

# Resource-Theoretic Quantifiers of Weak and Strong Symmetry Breaking: Strong Entanglement Asymmetry and Beyond

Yuya Kusuki,<sup>1, 2, 3, \*</sup> Sridip Pal,<sup>4, †</sup> and Hiroyasu Tajima<sup>5, 6, ‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute for Advanced Study, Kyushu University, Fukuoka 819-0395, Japan.*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, Kyushu University, Fukuoka 819-0395, Japan.*

<sup>3</sup>*RIKEN Interdisciplinary Theoretical and Mathematical Sciences (iTHEMS), Wako, Saitama 351-0198, Japan.*

<sup>4</sup>*Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques (IHES), 91440 Bures-sur-Yvette, France*

<sup>5</sup>*Department of Informatics, Faculty of Information Science and Electrical Engineering, Kyushu University, Fukuoka 819-0395, Japan.*

<sup>6</sup>*JST, FOREST, 4-1-8 Honcho, Kawaguchi, Saitama, 332-0012, Japan.*

Quantifying *how much* a quantum state breaks a symmetry is essential for characterizing phases, nonequilibrium dynamics, and open-system behavior. Quantum resource theory provides a rigorous operational framework to define and characterize such quantifiers of symmetry-breaking. As a starter, we exemplify the usefulness of resource theory by noting that *second-Rényi* entanglement asymmetry can *increase* under symmetric operations, and hence is not a resource monotone, and should not *solely* be used to capture Quantum Mpemba effect. More importantly, motivated by mixed-state physics where *weak* and *strong* symmetries are inequivalent, we formulate a new resource theory tailored to strong symmetry, identifying free states and strong-covariant operations. This framework systematically identifies quantifiers of strong symmetry breaking for a broad class of symmetry groups, including a strong entanglement asymmetry. A particularly transparent structure emerges for U(1) symmetry, where the resource theory for the strong symmetry breaking has a completely parallel structure to the entanglement theory: the variance of the conserved quantity fully characterizes the asymptotic manipulation of strong symmetry breaking. By connecting this result to the knowledge of the geometry of quantum state space, we obtain a quantitative framework to track how weak symmetry breaking is irreversibly converted into strong symmetry breaking in open quantum systems. We further propose extensions to generalized symmetries and illustrate the qualitative impact of strong symmetry breaking in analytically tractable QFT examples and applications.

## I. INTRODUCTION & SUMMARY

Symmetry breaking is a paradigmatic concept in modern physics, underpinning our understanding of phases of matter, non-equilibrium dynamics, and high-energy physics. In quantum many-body systems in and out of equilibrium, it is often not enough to know whether a symmetry is present or broken: one would like to quantify *how much* a given state breaks a symmetry. This seemingly simple question immediately leads to a proliferation of possible quantifiers, from correlation functions and order parameters to entropic and information-theoretic measures. A natural challenge is then to identify, among this vast landscape of candidates, those measures that admit a clear physical and operational meaning.

Over the past decade, the resource theory of asymmetry has emerged as a powerful framework for addressing this problem. Within this framework, symmetric operations are regarded as “free”, and states that break the symmetry are viewed as “resources” enabling tasks that would otherwise be impossible. This perspective singles out distinguished asymmetry measures by requiring them

to obey natural axioms such as monotonicity under symmetric operations and additivity under composition. A paradigmatic example is the *relative entropy of asymmetry*, or *G-asymmetry*, which quantifies how far a state is from the set of symmetric states in an information-theoretic sense [1, 2]. Beyond finite-size characterizations, recent progress has further identified asymmetry measures that play a distinguished role in the many-copy (i.i.d.) limit, where the central question is how efficiently one resource state can be converted into another [3–7]. In close analogy with entanglement theory—where the entanglement entropy uniquely determines asymptotic interconversion rates between pure states—such i.i.d.-complete measures provide the fundamental quantifiers of resource at the macroscopic and operational level.

In parallel with these resource-theoretic developments, a major line of progress in many-body physics has been the introduction of the so-called *entanglement asymmetry* [8], which has been widely adopted in both high-energy and condensed-matter contexts as a convenient quantifier of symmetry breaking in non-equilibrium settings [9–16] and near or at equilibrium [11–13, 17–20], in anomalous breaking [21], in holographic setting [22], including prominent applications to the quantum Mpemba effect [8, 9, 23–34] (see the review article [35] and the references there in as well.) Initially, the entanglement asymmetry was proposed as a quantifier, motivated mainly by physical understanding, without explicit ref-

\* [kusuki.yuya@phys.kyushu-u.ac.jp](mailto:kusuki.yuya@phys.kyushu-u.ac.jp)

† [sridip@ihes.fr](mailto:sridip@ihes.fr)

‡ [hiroyasu.tajima@inf.kyushu-u.ac.jp](mailto:hiroyasu.tajima@inf.kyushu-u.ac.jp);

Three authors contributed equally to this work.

erence to the resource-theoretic framework. It was later appreciated that entanglement asymmetry in fact coincides with the relative entropy of asymmetry, one of the central quantities in the resource theory of asymmetry with a rigorous operational interpretation. This identification—namely, that a quantity introduced from many-body considerations coincides with a distinguished resource-theoretic measure—has served as a key impetus for making resource-theoretic structures explicit in recent studies, e.g. [36–39]. A central aim of the present work is to bring this structure to the forefront and to argue that “good” measures of symmetry breaking can be systematically derived from resource-theoretic axioms.

From the resource-theoretic viewpoint, a meaningful quantifier of symmetry breaking is required to satisfy basic structural principles, most notably monotonicity under symmetric operations and a clear operational interpretation. These requirements become particularly stringent when one is interested in macroscopic or long-time behavior, where only quantities with a clear asymptotic and operational meaning can faithfully characterize symmetry breaking.

As a simple illustration of the power of this viewpoint, we show that the *2nd-Rényi asymmetry*, in spite of mimicking some properties of entanglement asymmetry, should not be solely used as a proxy for entanglement asymmetry to capture quantum Mpemba effect because it is not an asymmetry monotone (can potentially increase even under symmetric operations) and is therefore an inappropriate measure of the amount of symmetry breaking.

The resource-theoretic perspective becomes especially important once we move beyond closed systems and conventional symmetry scenarios. Recent developments in the theory of open quantum systems have highlighted that, for mixed states, there are in fact two natural notions of symmetry [40–47]. The first, often referred to as *weak symmetry*, imposes invariance of the density matrix under conjugation by the unitary representation of the symmetry group,

$$U_g \rho U_g^\dagger = \rho, \quad g \in G. \quad (1)$$

The second, known as *strong symmetry*, requires instead that the state transform as

$$U_g \rho = e^{i\theta_g} \rho, \quad g \in G. \quad (2)$$

Any strong symmetric state is automatically weak symmetric, but the converse does not hold. Intuitively, weak symmetry allows for the exchange of conserved charges with an environment, whereas strong symmetry forbids such exchange and therefore encodes a more stringent notion of symmetry for mixed states. We further note that for non-abelian group, there might not be any strong symmetric state, for that purpose, later we define *single sector states*, a weakened notion of strong symmetry for the non-abelian group.

Existing asymmetry measures, including entanglement asymmetry, are tailored to weak symmetry and are, in

fact, insensitive to whether strong symmetry is broken. From the viewpoint of mixed states, this is a serious limitation: two states can be equally weak symmetric yet differ dramatically in whether they possess strong symmetry. This observation raises a fundamental question: *Is it possible to construct a resource theory for strong symmetry, and within it, identify a principled measure that quantifies strong symmetry breaking?* Such a measure would automatically quantify weak symmetry breaking as well, since the set of strong symmetric states is a strict subset of the weak symmetric ones, but it would be capable of distinguishing situations that conventional asymmetry measures cannot.

In this work, we address this gap by developing a resource theory explicitly tailored to strong symmetry. Within this framework, we systematically identify quantifiers of strong symmetry breaking for a broad class of symmetry groups, including an extension of entanglement asymmetry to strong symmetry as well as variance- and covariance-matrix-based measures with clear operational and geometric meanings. These quantities allow one to characterize strong symmetry breaking across different symmetry settings in a unified manner.

A particularly transparent structure emerges for  $U(1)$  symmetry. In this case, the variance of the conserved quantity plays a role directly analogous to that of the entanglement entropy in entanglement theory: it uniquely determines the optimal i.i.d.-asymptotic distillation and dilution of strong symmetry breaking. More generally, by connecting this resource-theoretic quantifier to the geometry of quantum state space—specifically, to inner products and the induced information-geometric metrics—we obtain a quantitative framework to track how weak symmetry breaking is irreversibly converted into strong symmetry breaking in open quantum systems.

The structure of this paper is as follows:

- **Clarifying the resource-theoretic origin of (weak) entanglement asymmetry [§II]:** We emphasize that the *entanglement asymmetry*, widely used in QFT, in fact coincides with the *relative entropy of asymmetry* in the resource theory of asymmetry. This makes it clear that entanglement asymmetry is not merely a convenient diagnostic, but a principled quantity selected by operational meaning and axioms (such as monotonicity), thereby justifying our subsequent extension to strong symmetry.
- **Limitations of second Rényi asymmetry [§III]:** We show that the *second Rényi asymmetry*, despite its computational simplicity, can increase under symmetric operations, i.e., it is not a resource monotone. This clarifies that conclusions based *solely* on such proxies can be misleading in discussions of symmetry breaking (especially in dynamical settings and in connection with the quantum Mpemba effect), and highlights the need for principled measures based on a resource theory.

