}(\rho)$ is a coherence measure for Gaussian states. Now we show that $C_{Gr}(\rho)$ also satisfies (CG4) and (CG6).

$C_{Gr}(\rho)$ satisfying (CG6) is easy to prove. By the definition $S(\rho) = -\text{tr}(\rho \log_2 \rho)$ we see that $S(\rho) = S(\rho^*)$. Alternatively, $S(\rho) = S(\rho^*)$ follows by Eq. (41) and the fact that the Gaussian state $\rho(\bar{X}, V)$ and its conjugate $\rho(O\bar{X}, OVO)$ have the same symplectic eigenvalues (see Appendix for more details). $\bar{\rho} = \rho^*$ evidently holds from Eq. (40). Then Eq. (39) ensures that $C_{Gr}(\rho)$ satisfies (CG6).

Since $C_{Gr}(\rho)$ satisfies (CG6), then $C_{Gr}(\rho)$ satisfying (CG4) is equivalent to the following Theorem 5.

Theorem 5. $C_{Gr}(\rho) - C_{Gr}(\rho') \geq 0$ for any Gaussian state ρ .

Proof. From Eqs. (39-43) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & C_{Gr}(\rho) - C_{Gr}(\rho') \\ &= S(\bar{\rho}) - S(\rho) - S(\bar{\rho}') + S(\rho') \\ &= [S(\bar{\rho}) - S(\bar{\rho}')] + [S(\rho') - S(\rho)], \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

$$S(\bar{\rho}) = \sum_{j=1}^n g \left[\frac{1}{2} (V_{2j-1,2j-1} + V_{2j,2j} + \bar{X}_{2j-1}^2 + \bar{X}_{2j}^2) \right], \quad (45)$$

$$S(\bar{\rho}') = \sum_{j=1}^n g \left[\frac{1}{2} (V_{2j-1,2j-1} + V_{2j,2j} + \bar{X}_{2j-1}^2) \right]. \quad (46)$$

Since $g(x)$ is increasing, then $S(\bar{\rho}) - S(\bar{\rho}') \geq 0$. Corollary 2 in Appendix ensures $S(\rho') - S(\rho) \geq 0$. Theorem 5 then follows. \square

C. Examples

Example 4. Consider the one-mode Glauber coherent state

$$|\alpha\rangle = e^{-\frac{|\alpha|^2}{2}} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha^j}{\sqrt{j!}} |j\rangle \quad (47)$$

with α any complex number. The mean of $|\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|$ is $\bar{X} = (2\text{Re}\alpha, 2\text{Im}\alpha)^T$, the covariance matrix of $\rho = |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|$ is $V = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $\rho' \left(\frac{\bar{X} + O\bar{X}}{2}, \frac{V + OVO}{2} \right)$ has $\frac{\bar{X} + O\bar{X}}{2} = (2\text{Re}\alpha, 0)^T$, $\frac{V + OVO}{2} = V = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Eqs. (44,45,46) yield $S(\rho') - S(\rho) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & C_{Gr}(\rho) - C_{Gr}(\rho') = S(\bar{\rho}) - S(\bar{\rho}') \\ &= g[1 + 2(\text{Re}\alpha)^2 + 2(\text{Im}\alpha)^2] - g[1 + 2(\text{Re}\alpha)^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

We see that, $C_{Gr}(\rho) - C_{Gr}(\rho') \geq 0$ and $C_{Gr}(\rho) - C_{Gr}(\rho') = 0$ if and only if α is a real number, namely, $|\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|$ is a real Gaussian state. We depict Eq. (48) in Fig. 2.

Example 5. Consider the one-mode squeezed state

$$\begin{aligned} |\zeta\rangle &= \exp\left[\frac{1}{2}(\zeta^* a^2 - \zeta a^{*2})\right] |0\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\cosh|\zeta|}} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-e^{i\theta} \tanh|\zeta|)^j \frac{\sqrt{(2j)!}}{2^j j!} |2j\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$




Figure 2. $C_{Gr}(\rho) - C_{Gr}(\rho')$ versus $\text{Re}\alpha$ and $\text{Im}\alpha$ in Eq. (48).