- **Constructing a resource theory of strong symmetry [§IV]:** We define the basic ingredients needed to quantify *strong* symmetry breaking—namely, the free states and free operations—and show that they form a consistent resource theory. We provide simple examples of free states. We also point out that for non-abelian symmetry group, one can define a middle-tier between strong symmetric states and weak symmetric states, which we call “single-sector states”. This requires satisfying a weaker condition than what is required for the state being strong symmetric; but a stronger condition than what is required for the state being weak symmetric. We also clarify how the resource-theoretic structure of the resulting resource theory differs from that of the standard resource theory of (weak) asymmetry. In summary, in this section, we establish a systematic approach to treating strong symmetry breaking.
- **New quantifiers of strong symmetry breaking [§IV D]:** We propose new measures that quantify strong symmetry breaking and demonstrate that they are resource monotones. The measures can distinguish mixed states that are indistinguishable from the viewpoint of weak symmetry, and provide a new axis for analyzing physics in which strong symmetry plays a role (e.g., open systems and nonequilibrium dynamics). In particular, for  $U(1)$  symmetry, the structure becomes especially transparent: the variance of the conserved quantity fully characterizes strong symmetry breaking at the macroscopic level, playing a role directly analogous to that of the entanglement entropy in entanglement theory.
- **Extension to generalized symmetries [§V]:** We propose a natural extension of our resource monotones to *strong* generalized symmetries.
- **Representative examples and qualitative changes in strong symmetry breaking [§VI & §VII]:** In analytically tractable examples, we show that the new measure captures situations where weak symmetry is preserved while strong symmetry is substantially broken. We further support the usefulness of our framework by applying it to strong-to-weak spontaneous symmetry breaking and to the cross-over, or “Strong-Mpemba” effect, demonstrating that the concept is not merely formal but provides meaningful diagnostics in concrete QFT settings.

## II. PRELIMINARY: BASICS OF THE RESOURCE THEORY OF ASYMMETRY

When one is asked to “quantify how strong a quantum state breaks a given symmetry”, a natural first step in

many-body and high-energy physics is to look at an order parameter. For a symmetry group  $G$ , one might consider the expectation value of a symmetry-breaking operator  $O$ ,

$$m_O(\rho) := \langle O \rangle_\rho = \text{Tr}(\rho O), \quad (3)$$

or closely related correlation functions. While such quantities are extremely useful for diagnosing phases and symmetry breaking, they are not satisfactory as general measures of “how much” symmetry is broken. They depend on the particular choice of operator  $O$ : two different symmetry-breaking operators may induce different orderings of states, and there is no canonical way to decide which one should define the degree of symmetry breaking. Moreover, they need not be monotone under symmetric operations: for instance, coupling to a symmetric environment or coarse-graining can increase  $|m_O|$ , even though no additional “symmetry-breaking” has been supplied.

These limitations motivate a structural approach in which one quantifies how much “asymmetry” a state possesses with respect to a symmetry group  $G$  by treating asymmetry itself as a resource. This is the viewpoint of the *resource theory of asymmetry*.

In this section, we therefore briefly review the basic notions of resource theories, specialized to symmetry breaking. Many of these concepts are standard in the quantum information literature, but they are perhaps less familiar in the high-energy and condensed-matter communities. For this reason, we include here a self-contained overview. In the present work, the “resource” will be symmetry breaking. Our goal in this section is to explain how resource theory provides a principled framework for defining quantifiers of symmetry breaking that are selected by clear operational and axiomatic requirements, and therefore, all of this section serves as a review of the previous results, unlike other sections.

### A. Resource theories

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a Hilbert space and let  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  denote the set of bounded operators acting on  $\mathcal{H}$ . We write

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) := \{\rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \mid \rho \geq 0, \text{Tr}\rho = 1\} \quad (4)$$

for the set of density operators on  $\mathcal{H}$ . The allowed operations on  $\mathcal{H}$  are described by quantum channels, i.e. completely positive trace-preserving (CPTP) maps

$$\Phi : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}'), \quad (5)$$

which satisfy the following two properties

- (i) *Completely positivity:* For any additional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_R$  and any operator  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_R)$ ,

$$A \geq 0 \Rightarrow \Phi \otimes \text{id}_R(A) \geq 0, \quad (6)$$

where  $\text{id}_R$  is the identity map on  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_R)$ .

(ii) *Trace preserving*: For any  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ ,

$$\text{Tr}\Phi(A) = \text{Tr}A. \quad (7)$$

Because of these properties, any CPTP map satisfies  $\Phi \otimes \text{id}_R(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_R)) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}' \otimes \mathcal{H}_R)$ . By the Kraus representation theorem, any CPTP map  $\Phi : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$  can be written as

$$\Phi(X) = \sum_{\alpha} K_{\alpha} X K_{\alpha}^{\dagger}, \quad X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), \quad (8)$$

where the *Kraus operator*  $K_{\alpha} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'$  obey

$$\sum_{\alpha} K_{\alpha}^{\dagger} K_{\alpha} = \mathbf{1}. \quad (9)$$

**Free states and free operations.** A resource theory specifies which states are considered “free” (containing no resource) and which physical operations are allowed to be performed at no cost.

*Free states.* A set of free states is a subset

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \quad (10)$$

representing those states that are accessible without consuming the resource. For instance, in the resource theory of entanglement,  $\mathcal{F}$  consists of separable states; in the resource theory of asymmetry,  $\mathcal{F}$  will be the set of symmetric states.

*Free operations.* A set of free operations is a subset  $\mathcal{O}$  of CPTP maps that satisfy

(i) *Closure*:  $\mathcal{O}$  is closed under finite composition and contains the identity channel.

(ii) *Free preservation*: For any  $\Phi \in \mathcal{O}$  and any  $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}$ ,

$$\Phi(\sigma) \in \mathcal{F}. \quad (11)$$

In words, free operations cannot generate resourceful states from free ones.

**Resource monotones.** A central object in a resource theory is a numerical quantity that measures how much resource a state contains.

For the resource theory  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{O})$ , let  $M$  be a function

$$M : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}, \quad (12)$$

where  $\mathcal{X}$  is a partially ordered set, typically  $\mathcal{X} = [0, \infty)$ , while matrix-valued monotones arise naturally when  $\mathcal{X}$  is taken to be a space of positive semidefinite matrices. The function  $M$  is called a *resource monotone* if it satisfies the following conditions:

(i-a) *Positivity and vanishing on free states*:  $M(\rho) \geq 0$  for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ , and

$$M(\sigma) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \sigma \in \mathcal{F}. \quad (13)$$

(i-b) *Monotonicity under free operations*: For all  $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  and all  $\Phi \in \mathcal{O}$ ,

$$M(\Phi(\rho)) \leq M(\rho). \quad (14)$$

Here, when  $\mathcal{X} = [0, \infty)$ , the inequalities appearing in these conditions are understood as inequalities between real numbers. When  $\mathcal{X}$  is a space of positive semidefinite matrices, the inequalities are understood as matrix inequalities, where  $A \geq B$  means that  $A - B$  is positive semidefinite.

Beyond these minimal axioms, additional structural requirements are often imposed.

(ii) *Faithfulness*: A resource monotone  $M$  is *faithful* if, in addition to (i-a),

$$M(\rho) = 0 \implies \rho \in \mathcal{F}. \quad (15)$$

(iii) *Convexity*:

$$M\left(\sum_i \lambda_i \rho_i\right) \leq \sum_i \lambda_i M(\rho_i), \quad \lambda_i \geq 0, \quad \sum_i \lambda_i = 1, \quad (16)$$

expressing that classical mixing of states cannot increase the resource on average.

(iv) *Strong monotonicity*:

Let  $\{\Phi_k\}_{k \in K}$  be completely positive maps such that the associated quantum-classical (QC) measurement channel  $\sum_k \Phi_k(\cdot) \otimes |k\rangle \langle k|_C$  belongs to the set of free operations  $\mathcal{O}$ , where  $C$  is a “classical” register with an orthonormal basis  $\{|k\rangle\}$ . Such QC measurement channels may not be allowed as free operations in every resource theory. Indeed, in some resource theories, e.g. quantum thermodynamics, no such free channels are allowed at all. When they are allowed, however, we call the measurement  $\{\Phi_k\}_{k \in K}$  *free*. With respect to free measurements, strong monotonicity is defined as follows. Starting from a state  $\rho$ , outcome  $k$  occurs with probability

$$p_k := \text{Tr}[\Phi_k(\rho)], \quad (17)$$

and post-measurement state

$$\rho_k := \frac{\Phi_k(\rho)}{p_k}. \quad (18)$$

Strong monotonicity requires

$$\sum_k p_k M(\rho_k) \leq M(\rho). \quad (19)$$

We remark that a measure  $M$  satisfies strong monotonicity if it satisfies the following two properties for an arbitrary QC state  $\sum_k q_k \eta_k \otimes |k\rangle \langle k|_C$ : (a) *Linear convexity*:  $M(\sum_k q_k \eta_k \otimes |k\rangle \langle k|_C) = \sum_k q_k M(\eta_k \otimes |k\rangle \langle k|_C)$ , and (b) *Invariance under classical flags*:  $M(\eta_k \otimes |k\rangle \langle k|_C) = M(\eta_k)$ .

(v) *Additivity.*

$$M(\rho \otimes \sigma) = M(\rho) + M(\sigma), \quad (20)$$

which in particular implies  $M(\rho^{\otimes n}) = n M(\rho)$ .

(vi) *Completeness for i.i.d. convertibility.* Assume the resource theory  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{O})$  is consistently defined on tensor-product systems so that free operations can act on  $N$  copies of the system and produce  $\lfloor rN \rfloor$  copies of another system. For two resource states  $\rho, \sigma \notin \mathcal{F}$ , define the optimal asymptotic conversion rate  $R(\rho \rightarrow \sigma)$  as the largest real number  $r \geq 0$  such that there exists a sequence of free operations

$$\Phi_N : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}), \quad N \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (21)$$

satisfying

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \Phi_N(\rho^{\otimes N}) - \sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \right\|_1 = 0, \quad (22)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_1$  denotes the trace norm. We say that a set of resource monotone  $\{M_i\}$  is *i.i.d. complete* if for any resource states  $\rho, \sigma$  in some subclass of states, e.g. pure states,

$$R(\rho \rightarrow \sigma) = \sup\{r \mid \forall i, M_i(\rho) \geq r M_i(\sigma)\}. \quad (23)$$

In particular, when each  $M_i$  is a real number, i.e.  $\mathcal{X} = [0, \infty)$ , the above condition becomes

$$R(\rho \rightarrow \sigma) = \min_i \frac{M_i(\rho)}{M_i(\sigma)}, \quad (24)$$

and furthermore, when  $\{M_i\}$  contains only single real-number measure  $M$ ,

$$R(\rho \rightarrow \sigma) = \frac{M(\rho)}{M(\sigma)}. \quad (25)$$

Then  $M$  alone determines the optimal rate at which many copies of  $\rho$  can be reversibly converted into copies of  $\sigma$  by free operations. A familiar example is the entanglement entropy: the entanglement entropy determines the optimal rate for the i.i.d. convertibility between any pure states in the entanglement theory [48]. Another example is the quantum Fisher information in the resource theory of asymmetry for the  $U(1)$ -symmetry, which plays an analogous role to the entanglement entropy in the entanglement theory [3–5].

We also define the optimal exact conversion rate  $R_{\text{ex}}(\rho \rightarrow \sigma)$  as the largest real number  $r \geq 0$  such that there exists a sequence of free operations (21) satisfying

$$\Phi_N(\rho^{\otimes N}) = \sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}. \quad (26)$$

There are two main advantages to introducing i.i.d. complete resource measure(s). The first advantage

is purely operational. For example, in the entanglement theory, one often considers distillation protocols, in which many copies of a weakly entangled state are processed to produce copies of a maximally entangled state, namely a Bell pair. If an i.i.d. complete measure exists, it allows one to determine the ultimate efficiency limit of such distillation procedures. Indeed, in entanglement theory, the entanglement entropy is well known to quantify precisely this optimal distillation rate [48].

The second advantage is that resource measures enable a characterization of macroscopic states. Two states  $\psi$  and  $\phi$  satisfying  $R(\psi \rightarrow \phi) = R(\phi \rightarrow \psi) = 1$  are equivalent in the sense that  $\psi^{\otimes N}$  and  $\phi^{\otimes N}$  can be approximately interconverted by free operations. An i.i.d. complete resource measure implies that the equivalence classes of macroscopic states defined by such asymptotic free interconvertibility are fully characterized by a single numerical quantity.

In this language, a quantity is a “good” measure for a given resource precisely when it obeys such axioms for an appropriate choice of free states and free operations. For instance, the entanglement entropy is a good entanglement monotone under LOCC (local operations and classical communication). In the following, we specialize this general structure to the case where the resource is symmetry-breaking.

## B. Resource theory of asymmetry for weak symmetry

We now review the standard formulation of the resource theory of asymmetry [49, 50], a.k.a. the resource theory of quantum reference frames [3]. Let  $G$  be a (compact) group with unitary representation  $U : G \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$ ,  $g \mapsto U_g$ .

**Free states: symmetric states:** A state  $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  is *G-symmetric* (or weak symmetric) if it is invariant under the adjoint action of  $U_g$ :

$$U_g \rho U_g^\dagger = \rho \quad \forall g \in G. \quad (27)$$

The set of free states in the resource theory of asymmetry is

$$\mathcal{F}_G := \{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \mid U_g \rho U_g^\dagger = \rho \ \forall g \in G\}. \quad (28)$$

A useful object is the *group twirling* (or *G-twirling*) channel  $\mathcal{G}$  defined by

$$\mathcal{G}(X) := \int_G dg U_g X U_g^\dagger, \quad X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), \quad (29)$$

where  $dg$  denotes the normalized Haar measure on  $G$ . This defines a CPTP map  $\mathcal{G} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ . For states  $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  we have  $\mathcal{G}(\rho) \in \mathcal{F}_G$ , and

$$\mathcal{G}(\sigma) = \sigma \quad \text{for all } \sigma \in \mathcal{F}_G. \quad (30)$$

**Free operations: covariant channels:** The standard free operations in the resource theory of asymmetry are  $G$ -covariant quantum channels.

A CPTP map

$$\Phi : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}') \quad (31)$$

is  $G$ -covariant (or  $(U, U')$ -covariant) if  $\Phi$  satisfies the following condition for a unitary representation  $U' : G \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}')$

$$\Phi(U_g X U_g^\dagger) = U'_g \Phi(X) U'_g^\dagger \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), \forall g \in G. \quad (32)$$

We denote the set of  $G$ -covariant channels by  $\mathcal{O}_G$ . By construction, such channels map symmetric states to symmetric states: if  $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}_G$  then  $\Phi(\sigma) \in \mathcal{F}_G$ . Thus  $(\mathcal{F}_G, \mathcal{O}_G)$  forms a resource theory in which any deviation from  $G$ -symmetry is interpreted as a resource.

Intuitively, a covariant operation can be understood as an operation that is realized by interacting the system with an environment prepared in a symmetric state, through an interaction that respects the symmetry. Indeed, the following theorem holds:

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $G$  be a group, and let  $U : G \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$  and  $U' : G \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}')$  be unitary representations acting on  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{H}'$ . Let a CPTP map  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$  be a  $(U, U')$ -covariant operation. Then, there exist two auxiliary Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{H}_E$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{E'}$  satisfying  $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_E \cong \mathcal{H}' \otimes \mathcal{H}_{E'}$ , a unitary operator  $V : \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_E \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{S'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{E'}$ , two (projective) unitary representations  $\{U_g^{(E)}\}_{g \in G}$  and  $\{U_g^{(E')}\}_{g \in G}$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}_E$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{E'}$ , and a symmetric state  $\sigma_E$  on the ancillary system  $E$  such that*

$$(U'_g \otimes U_g^{(E')}) V = V (U_g \otimes U_g^{(E)}) \quad \forall g \in G, \quad (33)$$

$$\sigma_E = U_g^{(E)} \sigma_E (U_g^{(E)})^\dagger \quad \forall g \in G, \quad (34)$$

$$\Lambda(\rho) = \text{Tr}_{E'} [V(\rho \otimes \sigma_E) V^\dagger]. \quad (35)$$

Conversely, when a CPTP map  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$  can be realized by  $(V, \sigma_E)$  satisfying (33)–(35), the map is  $(U, U')$ -covariant.

**Covariant measurements:** To discuss strong monotonicity, we also introduce QC states and free measurements. We define a classical register as a system on which the unitary representation of the group  $G$  is always given by the identity operator  $I$ . A QC state is then taken to be of the form

$$\sum_k p_k \rho_k \otimes |k\rangle \langle k|_C.$$

We define a  $(U, U')$ -covariant measurement  $\{\Psi_k : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')\}$  as a collection of completely positive maps such that the associated QC channel

$$\sum_k \Psi_k(\cdot) \otimes |k\rangle \langle k|_C$$

is a  $(U, U' \otimes I_C)$ -covariant operation. Note that  $\{\Psi_k\}$  is a  $(U, U')$ -covariant measurement iff each CP map  $\Psi_k$  is individually  $(U, U')$ -covariant.

### C. Asymmetry monotones for weak symmetry

Within this framework, a good quantifier of symmetry breaking is a resource monotone for the resource theory  $(\mathcal{F}_G, \mathcal{O}_G)$ .

#### 1. Relative entropy of asymmetry

We now recall the relative entropy of asymmetry, which plays a central role in our work.

**Relative entropy of asymmetry (a.k.a. Entanglement asymmetry):** Given a symmetry group  $G$  and its twirling channel  $\mathcal{G}$ , the *relative entropy of asymmetry* [1, 2] is defined by

$$A_G(\rho) := \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}_G} S(\rho \|\sigma), \quad (36)$$

where  $S(\rho \|\sigma) := \text{Tr}[\rho(\log \rho - \log \sigma)]$  is the relative entropy. Equivalently, it is written as [2]

$$A_G(\rho) = S(\rho \|\mathcal{G}(\rho)) = S(\mathcal{G}(\rho)) - S(\rho), \quad (37)$$

with  $S(\rho) := -\text{Tr}[\rho \log \rho]$  the von Neumann entropy. The relative entropy of asymmetry  $A_G$  satisfies: (i) *the minimal requirements (i-a) and (i-b) as a resource monotone* [1], (ii) *Faithfulness* [1], (iii) *Convexity* [51], and (iv) *Strong monotonicity* [1].

The quantity  $A_G$  thus provides a mathematically well-defined and operationally meaningful measure of symmetry breaking with respect to  $G$ : it vanishes exactly on symmetric states, does not increase under  $G$ -covariant operations. In this way, resource theory singles out canonical measures such as the relative entropy of asymmetry, and also provides a systematic language for comparing and selecting among multiple candidate quantifiers of symmetry breaking.

#### 2. Complete monotones for the i.i.d. convertibility

The virtues of the relative entropy of asymmetry are that it is faithful and can be defined for any group  $G$  for which the twirling operation is well defined. However, as we will discuss later, the rate of this quantity  $A_G(\rho^{\otimes N})/N$  vanishes in the independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) asymptotic limit and therefore cannot characterize the optimal ratio of the conversions between the i.i.d. states. In other words, the measures that play the role analogous to the entanglement entropy in entanglement theory—an i.i.d. complete monotone—must be different quantities. In the case of weak symmetry, it has been clarified for various symmetries which quantities serve as such i.i.d. complete monotones. In the following, we briefly review these results.

**U(1): Quantum Fisher information:** Given a unitary representation  $\{e^{-iHt}\}_{t \in [0, 2\pi]}$  of  $U(1)$  and its generator  $H$ , the *Symmetrized Logarithmic Derivative (SLD)-quantum Fisher information* [52] for the state family  $\{e^{-iHt}\rho e^{iHt}\}$  is defined by

$$\mathcal{I}_H(\rho) := 2 \sum_{k,l} \frac{(p_k - p_l)^2}{p_k + p_l} |\langle k | H | l \rangle|^2, \quad (38)$$

where  $\{p_k, |k\rangle\}$  are the eigenvalues and eigenstates of  $\rho$ . This quantity is also called *SLD-skew information* [53]:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_H(\rho) := \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{I}_H(\rho). \quad (39)$$

When  $\rho$  is pure, it is equal to 4 times of the variance of  $L$ :

$$\mathcal{I}_H(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = 4V_H(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|), \quad (40)$$

where  $V_H(\rho) := \text{Tr}[H^2\rho] - \text{Tr}[H\rho]^2$ . The Fisher information  $\mathcal{I}_H(\rho)$  satisfies: (i) *the minimal requirements (i-a) and (i-b) as a resource monotone* [54], (ii) *Faithfulness* [54], (iii) *Convexity* [54], and (iv) *Strong monotonicity* [54], and (v) *Additivity* [53]. Furthermore, it also satisfies (vi) *Completeness for i.i.d. convertibility between pure states* [3] and from a pure state to a mixed state [5]:

$$R(|\psi\rangle\rightarrow|\phi\rangle) = \frac{\mathcal{I}_H(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)}{\mathcal{I}_H(|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|)}, \quad (41)$$

when  $\text{Sym}_{U(1)}(\psi) \subset \text{Sym}_{U(1)}(\phi)$ , where  $\text{Sym}_G(\rho) := \{g \in G | U_g \rho U_g^\dagger = \rho\}$ . (If  $\text{Sym}_{U(1)}(\psi) \not\subset \text{Sym}_{U(1)}(\phi)$ ,  $R(\psi \rightarrow \phi) = 0$ .)