with ζ any complex number and $\zeta = |\zeta|e^{i\theta}$ its polar form. $\exp[\frac{1}{2}(\zeta^* a^2 - \zeta a^{*2})]$ is the squeezing operator. The mean of $|\zeta\rangle\langle\zeta|$ is $\bar{X} = (0, 0)^T$, the covariance matrix V of $|\zeta\rangle\langle\zeta|$ is

$$\begin{cases} V_{11} = \cosh(2|\zeta|) + \cos\theta \sinh(2|\zeta|) \\ V_{12} = V_{21} = \sin\theta \sinh(2|\zeta|) \\ V_{22} = \cosh(2|\zeta|) - \cos\theta \sinh(2|\zeta|). \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

Then Eqs. (44,45,46) yield $S(\bar{\rho}) - S(\bar{\rho}') = 0$. With the facts $S(\rho) = \det V$ and $S(\rho') = \det \frac{V + OVO}{2}$ (see more details in Appendix), one gets

$$\begin{aligned} & C_{Gr}(\rho) - C_{Gr}(\rho') = S(\rho') - S(\rho) \\ &= g[1 + \sin^2\theta \sinh^2(2|\zeta|)]. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

We see that, $C_{Gr}(\rho) - C_{Gr}(\rho') \geq 0$ and $C_{Gr}(\rho) - C_{Gr}(\rho') = 0$ if and only if ζ is a real number, that is, $|\zeta\rangle\langle\zeta|$ is a real Gaussian state. We depict Eq. (51) in Figure 3.

IV. SUMMARY

For the fixed orthonormal basis, if a quantum state ρ has nonzero imaginary part then ρ must be coherent. We discussed how to quantitatively characterize this fact. We proved that, if a coherence measure C satisfies $C(\rho) = C(\rho^*)$ then $C(\rho) - C(\text{Re}\rho) \geq 0$. If a coherence measure C does not satisfy $C(\rho) = C(\rho^*)$ then we can define a new coherence measure $C'(\rho) = \frac{1}{2}[C(\rho) + C(\rho^*)]$ then $C'(\rho) = C'(\rho^*)$. For Gaussian state ρ , since $\text{Re}\rho$ in general is not Gaussian, we consider whether $C_G(\rho) - C_G(\rho') \geq 0$ where ρ' is a real Gaussian state induced by ρ and C_G is a coherence measure for Gaussian states.

Our results revealed some relationships between coherence and imaginarity. The physical implications and applications of these results are worthy of further investigations.




Figure 3. $C_{Gr}(\rho) - C_{Gr}(\rho')$ versus $\text{Re}\zeta$ and $\text{Im}\zeta$ in Eq. (51).

APPENDIX: SOME RESULTS ABOUT SYMPLECTIC SPECTRUMS AND GAUSSIAN STATES

For a Gaussian state $\rho(\bar{X}, V)$, the covariance matrix V is a positive definite real matrix, i.e., $V > 0$. According to Williamson's theorem [49], every positive definite real matrix of even dimension can be written in diagonal form by a symplectic transformation. Applying Williamson's theorem to the covariance matrix V , then there exists a symplectic matrix M such that

$$MVM^T = \oplus_{j=1}^n \nu_j I_2, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $\nu(V) = \{\nu_j(V)\}_{j=1}^n$ is (are) called the symplectic spectrum (eigenvalues) of V , without loss of generality we always assume $0 < \nu_j(V) \leq \nu_k(V)$ for $j < k$. We denote the set of all real symplectic matrices of $2n$ dimension by

$$\text{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R}) = \{M \mid M\Omega M^T = \Omega\}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

$\text{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ forms a group, called symplectic group, and $M \in \text{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ if and only if $M^T \in \text{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$. The symplectic spectrum $\nu(V)$ is just the modulus of the $2n$ standard eigenvalues of the matrix $i\Omega V$. It is easy to check that when $n = 1$, V has only one symplectic eigenvalue being $\det V$.

The conjugate of the Gaussian state $\rho(\bar{X}, V)$ is still a Gaussian state $\rho^*(\bar{O}\bar{X}, \bar{O}V\bar{O})$. Using the facts $\bar{O}^2 = I_{2n}$, $\bar{O}\Omega = -\Omega\bar{O}$, $\bar{O}(\oplus_{j=1}^n \nu_j I_2)\bar{O} = \oplus_{j=1}^n \nu_j I_2$, and Eq. (A1), we get

$$(\bar{O}M\bar{O})(\bar{O}V\bar{O})(\bar{O}M\bar{O})^T = \oplus_{j=1}^n \nu_j I_2, \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$(\bar{O}M\bar{O})\Omega(\bar{O}M\bar{O})^T = \Omega. \quad (\text{A4})$$

These show that $\bar{O}M\bar{O} \in \text{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ and the symplectic spectrum of $\bar{O}V\bar{O}$ is still $\{\nu_j\}_{j=1}^n$.