This quantity is also computationally accessible in many-body physics and can serve as a useful indicator of symmetry breaking. For instance, in the BCS model, it is proportional to the number of Cooper pairs, and allows us to analyze the quantum Mbemba effect in the thermodynamic limit [39]. Another related topic is the conversion theory. In the case of  $U(1)$  symmetry, the asymptotic convertibility of pure states beyond the i.i.d. regime (i.e. allowing arbitrary correlations) admits both a necessary condition and a sufficient condition, given by an extension of the quantum Fisher information [55, 56].

**Compact Lie group: Quantum geometric tensor**  
Given a compact Lie group  $G$  and its (projective) unitary representation  $U_{g \in G}$ , the *quantum geometric tensor* [57, 58] for a pure state  $|\psi\rangle$  is defined by

$$\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}^\psi := \langle \psi | X_i X_j | \psi \rangle - \langle \psi | X_i | \psi \rangle \langle \psi | X_j | \psi \rangle, \quad (42)$$

where  $\{X_i\}$  are the Hermitian operators defined as

$$X_i := -i \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda^i} U_{g(\lambda)}|_{\lambda=0} \quad (43)$$

and  $g(\lambda) = e^{i \sum_i \lambda^i A_i}$  is a parametrization of elements in the neighborhood of the identity  $e \in G$  with a basis  $\{A_i\}$

of the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ . The quantum geometric tensor  $\mathcal{Q}^\psi$  satisfies: (i) *the minimal requirements (i-a) and (i-b) as a resource monotone* [7], (ii) *Faithfulness* [7], (iv) *Strong monotonicity* [7], and (v) *Additivity* [7]. Furthermore, it also satisfies (vi) *Completeness for i.i.d. convertibility between pure states* [7]: when  $\text{Sym}_G(\psi) \subset \text{Sym}_G(\phi)$ ,

$$R(|\psi\rangle\rightarrow|\phi\rangle) = \sup\{r \geq 0 | \mathcal{Q}^\psi \geq r \mathcal{Q}^\phi\}. \quad (44)$$

(If  $\text{Sym}_G(\psi) \not\subset \text{Sym}_G(\phi)$ ,  $R(\psi \rightarrow \phi) = 0$ .)

While the quantum geometric tensor is a powerful quantity, its established definition is limited to pure states. For mixed states, we can employ the SLD-quantum Fisher information matrix, which satisfies the properties (i)-(v) of resource measure for an arbitrary connected Lie group (and (i) and (iii)-(v) for non-connected Lie group) [59]:

$$\mathcal{I}_{i,j}^\rho := 2 \sum_{k,l} \frac{(p_k - p_l)^2}{p_k + p_l} \langle k | X_i | l \rangle \langle l | X_j | k \rangle, \quad (45)$$

where  $\{p_k, |k\rangle\}$  are the eigenvalues and eigenstates of  $\rho$ . For pure states, the quantum Fisher information matrix coincides with the real part of the quantum geometric tensor.

**Finite group: logarithmic fidelity-based characteristic function:** Given a finite group  $G$  and its (projective) unitary representation  $U$ , we define the *logarithmic fidelity-based characteristic function (LFCF)* as

$$LF_{G,g}(\rho) := -\log F(\rho, U_g \rho U_g^\dagger), \quad (46)$$

where  $F(\rho, \sigma) := \text{Tr}[\sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma}\rho\sqrt{\sigma}}]$  is the Uhlmann fidelity. When  $\rho$  is pure, the LFCF coincides with the logarithmic characteristic function (LCF)  $L_{G,g}(\rho) := -\log |\text{Tr}[U_g \rho]|$ , which is defined only for pure states in Ref. [6]. For any  $g \in G$ ,  $LF_{G,g}(\rho)$  satisfies (i) *the minimal requirements (i-a) and (i-b) as a resource monotone*, (iii) *Convexity*, (iv) *Strong monotonicity*, and (v) *Additivity*. And the set  $\{LF_{G,g}(\rho)\}_{g \in G}$  satisfies (ii) *Faithfulness*:  $\rho \in \mathcal{F}_G$  iff  $LF_{G,g}(\rho) = 0$  for any  $g \in G$ . In these properties, (i), (ii) and (v) for pure states are shown in Ref. [6] using the techniques in Ref. [50], and (i)-(v) for any states are shown in Appendix A of this paper.

Furthermore, the set  $\{LF_{G,g}(\rho)\}_{g \in G}$  satisfies (vi) *Completeness for i.i.d. convertibility between pure states* [6]: when  $\text{Sym}_G(\psi) \subset \text{Sym}_G(\phi)$  holds,

$$R_{\text{ex}}(|\psi\rangle\rightarrow|\phi\rangle) = \min_{g \in G} \frac{LF_{G,g}(\psi)}{LF_{G,g}(\phi)}. \quad (47)$$

If  $\text{Sym}_G(\psi) \not\subset \text{Sym}_G(\phi)$ ,  $R_{\text{ex}}(\psi \rightarrow \phi) = 0$ .

As an important remark, for finite groups, the usual asymptotic conversion rate satisfies the following property [6]:

$$R(|\psi\rangle\rightarrow|\phi\rangle) = \begin{cases} 0 & (\text{Sym}_G(\psi) \not\subset \text{Sym}_G(\phi)) \\ \infty & (\text{Otherwise}) \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

### III. RESOURCE-THEORETIC RESULTS FOR WEAK SYMMETRY

Before turning to strong symmetry, it is useful to highlight what one can learn by applying the resource theory to weak symmetry. In this section, we briefly summarize two simple but important results. Both rely on taking the basic axioms of a resource monotone seriously (faithfulness, monotonicity under free operations, etc.), and both illustrate how resource theory helps to discriminate between “good” and “merely convenient” measures of symmetry breaking.

#### A. Rényi-2 proxies are not resource monotones

Motivated by the simplicity of Rényi entropies, a “second Rényi” analogue of the relative entropy of asymmetry,

$$A_G^{(2)}(\rho) := S^{(2)}(\mathcal{G}(\rho)) - S^{(2)}(\rho), \quad S^{(2)}(\rho) := -\log \text{Tr}(\rho^2), \quad (49)$$

or closely related quantities have been considered [8–12, 14–16, 18, 20, 25, 30, 60, 61]. Such quantities are easy to compute and often behave qualitatively like  $A_G$  in explicit examples, so they have been widely used in the context of symmetry breaking.

The quantity,  $A_G^{(2)}(\rho) = 0$  if and only if  $\rho$  is weak-symmetric, hence a nice proxy as an indicator of symmetry breaking. However, as a “quantifier”, it fails the crucial test of monotonicity under free operations (symmetric operation). Hence, one should not use  $A_G^{(2)}(\rho)$  *solely* to infer anything about “amount” of symmetry breaking, e.g. to deduce quantum Mpemba effect.

Consider a single qubit with a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetry generated by the Pauli operator  $X$ , so that the twirling map is  $\mathcal{G}_X(\rho) = \frac{1}{2}(\rho + X\rho X)$ . Then the  $Z$ -basis dephasing channel

$$\Delta_Z(\rho) = \sum_{s=\pm 1} P_s \rho P_s, \quad P_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{1} \pm Z) \quad (50)$$

is  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -covariant (hence free), yet it can strictly *increase* the Rényi-2 proxy. For example, for

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2} \left( \mathbf{1} + \frac{1}{2}X + \frac{1}{2}Z \right), \quad (51)$$

one finds

$$A_G^{(2)}(\Delta_Z(\rho)) > A_G^{(2)}(\rho). \quad (52)$$

We present the detailed calculation in Appendix B.

Thus,  $A_G^{(2)}$  can be strictly *increased* by free operations, and therefore fails to be a resource monotone, even though it looks natural and is convenient in many-body calculations. Accordingly,  $A_G^{(2)}$  should be regarded as a model-dependent proxy whose behavior must be interpreted with care, rather than as a principled, universally

valid quantifier of weak symmetry breaking. For example, from the results of  $A_G^{(2)}$  alone, one cannot determine precisely whether the quantum Mpemba effect is occurring. This simple but important application to physics clearly illustrates the usefulness of the resource-theoretic framework, since it is impossible to discuss monotonicity rigorously without resource theory.

#### B. Relative entropy of asymmetry and the thermodynamic limit

For weak symmetry with respect to a compact group  $G$ , the standard resource-theoretic measure is the relative entropy of asymmetry  $A_G$ . For many-body systems, however, resource theory also makes the limitation of  $A_G$  transparent.

It is known that the quantity  $A_G$  exhibits at most logarithmic growth in the system size  $L$  in two cases: i.i.d. states  $\rho^{\otimes L}$  of any state  $\rho$  [2] and translationally invariant matrix product states (MPS) with finite bond dimension [18]. Therefore, in at least these two cases, the asymmetry density vanishes in the thermodynamic limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\frac{A_G(\rho_L)}{L} \rightarrow 0. \quad (53)$$

In resource-theoretic language,  $A_G$  is not additive and not extensive, and consequently cannot be a complete measure determining optimal asymptotic conversion rates between many copies of resource states. Thus, while  $A_G$  is conceptually clean and operationally meaningful at finite size, it does not define a nontrivial extensive resource measure in the thermodynamic limit and therefore is not an appropriate thermodynamic quantifier of weak symmetry breaking. This conclusion naturally emerges once one asks for additivity and completeness within the resource theory, and it motivates the search for alternative measures (such as the quantum Fisher information) when dealing with macroscopic systems [39].

These examples show the practical value of the resource theory. They do not only generate new candidates; they also provide a systematic way to test and sometimes rule out quantities that are introduced ad hoc. In the remainder of the paper, we will adopt the same philosophy for strong symmetry: we will first specify the appropriate notion of free states and free operations, and then derive a measure of strong symmetry breaking that satisfies the basic resource-theoretic requirements by construction.

### IV. RESOURCE THEORY OF ASYMMETRY FOR STRONG SYMMETRY

Now, let us formulate the resource theory of asymmetry for strong symmetry. Throughout this section, we restrict attention to finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces and provide proofs under this assumption, as is common in

many resource theories. We expect that the framework and most of the results themselves do not rely on finite dimensionality, and many of the quantities we introduce remain well defined (and often computable) in physically relevant infinite-dimensional settings. See section VI for examples, where we compute asymmetry in the settings involving CFT.

### A. Free states and free operations

We first define the free states. A natural choice is to take the following “strong symmetric states” as free states.

**Free states: Strong symmetric states:** Let  $S$  be a quantum system, and let  $G$  be a group with a (projective) unitary representation  $U$  acting on  $S$ . A state  $\rho$  on  $S$  is said to be strong symmetric with respect to  $U$  if it satisfies

$$U_g \rho = e^{i\theta_{g,\rho}} \rho, \quad \forall g \in G, \quad (54)$$

where  $\theta_{g,\rho}$  is a real-valued function of  $g$  and  $\rho$ . We refer to the whole set of strong symmetric states as  $\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$ .

The intuition behind this class becomes clear when we consider the case of  $U(1)$  symmetry. For example, if  $U$  can be expressed as  $\{e^{iQ\theta}\}$ , then a strong symmetric state is simply an (not necessarily pure) eigenstate of  $Q$ . This class of states is a natural extension of symmetric states and is widely used in the field of condensed matter physics. Hereafter, we refer to symmetric states for weak symmetry as weak symmetric states.

An important remark on this class is that there are many cases where no strong symmetric state exists. As an example of such cases, let us consider the situation where the system of interest is a qubit,  $G$  is  $SU(2)$ , and  $U$  is the natural irreducible unitary representation of  $SU(2)$  acting on the qubit:  $U_g := e^{-i\frac{\theta_g}{2}\vec{n}_g \cdot \vec{\sigma}}$ , where  $\theta_g$  is a real parameter describing the rotation angle,  $\vec{n}_g$  is a real vector parameter defined as  $\vec{n}_g := (n_x(g), n_y(g), n_z(g))$  describing the rotation axis, and  $\vec{\sigma} := (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$  denotes the Pauli operators. Then, for any strong symmetric state  $\rho$ , the condition  $U_g \rho U_g^\dagger = \rho$  must hold for all  $g \in G$ . Since the representation  $U$  is irreducible, it follows that  $\rho = I/2$ . However, since  $U$  includes  $\sigma_x$ , we have  $\sigma_x \rho = \sigma_x/2 \not\propto \rho$ . This leads to a contradiction, and hence there is no strong symmetric state in this case. We further note that for Abelian group, the strong symmetric states always exist, only in the case of non-Abelian symmetry, the subtlety as mentioned in this paragraph may appear.

To compensate for the limitation, we introduce another class of states as follows:

**Additional class of states: Single-sector states:** Let  $S$  be a quantum system, and let  $G$  be a group with a (projective) unitary representation  $U$  acting on  $S$ . We

assume that  $U_{g \in G}$  admits the following irreducible decomposition:

$$U_g = \bigoplus_{\nu} U_g^{(\nu)} \otimes I_{m_{\nu}}, \quad (55)$$

where  $m_{\nu}$  denotes the multiplicity of the irrep labeled by  $\nu$ . Correspondingly, the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  can be decomposed as

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{\nu} \mathcal{H}_{\nu} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m_{\nu}}. \quad (56)$$

A state  $\rho$  on  $S$  is said to be *single-sector* with respect to  $U$  if it is weak symmetric with respect to  $U$  and satisfies

$$\exists \nu \text{ such that } P_{\nu} \rho P_{\nu} = \rho, \quad (57)$$

where  $P_{\nu}$  is the projection operator onto  $\mathcal{H}_{\nu} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m_{\nu}}$ . We refer to the whole set of single-sector states as  $\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{single}}$ .

Clearly, any single-sector state  $\rho$  must take the following form (note that a single-sector state is also weak symmetric):

$$\rho = \frac{I_{\nu}}{d_{\nu}} \otimes \rho_{m_{\nu}}, \quad (58)$$

where  $I_{\nu}$  is the identity operator on  $\mathcal{H}_{\nu}$ ,  $d_{\nu} := \text{Tr } I_{\nu}$  and  $\rho_{m_{\nu}}$  is a quantum state on  $\mathbb{C}^{m_{\nu}}$ .

When  $G = U(1)$ , the single-sector states coincide with the strong symmetric states. For a general group  $G$ , however, the single-sector states constitute a distinct class from the strong symmetric states. They always include all strong symmetric states and exist even in situations where no strong symmetric state exists. The relationship among weak symmetric, single-sector, and strong symmetric states is illustrated in Figure 1.

**Examples:** Let us unpack the definitions above for the purpose of illustration. We consider a single qubit system. Using the Bloch-sphere representation, we have

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{1} + r_x X + r_y Y + r_z Z), \quad (59)$$

where  $\vec{r} = (r_x, r_y, r_z)$  lies on/inside the Bloch-sphere i.e.  $|\vec{r}| \leq 1$ . There is a natural action of  $SU(2)$  on the space of these density matrices: it rotates the vector  $\vec{r}$ . We further consider the  $U(1)$  subgroup, generated by  $Z$ .

The weak-symmetric states under  $U(1)$  are given by the following family of density matrices, parametrized by  $0 \leq p \leq 1$ .

$$\rho_{[p]} := \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1-p \end{pmatrix} \quad (60)$$

Among these, there exist only two strong symmetric states under  $U(1)$ , given by  $\rho_{[0]}$  and  $\rho_{[1]}$ . In terms of Bloch-vectors,  $\vec{r} = (0, 0, r)$  denotes the weak symmetric ones (with  $2p = 1+r$ ), and  $(0, 0, \pm 1)$  denotes the strong symmetric ones. As previously mentioned, strong symmetry is equivalent single-sector-ness for Abelian group.




FIG. 1. Classifications of states. In the figure, asymmetric states are indicated by the hatched region, whereas symmetric states are shown as the three shaded regions. The set of symmetric states exhibits a three-level nested hierarchical structure, i.e. (strong symmetric)  $\subset$  (single-sector)  $\subset$  (weak symmetric). The important features of this structure is the following four: (a) There exist cases where (strong symmetric)  $\subsetneq$  (single-sector) and (single-sector)  $\subsetneq$  (weak symmetric) hold. (b) When  $G = U(1)$ , (strong symmetric) = (single-sector) holds. (c) When  $G$  is some non-Abelian group, sometimes there are no strong symmetric states. (d) For any  $G$ , there is at least a single-sector state.

Now let us turn our attention to  $SU(2)$ , the only vector, invariant under  $SU(2)$  is the zero vector corresponding to  $\rho = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1} = \rho_{[1/2]}$ . This is the *only* weak-symmetric state under  $SU(2)$ . Note that  $\rho_{[p]}$ , in spite of being diagonal, is not weak-symmetric under  $SU(2)$  unless  $p = 1/2$ . Moreover,  $\rho_{[1/2]}$  is also a single sector state because it obeys (58), with  $\nu$  being the spin-1/2 irrep of  $SU(2)$  and  $m_\nu = 1$ . Furthermore, as mentioned before, there is no strong symmetric state in this case.

To explore further, we consider a two-qubit system. Again,  $SU(2)$  has a natural action. Now we have spin-1 irrep and spin-0 irrep. In the basis adapted to spin-1 irrep and spin-0 irrep, the weak-symmetric density matrices under  $SU(2)$  are given by the following family, parametrized by  $0 \leq p \leq 1/3$ :

$$\rho_{2\text{-qubit}[p]} := \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & p & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & p & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1-3p \end{pmatrix} \quad (61)$$

Once again, any diagonal density matrix may not be weak-symmetric. It has to be of the form given above. The *only* two single-sector states are  $\rho_{2\text{-qubit}[0]}$  and  $\rho_{2\text{-qubit}[1/3]}$ . The *only* strong-symmetric state is  $\rho_{2\text{-qubit}[0]}$ . Note that for non-abelian group, the strong-symmetric state exist only if there exists a single-sector state, transforming under dimension 1 irrep of the relevant group.

These examples illustrate the Venn-diagram, depicted in the figure. 1 .

As we shall see later, both the strong symmetric states and the single-sector states can serve as free states under strong symmetry. Moreover, faithful resource measures can be defined for each of them. We remark that, while single-sector states constitute a broader class that includes the strong symmetric states in general, for abelian groups, they are identical. In this paper, we treat the strong symmetric states as the free states, while also discussing the results for the single-sector states.

Next, let us define the free operations:

**Free operations: strong covariant operations:** Let  $G$  be a group, and let  $U$  and  $U'$  be unitary representations of  $G$  acting on two Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{H}'$ , respectively. A CPTP map  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$  is said to be  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant if it satisfies

$$\Lambda(U_g \dots) = U'_g \Lambda(\dots) \quad \forall g \in G. \quad (62)$$

We refer to the whole set of strong covariant operations as  $\mathcal{O}_{G,\text{strong}}$ .

The following theorem ensures that the above definitions of free states and free operations give rise to a well-defined resource theory.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $G$  be a (compact) group, and let  $U$ ,  $U'$  and  $U''$  be unitary representations acting on Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}'$  and  $\mathcal{H}''$ , respectively. Then, the following three are valid:*

- (i) *The identity operation on  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is  $(U, U)$ -strong covariant.*
- (ii) *If  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$  and  $\Lambda' : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}') \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}'')$  are  $(U, U')$ - and  $(U', U'')$ -strong covariant, respectively,  $\Lambda' \circ \Lambda$  is also  $(U, U'')$ -strong covariant.*
- (iii) *If  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$  is a  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant CPTP map, the following relations hold:*

$$\rho \in \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}} \Rightarrow \Lambda(\rho) \in \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}, \quad (63)$$

$$\rho \in \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{single}} \Rightarrow \Lambda(\rho) \in \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{single}}. \quad (64)$$

Namely, either the combination of  $(\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}, \mathcal{O}_{G,\text{strong}})$  or  $(\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{single}}, \mathcal{O}_{G,\text{strong}})$  satisfies the minimal requirements of the resource theory.

## B. Physical realization and Kraus representation of strong covariant operations

Intuitively, a strong covariant operation can be understood as an operation realized by dynamics that do not exchange any conserved quantity with the environment. Indeed, the following theorem is valid:

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $G$  be a (compact) group, and let  $U$  be a unitary representation acting on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . Let  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  be a  $(U, U)$ -strong covariant CPTP map. Then, there exists a auxiliary Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_E$ , a unitary operator  $V$  on  $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$ , and a state  $\sigma_E \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_E)$  such that*

$$(U_g \otimes I^{(E)}) V = V (U_g \otimes I^{(E)}) \quad \forall g \in G, \quad (65)$$

$$\Lambda(\rho) = \text{Tr}_E [V(\rho \otimes \sigma_E)V^\dagger]. \quad (66)$$




FIG. 2. Schematic diagram of physical realization of operations that are strong covariant with respect to particle number and weak covariant with respect to energy. The system exchanges energy with an external heat bath, while no particles are exchanged.