For the set $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n$ of real numbers, define $\{x_j^\uparrow\}_{j=1}^n$ as the increasing rearrangement of $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n$ such that $x_1^\uparrow \leq x_2^\uparrow \leq \dots \leq x_n^\uparrow$. Two sets $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n$ and $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^n$ of real numbers are said that $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n$ is weakly supermajorized by $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^n$ (see chapter 1, A.2. in Ref. [50]), denote by

$$\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n <^w \{y_j\}_{j=1}^n, \quad (\text{A5})$$

if

$$\sum_{j=1}^k x_j^\uparrow \geq \sum_{j=1}^k y_j^\uparrow, k = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (\text{A6})$$

Lemma 1. (Theorem 1 in Ref. [51]). Let A and B be $2n \times 2n$ real positive definite matrices ($A = A^T > 0, B = B^T > 0$). Then

$$\nu(A+B) <^w \nu(A) + \nu(B). \quad (\text{A7})$$

Another interesting result about $\nu(A)$, $\nu(B)$ and $\nu(A+B)$ is reported in Theorem 2 in Ref. [52]. The following Lemma is a result of C.1.b. in Chapter 3 of Ref. [50].

Lemma 2. If $f(x) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is concave and increasing, then $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n <^w \{y_j\}_{j=1}^n$ implies $\sum_{j=1}^n f(x_j) \geq \sum_{j=1}^n f(y_j)$.

With Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, we have Theorem 6 below.

Theorem 6. For $p \in (0, 1)$, Gaussian states $\rho(\bar{X}, V)$ and $\sigma(\bar{Y}, W)$, it holds that

$$S[p\rho \boxplus (1-p)\sigma] \geq pS(\rho) + (1-p)S(\sigma). \quad (\text{A8})$$

Proof. lemma 1 yields

$$\nu(pV + (1-p)W) <^w \nu(pV) + \nu((1-p)W).$$

From Eqs. (41,43) and lemma 2, $S(\rho) = \sum_{j=1}^n g(\nu_j)$, $g(x)$ is concave and increasing, then

$$\begin{aligned} & S(pV + (1-p)W) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n g[\nu_j(pV + (1-p)W)] \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^n g[p\nu_j(V) + (1-p)\nu_j(W)] \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^n \{pg[\nu_j(V)] + (1-p)g[\nu_j(W)]\} \\ &= pS(\rho) + (1-p)S(\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

□

Applying Theorem 6 to Eq. (37), we obtain Corollary 2 below.

Corollary 2. For any Gaussian state ρ , it holds that

$$S(\rho') \geq S(\rho). \quad (\text{A9})$$

The more general result of Theorem 6 is the following Corollary 3.

Corollary 3. For any probability distribution $\{p_j\}_j$ and any Gaussian states $\{\rho_j\}_j$, it holds that

$$S(\boxplus_j p_j \rho_j) \geq \sum_j p_j S(\rho_j), \quad (\text{A10})$$

or equivalently,

$$S(\boxplus_j p_j \rho_j) - \sum_j p_j S(\rho_j) \geq 0, \quad (\text{A11})$$

where $\boxplus_j p_j \rho_j = p_1 \rho_1 \boxplus p_2 \rho_2 \dots$

Recall that, the concavity of the entropy (see chapter 11 in Ref. [5]) says that $S(\sum_j p_j \rho_j) \geq \sum_j p_j S(\rho_j)$ for any probability distribution $\{p_j\}_j$ and any quantum states $\{\rho_j\}_j$, and $S(\sum_j p_j \rho_j) - \sum_j p_j S(\rho_j)$ is called the Holevo information. Then we can view Eq. (A10) as a counterpart of $S(\sum_j p_j \rho_j) \geq \sum_j p_j S(\rho_j)$, and view Eq. (A11) as a counterpart of Holevo information.