Conversely, when a CPTP map  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  can be realized by  $(V, \sigma_E)$  satisfying (65) and (66), the map is  $(U, U)$ -strong covariant.

By comparing this theorem with Theorem 1, one can gain an intuitive understanding of the difference between weak covariant and strong covariant operations. As an illustrative example, consider a thermodynamic process involving multiple conserved quantities. Suppose that the system of interest has both particle number  $N$  and energy  $E$  as conserved quantities, but that it exchanges only energy  $E$  with a heat bath, while no exchange of particle number occurs. Assume that the heat bath is prepared in a Gibbs state with respect to its Hamiltonian  $H_B$ , which is a weak symmetric state.

In such a setting, Theorem 3 guarantees that the CPTP map induced on the system  $S$  is strong covariant with respect to the unitary representation  $e^{iN_S t}$  generated by the particle-number operator  $N_S$ . At the same time, it is only weak covariant with respect to the unitary representation  $e^{iH_S t}$  generated by the Hamiltonian, reflecting the fact that energy is exchanged with the heat bath (Figure 2).

Furthermore, the Kraus operators of a strong covariant operation always commute with the unitary representation  $U_g$  of the symmetry. This statement can be established by the following theorem:

**Theorem 4.** Let  $G$  be a (compact) group, and let  $U$  and  $U'$  be unitary representations acting on Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{H}'$ , respectively. Let  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$  be a  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant CPTP map. Then, any Kraus representation  $\{K_m\}$  of  $\Lambda$  satisfies

$$K_m U_g = U'_g K_m, \quad \forall g \in G. \quad (67)$$

Conversely, when a CPTP map  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$  has a Kraus representation satisfying (67), it is  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant.

This is consistent with the definition of strong symmetry in cond-mat literature, see e.g. [46, 47, 62], in particular, sec. II.B of [47]. As a consequence of Theorem 4, it follows that if the time evolution generated by the Gorini–Kossakowski–Sudarshan–Lindblad (GKSL) equation is strong covariant, then all jump operators necessarily commute with the symmetry:

**Theorem 5.** Let  $S$  be a quantum system whose dynamics obeys the following GKSL equation:

$$\partial_t \rho = -i[H, \rho] + \sum_k \left( L_k \rho L_k^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{L_k^\dagger L_k, \rho\} \right). \quad (68)$$

Let  $G$  and  $U$  be a group and its (projective) unitary representation on  $\mathcal{H}$ , the Hilbert space of  $S$ . We also assume that the CPTP map  $\Lambda_t : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  realized by the master equation is  $(U, U)$ -strong covariant for any  $t$ , and that  $[H, U_g] = 0$ . Then, any jump operators  $\{L_k\}$  of the GKSL equation satisfy

$$[L_k, U_g] = 0, \quad \forall g \in G. \quad (69)$$

Although there may exist multiple sets of jump operators  $\{L_k\}$  that generate the same time evolution, (69) holds for any such choice.

### C. Relation between strong covariant and weak covariant

We make several remarks on the relation between the strong covariant operations and the weak covariant operations. First, by definition, any strong covariant operation is also weak covariant. Second, the converse is not true. Two illustrative examples of weak covariant operations which are not always strong covariant are as follows:

**The partial trace:** The partial trace is not always a strong covariant operation. As an example, consider two qubits  $S$  and  $S'$ , and equip the composite system with a  $U(1)$  symmetry represented by

$$U_t := e^{-i(H_S + H_{S'})t}, \quad (70)$$

where  $H_S = |1\rangle\langle 1|_S$  and  $H_{S'} = |1\rangle\langle 1|_{S'}$ . In this setting, the state

$$|\psi\rangle_{SS'} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |10\rangle) \quad (71)$$

is a strong symmetric state. However, tracing out  $S'$  yields the reduced state

$$\rho_S = \frac{1}{2}(|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|), \quad (72)$$

which is not strong symmetric. Therefore, in this example, taking the partial trace over  $S'$  is not a strong covariant operation.

We stress that, sometimes the partial trace is strong covariant. Indeed, for two Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_E$ , let us assume that  $U : G \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_E)$  and  $U' : G \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H})$  satisfy

$$U_g = V_g \otimes I_E \quad (73)$$

$$U'_g = V_g, \quad (74)$$

where  $V : G \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H})$  is a unitary representation acting on  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then, we can show that the partial trace  $\text{Tr}_E$  is  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}_E[U_g(\cdot)] &= V_g \sum_j \langle j|_E(\cdot) |j\rangle_E \\ &= U'_g \text{Tr}_E[\cdot]. \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

Therefore, the partial trace taken in Theorem 3 is a free (=strong covariant) operation.

**Appending a strong symmetric state:** Appending a strong symmetric state may also fail to be a strong covariant operation, depending on the situation. This can be seen by revisiting the two-qubit example above with systems  $S$  and  $S'$ . Define a map  $\Lambda : S \rightarrow SS'$  by

$$\Lambda(\cdot) = (\cdot) \otimes |1\rangle \langle 1|_{S'}. \quad (76)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-i(H_S + H_{S'})t} \Lambda(|0\rangle \langle 0|) &= e^{-i(H_S + H_{S'})t} |0\rangle \langle 0|_S \otimes |1\rangle \langle 1|_{S'} \\ &= e^{-it} \Lambda(|0\rangle \langle 0|) \\ &\neq \Lambda(e^{-iH_{S'}} |0\rangle \langle 0|), \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

and hence  $\Lambda$  is not strong covariant.

We stress that, as the partial trace, sometimes the map appending a strong symmetric state is strong covariant. Indeed, for two Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_E$ , let us assume that  $U : G \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H})$  and  $U' : G \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_E)$  satisfy

$$U_g = V_g \quad (78)$$

$$U'_g = V_g \otimes I_E, \quad (79)$$

where  $V : G \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H})$  is a unitary representation acting on  $\mathcal{H}$ . Now, let us define a CPTP map  $\Lambda_{\text{add}} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_E)$  as  $\Lambda_{\text{add}}(\cdot) := \cdot \otimes \sigma_E$ , where  $\sigma_E$  is an arbitrary state  $\sigma_E \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_E)$ , which is a strong symmetric state with respect to the trivial representation on  $\mathcal{H}_E$ . Then, we can easily see that

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{\text{add}}(U_g) &= (V_g \cdot) \otimes \sigma_E \\ &= U'_g \Lambda_{\text{add}}(\cdot). \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

Therefore, the operation appending  $\sigma_E$  which is taken in Theorem 3 is a free (=strong covariant) operation.

These operations are usually regarded as free operations in standard resource theories, even though they are not included in the minimal requirements for free states and free operations. As a result, readers familiar with resource-theoretic frameworks may find this somewhat unnatural. However, this behavior is a direct consequence of the required property of strong covariant operations: namely, that the channel does not exchange any conserved quantity with the external environment.

This is precisely the property of “strong symmetric-preserving” dynamics often emphasized in previous studies of strong symmetry.

Indeed, the two operations discussed above—the partial trace and the appending of a strong symmetric state—both create an opportunity either to leak conserved quantities to an external system or to inject conserved quantities from the outside into the system of interest. For this reason, neither operation qualifies as strong covariant under our definition.

The restriction that forbids any opportunity for leakage or injection of conserved quantities is very strong, and it imposes several additional constraints on strong covariant operations beyond those discussed above. For example, when a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  has a larger dimension than another Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}'$ , a strong covariant operation from  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  to  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$  does not necessarily exist. An illustrative example is in the case of  $U(1)$  symmetry, as shown in the following lemma:

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{H}'$  be Hilbert spaces whose dimensions are  $d$  and  $d'$ , respectively, and assume  $d > d'$ . Let  $U : U(1) \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H})$  and  $U' : U(1) \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H}')$  be unitary representations which are defined as  $U_t := e^{-iHt}$  and  $U'_t := e^{-iH't}$ , respectively. If  $H$  has strictly more distinct eigenvalues than  $H'$ , then there exists no  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant operation  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$ .*

## D. Resource measures

In this subsection, we introduce resource measures of strong symmetry breaking, which is one of the main goals of this paper. Unless otherwise stated, in this section we treat the strong symmetric states as the free states. When the single-sector states are taken as the free states, it will be explicitly mentioned.

Since the symmetry depends on the choice of the (projective) unitary representation, all quantities introduced in this section are functions of the representation. For simplicity, we omit the explicit dependence on the unitary representation whenever it is clear from the context, and specify it only when necessary. In particular, we write a measure  $M$  as  $M(\rho)$  when the representation is omitted, and write it as  $M(\rho \| U)$  when the representation is explicitly indicated, e.g.  $A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho \| U)$ ,  $L(\rho \| U)$ , etc.

### 1. Measures for general-group symmetry

In this subsection, we introduce two measures which are applicable to a general group  $G$ .

**Definition 1** (Entanglement asymmetry of strong symmetry breaking). *Let  $G$  be a group, and let  $U$  be its (projective) unitary representation acting on a system  $S$ . We assume that  $G$  has Haar measure  $\int_G dg = 1$  and that  $U$*

has the irreducible decomposition

$$U_g = \bigoplus_{\nu} U_g^{(\nu)} \otimes I_{m_{\nu}}. \quad (81)$$

Then, we define  $A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho) &:= H\{p_{\nu}(\rho)\} + S(\mathcal{G}(\rho)) - S(\rho), \\ &= H\{p_{\nu}(\rho)\} + A_G(\rho) \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

where

$$S(\rho) := -\text{Tr}[\rho \log \rho], \quad (83)$$

$$\mathcal{G}(\rho) := \int_G dg U_g \rho U_g^{\dagger}, \quad (84)$$

$$p_{\nu}(\rho) := \text{Tr}[P_{\nu} \mathcal{G}(\rho)] = \text{Tr}[P_{\nu} \rho], \quad (85)$$

$$H\{p_{\nu}\} := -\sum_{\nu} p_{\nu} \log p_{\nu}, \quad (86)$$

and  $P_{\nu}$  is the projection to  $\mathcal{H}_{\nu} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m_{\nu}}$  in the decomposition of  $\mathcal{H}$  under  $U$ :

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{\nu} \mathcal{H}_{\nu} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m_{\nu}}. \quad (87)$$

**Examples:** Let us consider the one qubit example, mentioned earlier:

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{1} + r_x X + r_y Y + r_z Z).$$

For  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  or  $U(1)$ , generated by  $Z$ , we have

$$\mathcal{G}(\rho) = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{1} + r_z Z),$$

so that we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\pm} &= (1 \pm r_z)/2, \\ A_{G,\text{strong}}^{\mathbb{Z}_2/U(1)}(\rho) &= \log 2 - 2f(r_z) + f(|\vec{r}|), \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

with  $f(x) = \frac{1+x}{2} \log(1+x) + \frac{1-x}{2} \log(1-x)$ . Note that

$$0 \leq x \leq y \Leftrightarrow \frac{f(x)}{x^2} \leq \frac{f(y)}{y^2}, \quad (89)$$

(the proof of the inequality can be found in the appendix, in particular, see (B30),(B31),(B32)) from which it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{G,\text{strong}}^{\mathbb{Z}_2/U(1)}(\rho) &= \log 2 - 2f(r_z) + f(|\vec{r}|) \\ &\geq \log 2 - f(r_z) + f(|\vec{r}|) \left(1 - \frac{r_z^2}{|\vec{r}|^2}\right) \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

The first inequality above is saturated if  $r_x = r_y = 0$  and the second inequality is saturated if  $r_z = 1$  (and by evenness if  $r_z = -1$ ). The Bloch vector  $\vec{r} = (0, 0, \pm 1)$  precisely corresponds to strong symmetric states under  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  and  $U(1)$ .

Hence,  $A_{G,\text{strong}}^{\mathbb{Z}_2/U(1)}(\rho)$ , in this example, is faithful i.e. it is zero iff the state is strong-symmetric. This is indeed the case when the group is Abelian. However, as noted in the next example and the theorem, the resource monotone is not faithful when the symmetry group is non-abelian.

For  $SU(2)$ , let us consider the same density matrix  $\rho$ , now the relevant irrep is spin-1/2 representation and  $\mathcal{G}(\rho) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}$ , resulting in  $p_{\nu} = 1$ ,  $H\{p_{\nu}(\rho)\} = 0$  and

$$A_{G,\text{strong}}^{SU(2)} = f(|\vec{r}|) \quad (91)$$

As mentioned previously, there is no strong-symmetric state in this case, however,  $f(0) = 0$ , hence the resource monotone is not faithful.

**Theorem 6.** *The quantity  $A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho)$  satisfies the following features*

**(A):**  *$A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho)$  is a resource measure. Namely, (i-a) it is non-negative and when  $\rho$  is strong symmetric, it is zero, and (i-b) when a CPTP map  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$  is  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant,*

$$A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho\|U) \geq A_{G,\text{strong}}(\Lambda(\rho)\|U') \quad (92)$$

**(B):** *It is faithful when we employ  $\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{single}}$  as free states. In other words,  $A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho) = 0$  if and only if  $\rho$  is a single-sector state.*

**(C):** *It is not necessarily faithful (=property (ii)) when we employ  $\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$  as free states. In other words, there exists a resource state  $\rho$  (=state which is not strong symmetric) satisfying  $A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho) = 0$ .*

**(D):** *When we employ collective representation, it is not additive for product states. In other words, for two systems  $A$  and  $B$ , there exists unitary representations  $U^A$  and  $U^B$  and states  $\rho_A$  and  $\sigma_B$  satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho_A \otimes \sigma_B\|U^A \otimes U^B) \\ \neq A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho_A\|U^A) + A_{G,\text{strong}}(\sigma_B\|U^B). \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

**(E):** *When  $S$  is a finite-dimension system and  $G$  is a compact Lie group or a finite group, for any  $\rho$  on  $S$  and any representation  $U$  of  $G$  acting on  $S$ ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho^{\otimes n}\|U^{\otimes n})}{n} = 0. \quad (94)$$

The second one is given by the logarithmic characteristic function.

**Definition 2** (Averaged logarithmic characteristic function). *Let  $G$  be a group, and let  $U$  be its (projective) unitary representation acting on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . We assume that  $G$  has Haar measure  $\int_G dg = 1$  and that  $U_g$  has the irreducible decomposition (81). Then, we define  $L(\rho)$  as*

$$L(\rho) := \int_G dg L_{g,\text{strong}}(\rho), \quad (95)$$

where

$$L_{g,\text{strong}}(\rho) := -\log |\text{Tr}[U_g \rho]|, \quad (96)$$

and when  $G$  is finite,  $\int_G dg$  is replaced by  $\frac{1}{|G|} \sum_g$ .

**Examples:** Let us go back to the one qubit example:  $\rho = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{1} + r_x X + r_y Y + r_z Z)$ . One can compute

$$\begin{aligned} L^{\mathbb{Z}_2}(\rho) &= -\frac{1}{2} \log |r_z|, \\ L^{U(1)}(\rho) &= -\log \frac{1 + |r_z|}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

We can see that  $\rho$  is strong-symmetric state with respect to  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  or/and  $U(1)$  iff  $r_z = \pm 1$ .

Now we consider the asymmetry due to  $SU(2)$ . Earlier we have pointed out that the  $\vec{r} = 0$  state is not strong symmetric even if  $A_{G,\text{strong}}^{SU(2)} = 0$  for this state. In contrast, now we have

$$L^{SU(2)}\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}\right) = \frac{1}{2} + \log 2 > 0, \quad (98)$$

indicating this is indeed not strong-symmetric. In the next theorem, we are going to show that this resource monotone is indeed faithful.

**Theorem 7.** *The quantity  $L(\rho)$  satisfies the following features*

**(A):**  *$L(\rho)$  is a resource measure. Namely, (i-a) it is non-negative and when  $\rho$  is strong symmetric, it is zero, and (i-b) when  $\Lambda$  is  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant, the inequality  $L(\rho) \geq L(\Lambda(\rho))$  holds. More precisely,  $L(\rho) = L(\Lambda(\rho))$ .*

**(B):** *It is faithful for  $\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$ . In other words,  $L(\rho) = 0$  if and only if  $\rho$  is strong symmetric.*

**(C):** *When we employ collective representation, it is additive for product states. In other words, for two systems  $A$  and  $B$  and (projective) unitary representations  $U^A$  and  $U^B$  on them, any states  $\rho_A$  and  $\sigma_B$  satisfy*

$$L(\rho_A \otimes \sigma_B \| U^A \otimes U^B) = L(\rho_A \| U^A) + L(\sigma_B \| U^B). \quad (99)$$

Consequently,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L(\rho^{\otimes n} \| U^{\otimes n})}{n} = L(\rho) \quad (100)$$

holds.

We remark that each  $L_\rho(g)$  is also a resource measure and additive, but it is not faithful.

## 2. Measures for compact-Lie-group symmetry

Next, we introduce a resource measure that works particularly well when the group  $G$  is a compact Lie group:

**Definition 3** (Non-symmetrized and symmetrized covariance matrices). *Let  $G$  be a compact Lie group, and let  $\dim G$  denote the dimension of  $G$  as a smooth manifold. Then, elements in the neighborhood of the identity  $e \in G$  can be parametrized as  $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = e^{i \sum_{j=1}^{\dim G} \lambda^j A_j}$  with a basis  $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^{\dim G}$  of the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Let  $U$  be a unitary representation of  $G$  acting on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . We introduce Hermitian operators*

$$X_j := -i \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda^j} U(g(\boldsymbol{\lambda})) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}=0} \quad (101)$$

for  $j = 1, \dots, \dim G$ , which corresponds to  $L(A_j)$ , where  $L$  is the Lie algebra representation defined as  $L(A) := -i \frac{d}{dt} U(e^{itA})|_{t=0}$ . Then, we define two types of covariance matrices associated with  $\rho$ .

**1. Non-symmetrized covariance matrix.** The non-symmetrized covariance matrix  $V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho)$  is defined by

$$(V^{\text{n-sym}})_{i,j} := \text{Tr}[\rho X_i X_j] - \langle X_i \rangle_\rho \langle X_j \rangle_\rho, \quad (102)$$

where  $\langle X \rangle_\rho := \text{Tr}[\rho X]$ .

**2. Symmetrized covariance matrix.** The symmetrized covariance matrix  $V^{\text{sym}}(\rho)$  is defined by

$$(V^{\text{sym}}(\rho))_{i,j} := \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[\rho \{X_i, X_j\}] - \langle X_i \rangle_\rho \langle X_j \rangle_\rho, \quad (103)$$

where  $\{X_i, X_j\} := X_i X_j + X_j X_i$  denotes the anti-commutator.

We remark that when the symmetry is  $U(1)$ , both covariance matrix becomes the variance.

**Theorem 8.** *The covariance matrices  $V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho)$  and  $V^{\text{sym}}(\rho)$  satisfy the following features*

**(A):**  *$V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho)$  and  $V^{\text{sym}}(\rho)$  are resource measures. Namely, (i-a) they are positive-semidefinite matrices, and when  $\rho$  is strong symmetric, they are zero, and (i-b) when  $\Lambda$  is  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant, the inequalities  $V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho) \geq V^{\text{n-sym}}(\Lambda(\rho))$  and  $V^{\text{sym}}(\rho) \geq V^{\text{sym}}(\Lambda(\rho))$  hold. More precisely,  $V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho) = V^{\text{n-sym}}(\Lambda(\rho))$  and  $V^{\text{sym}}(\rho) = V^{\text{sym}}(\Lambda(\rho))$  are valid.*

**(B):** *When  $G$  is connected, they are faithful for  $\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$ . In other words,*

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho) = 0 &\Leftrightarrow V^{\text{sym}}(\rho) = 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \rho \in \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}. \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

Using (i-a) of  $V^{\text{sym}}$  and  $V^{\text{n-sym}}$ , we can equivalently state

$$\sum_i V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho)_{ii} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \sum_i V^{\text{sym}}(\rho)_{ii} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \rho \in \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}. \quad (105)$$

	Group	(i-a) for $\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$	(i-a) for $\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{single}}$	(i-b)	(ii) for $\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$	(ii) for $\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{single}}$	(v)
$A_{G,\text{strong}}$	arbitrary	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗
$L$	arbitrary	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓
$V^{\text{n-sym}}$	compact Lie	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓
$V^{\text{sym}}$	compact Lie	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓

TABLE I. Table of measures of strong symmetry breaking

**(C):** When we employ collective representation, they are additive for product states. In other words, for two systems  $A$  and  $B$  and unitary representations  $U^A$  and  $U^B$  on them, any states  $\rho_A$  and  $\sigma_B$  satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} & V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho_A \otimes \sigma_B \| U^A \otimes U^B) \\ &= V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho_A \| U^A) + V^{\text{n-sym}}(\sigma_B \| U^B), \end{aligned} \quad (106)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & V^{\text{sym}}(\rho_A \otimes \sigma_B \| U^A \otimes U^B) \\ &= V^{\text{sym}}(\rho_A \| U^A) + V^{\text{sym}}(\sigma_B \| U^B) \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

Consequently,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho^{\otimes n} \| U^{\otimes n})/n = V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho)$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V^{\text{sym}}(\rho^{\otimes n} \| U^{\otimes n})/n = V^{\text{sym}}(\rho)$  hold.