-
- [1] T. Baumgratz, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, Quantifying coherence, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 140401 (2014).
- [2] A. Streltsov, G. Adesso, and M. B. Plenio, Colloquium: Quantum coherence as a resource, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89**, 041003 (2017).
- [3] M.-L. Hu, X. Hu, J. Wang, Y. Peng, Y.-R. Zhang, and H. Fan, Quantum coherence and geometric quantum discord, *Physics Reports* **762-764**, 1 (2018).
- [4] K.-D. Wu, A. Streltsov, B. Regula, G.-Y. Xiang, C.-F. Li, and G.-C. Guo, Experimental progress on quantum coherence: Detection, quantification, and manipulation, *Advanced Quantum Technologies* **4**, 2100040 (2021).
- [5] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information* (Cambridge university press, 2010).
- [6] X.-D. Yu, D.-J. Zhang, G. F. Xu, and D. M. Tong, Alternative framework for quantifying coherence, *Phys. Rev. A* **94**, 060302 (2016).
- [7] A. Hickey and G. Gour, Quantifying the imaginarity of quantum mechanics, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **51**, 414009 (2018).
- [8] K.-D. Wu, T. V. Kondra, S. Rana, C. M. Scandolo, G.-Y. Xiang, C.-F. Li, G.-C. Guo, and A. Streltsov, Operational resource theory of imaginarity, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 090401 (2021).
- [9] K.-D. Wu, T. V. Kondra, S. Rana, C. M. Scandolo, G.-Y. Xiang, C.-F. Li, G.-C. Guo, and A. Streltsov, Resource theory of imaginarity: Quantification and state conversion, *Phys. Rev. A* **103**, 032401 (2021).
- [10] R.-Q. Zhang, Z. Hou, Z. Li, H. Zhu, G.-Y. Xiang, C.-F. Li, and G.-C. Guo, Experimental masking of real quantum states, *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **16**, 024052 (2021).
- [11] S. Xue, J. Guo, P. Li, M. Ye, and Y. Li, Quantification of resource theory of imaginarity, *Quantum Information Processing* **20**, 1 (2021).
- [12] M.-O. Renou, D. Trillo, M. Weilenmann, T. P. Le, A. Tavakoli, N. Gisin, A. Acín, and M. Navascués, Quantum theory based on real numbers can be experimentally falsified, *Nature* **600**, 625 (2021).
- [13] H. Zhu, Hiding and masking quantum information in complex and real quantum mechanics, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **3**, 033176 (2021).
- [14] Z.-D. Li, Y.-L. Mao, M. Weilenmann, A. Tavakoli, H. Chen, L. Feng, S.-J. Yang, M.-O. Renou, D. Trillo, T. P. Le, N. Gisin, A. Acín, M. Navascués, Z. Wang, and J. Fan, Testing real quantum theory in an optical quantum network, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 040402 (2022).
- [15] T. V. Kondra, C. Datta, and A. Streltsov, Real quantum operations and state transformations, *New Journal of Physics* **25**, 093043 (2023).
- [16] C. Datta, R. Ganardi, T. V. Kondra, and A. Streltsov, Is there a finite complete set of monotones in any quantum resource theory? *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 240204 (2023).
- [17] J. Xu, Imaginarity of gaussian states, *Phys. Rev. A* **108**, 062203 (2023).
- [18] K.-D. Wu, T. V. Kondra, C. M. Scandolo, S. Rana, G.-Y. Xiang, C.-F. Li, G.-C. Guo, and A. Streltsov, Resource theory of imaginarity: New distributed scenarios, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.04782* (2023).
- [19] M. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim, (quantumness in the context of) resource theories, *International Journal of Modern Physics B* **27**, 1345019 (2013).
- [20] E. Chitambar and G. Gour, Quantum resource theories, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **91**, 025001 (2019).
- [21] S. Du, Z. Bai, and Y. Guo, Conditions for coherence transformations under incoherent operations, *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 052120 (2015).
- [22] C.-S. Yu, Quantum coherence via skew information and its polygamy, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 042337 (2017).
- [23] H. Zhao and C.-S. Yu, Coherence measure in terms of the tsallis relative α entropy, *Scientific reports* **8**, 299 (2018).
- [24] C. Napoli, T. R. Bromley, M. Cianciaruso, M. Piani, N. Johnston, and G. Adesso, Robustness of coherence: An operational and observable measure of quantum coherence, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 150502 (2016).
- [25] M. Piani, M. Cianciaruso, T. R. Bromley, C. Napoli, N. Johnston, and G. Adesso, Robustness of asymmetry and coherence of quantum states, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 042107 (2016).
- [26] A. Streltsov, U. Singh, H. S. Dhar, M. N. Bera, and G. Adesso, Measuring quantum coherence with entanglement, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 020403 (2015).
- [27] K. Bu, N. Anand, and U. Singh, Asymmetry and coherence weight of quantum states, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 032342 (2018).
- [28] X. Yuan, H. Zhou, Z. Cao, and X. Ma, Intrinsic randomness as a measure of quantum coherence, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 022124 (2015).
- [29] S. Du, Z. Bai, and X. Qi, Coherence measures and optimal conversion for coherent states, *Quantum Information and Computation* **15**, 1307 (2015).
- [30] X. Qi, T. Gao, and F. Yan, Measuring coherence with entanglement concurrence, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **50**, 285301 (2017).
- [31] J. Xu, l_1 norm of coherence is not equal to its convex roof quan-

- tifier, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **55**, 145302 (2022).
- [32] S. L. Braunstein and P. van Loock, Quantum information with continuous variables, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **77**, 513 (2005).
- [33] X.-B. Wang, T. Hiroshima, A. Tomita, and M. Hayashi, Quantum information with gaussian states, *Physics Reports* **448**, 1 (2007).
- [34] A. Ferraro, S. Olivares, and M. G. Paris, Gaussian states in continuous variable quantum information, *arXiv preprint quant-ph/0503237* (2005).
- [35] S. Olivares, Quantum optics in the phase space: a tutorial on gaussian states, *The European Physical Journal Special Topics* **203**, 3 (2012).
- [36] C. Weedbrook, S. Pirandola, R. García-Patrón, N. J. Cerf, T. C. Ralph, J. H. Shapiro, and S. Lloyd, Gaussian quantum information, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **84**, 621 (2012).
- [37] G. Adesso, S. Ragy, and A. R. Lee, Continuous variable quantum information: Gaussian states and beyond, *Open Systems & Information Dynamics* **21**, 1440001 (2014).
- [38] A. Serafini, *Quantum continuous variables: a primer of theoretical methods* (CRC press, 2017).
- [39] J. Xu, Quantifying coherence of gaussian states, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 032111 (2016).
- [40] N. Quesada, L. G. Helt, J. Izaac, J. M. Arrazola, R. Shahrokhshahi, C. R. Myers, and K. K. Sabapathy, Simulating realistic non-gaussian state preparation, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 022341 (2019).
- [41] J. Huh, Multimode bogoliubov transformation and husimi's q-function, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **1612**, 012015 (2020).
- [42] Y. Yao, F. Miatto, and N. Quesada, The recursive representation of gaussian quantum mechanics, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.06069* (2022).
- [43] R. Simon, N. Mukunda, and B. Dutta, Quantum-noise matrix for multimode systems: U(n) invariance, squeezing, and normal forms, *Phys. Rev. A* **49**, 1567 (1994).
- [44] D. Buono, G. Nocerino, G. Petrillo, G. Torre, G. Zonzo, and F. Illuminati, Quantum coherence of gaussian states, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.00913* (2016).
- [45] J. Xu, Coherence of quantum gaussian channels, *Physics Letters A* **387**, 127028 (2021).
- [46] S. Du and Z. Bai, Conversion of gaussian states under incoherent gaussian operations, *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 022412 (2022).
- [47] S. Du and Z. Bai, Incoherent gaussian equivalence of m -mode gaussian states, *Phys. Rev. A* **107**, 012407 (2023).
- [48] A. S. Holevo, M. Sohma, and O. Hirota, Capacity of quantum gaussian channels, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 1820 (1999).
- [49] J. Williamson, On the algebraic problem concerning the normal forms of linear dynamical systems, *American journal of mathematics* **58**, 141 (1936).
- [50] A. W. Marshall, I. Olkin, and B. C. Arnold, *Inequalities: theory of majorization and its applications* (Second Edition, Springer, 2011).
- [51] T. Hiroshima, Additivity and multiplicativity properties of some gaussian channels for gaussian inputs, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 012330 (2006).
- [52] R. Bhatia and T. Jain, Variational principles for symplectic eigenvalues, *Canadian Mathematical Bulletin* **64**, 553 (2021).