### 3. i.i.d. complete measures for $U(1)$ -symmetry

Next, following the notions of entanglement distillation and dilution, we consider the distillation and dilution of strong symmetry breaking under  $U(1)$ -symmetry. As discussed in Section II A, these problems can be understood as instances of the i.i.d. convertibility problem.

We consider quantum systems with finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. On each system, which is a copy of system  $S$  with Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , we consider an identical unitary representation  $U := \{e^{-iHt}\}$  of  $U(1)$ , and assume that the smallest eigenvalue of  $H$  is equal to zero. Hereafter, we define the period of a state  $\rho$  on  $S$  as

$$\tau(\rho) := \inf\{t > 0 : e^{-iHt}\rho e^{iHt} = \rho\}. \quad (108)$$

Furthermore, we formulate

$$\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho) := \inf\{t > 0 : \exists \theta \in \mathbb{R}, e^{-iHt}\rho = e^{i\theta}\rho\}. \quad (109)$$

To formulate the i.i.d. conversion, we consider  $n$  copies of the system  $S$  as  $S^{(n)}$ , whose Hilbert space is  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ , and consider the collective unitary representation  $U^{(n)} := \{e^{-iH_{\text{tot}}^{(n)}t}\}$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ , where

$$H_{\text{tot}}^{(n)} := \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} I^{\otimes j} \otimes H \otimes I^{\otimes n-j-1}. \quad (110)$$

In other words,  $U^{(n)} = U^{\otimes n}$ .

Under the setup described above, we define the optimal conversion rate for i.i.d. states. To begin with, there is one important caveat. As shown in Lemma 1, a strong covariant operation from  $S^{(N)}$  to  $S^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}$  does not exist

when  $N > \lfloor rN \rfloor$ . Thus, if we consider the optimal rate for conversions by free operations

$$\Phi_N : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}), \quad N \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (111)$$

satisfying

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \Phi_N(\rho^{\otimes N}) - \sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \right\|_1 = 0, \quad (112)$$

the optimal rate is subject to a non-essential restriction: it can never be smaller than 1.

To avoid this artificial limitation, we define the optimal conversion rate  $R(\rho \rightarrow \sigma)$  by allowing an additional reference system in which we can store a free state after the state conversion. To be concrete, we define the optimal rate  $R(\rho \rightarrow \sigma)$  as the supremum of the following achievable rate  $r$ : the rate  $r$  is achievable when there are sequence of additional Hilbert spaces  $\{\mathcal{H}_{A_N}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , sequence of unitary representations  $\{U_{A_N} := \{e^{-iH_{A_N}t}\}_t\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $U(1)$  acting on the Hilbert spaces, and the sequence of  $(U^{(N)}, U^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)} \otimes U_{A_N})$ -strong covariant operations  $\{\Phi_N\}$  such as

$$\Phi_N : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A_N}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A_N}), \quad N \in \mathbb{N} \quad (113)$$

and

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \Phi_N(\rho^{\otimes N}) - \sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N} \right\|_1 = 0, \quad (114)$$

where  $\eta_{A_N}$  is a strong symmetric state in  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{A_N})$ .

The above definition allows us to consider, instead of a direct conversion from  $\rho^{\otimes N}$  to  $\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}$ , a conversion to the tensor product  $\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}$  with some free state  $\eta_{A_N}$ . In other standard resource theories, where appending free states and performing partial traces are regarded as free operations, this modification does not change the value of  $R(\rho \rightarrow \sigma)$ . Therefore, our definition of the optimal conversion rate is consistent with the conventional one.

As we see in the following theorems, when both  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$  are pure, or when both  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$  are weak symmetric states, the optimal ratio  $R(\rho \rightarrow \sigma)$  is determined by a single resource measure: the variance of  $H$ . Therefore, we can say the variance of  $H$  is the i.i.d. complete resource measure for these state conversions. The theorem for the pure states is as follows:

**Theorem 9.** Let  $S$  be a finite dimensional system with Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , and let  $\{e^{-iHt}\}$  be a unitary representation of  $U(1)$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}$ , where the smallest eigenvalue of  $H$  is equal to zero. For any pure states  $\psi$  and  $\phi$  on  $S$

satisfying  $\tau(\psi) = \tau(\phi)$ ,  $\psi \notin \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$  and  $\phi \notin \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$ , the optimal conversion rate  $R(\psi \rightarrow \phi)$  satisfies

$$R(\psi \rightarrow \phi) = \frac{V_H(\psi)}{V_H(\phi)}, \quad (115)$$

where  $V_H(\rho) := \text{Tr}[\rho H^2] - \text{Tr}[\rho H]^2$ .

When  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$  are weak symmetric (not necessarily pure), the optimal ratio  $R(\rho \rightarrow \sigma)$  is determined by the variance and the expectation value of  $H$ .

**Theorem 10.** *Let  $S$  be a finite dimensional system with Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , and let  $\{e^{-iHt}\}$  be a unitary representation of  $U(1)$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}$ , where the smallest eigenvalue of  $H$  is equal to zero. For any weak symmetric states  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$  on  $S$  satisfying  $\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho) = \tau_{\text{strong}}(\sigma)$ ,  $\rho \notin \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$  and  $\sigma \notin \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$ , the optimal conversion rate  $R(\rho \rightarrow \sigma)$  satisfies*

$$R(\rho \rightarrow \sigma) = \frac{V_H(\rho)}{V_H(\sigma)}. \quad (116)$$

Theorem 9 shows that, at least for  $U(1)$  symmetry, the variance plays the same role for strong symmetry breaking as the entanglement entropy does in entanglement theory: for pure states, the optimal i.i.d. conversion rate is completely determined by the ratio of variances. Moreover, Theorem 10 shows that, even for mixed states, if both  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$  are weak symmetric, again the conversion rate is completely determined by the variance. These theorems imply that, in the distillation or dilution of strong symmetry breaking in pure states or weak symmetric states, only the second moment of the conserved quantity is relevant. This fact is particularly intriguing in light of the observation that strong covariant operations cannot alter the probability distribution over the eigenvalues of the corresponding conserved quantity at all.

### E. Conversion from weak symmetry breaking to strong symmetry breaking

Reviewing the results obtained so far, we find that both the variance and the Fisher information serve as good measures of strong and weak symmetry breaking, respectively. Both quantities provide i.i.d. complete measures for a rather broad class of states, including, at least, all pure states. These two quantities admit a clear physical interpretation: they quantify, respectively, the total amount of fluctuations of the conserved quantity and the portion of fluctuations that originates purely from quantum superposition.

To make this distinction explicit, let us introduce a property of the SLD skew information (=a quarter of QFI) [63]:

$$\tilde{I}_H(\rho) = \min_{\{q_j, |\phi_j\rangle\}} \sum_j q_j V_{\phi_j}(H), \quad (117)$$

where  $\{q_j |\phi_j\rangle\}$  runs over all possible decomposition  $\sigma = \sum_j q_j \phi_j$  including non-orthogonal ones. The relation (117) implies that the skew information quantifies the “quantum part” of the variance, i.e., the fluctuation of  $H$  by quantum superposition. Furthermore, together with the concavity of the variance, the relation (117) immediately implies that the skew information is always upper bounded by the variance. Indeed, the variance can be decomposed as [64, 65]

$$V_H(\rho) = \tilde{I}_H(\rho) + C_H(\rho). \quad (118)$$

where the term  $C$  may be regarded as the contribution arising from classical fluctuations. This term can be defined as a variance with respect to the right logarithmic derivative (RLD) metric,

$$C_H(\rho) := \sum_{k,l} p_k f_{\text{RLD}}(p_l/p_k) |\langle k | H_\rho | l \rangle|^2, \quad (119)$$

where  $\{p_k\}$  and  $\{|k\rangle\}$  are eigenvalues and eigenvectors of  $\rho$ ,  $f_{\text{RLD}}(x) := 2x/(x+1)$  and  $H_\rho := H - I\text{Tr}[H\rho]$ , whereas the usual variance corresponds to the variance defined with respect to the SLD metric:

$$V_H(\rho) = \sum_{k,l} p_k f_{\text{SLD}}(p_l/p_k) |\langle k | H_\rho | l \rangle|^2, \quad (120)$$

where  $f_{\text{SLD}}(x) := (1+x)/2$ .

Using this decomposition, we can quantitatively evaluate how weak symmetry breaking is converted into strong symmetry breaking over time in open-system dynamics that do not exchange conserved quantities with the environment. First, the variance is invariant under strong covariant operations (Theorem 8). By contrast, the quantum Fisher information monotonically decreases under strong covariant operations. In other words, under strong covariant time evolution, the overall amount of symmetry breaking is conserved, while it is irreversibly transformed from weak symmetry breaking into strong symmetry breaking.

Note that, by Theorem 3, any time evolution that does not exchange the conserved quantity  $H$  with the environment is always described by a strong covariant operation. Our framework, therefore, provides a quantitative characterization of the transition from weak symmetry breaking to strong symmetry breaking under such dynamics. In particular, the question of “how much of the strong symmetry breaking is purely strong, i.e. not weak symmetry breaking” can be quantified by the following quantity:

$$\mathcal{R}_H(\rho) := \frac{C_H(\rho)}{V_H(\rho)}. \quad (121)$$

A similar behavior can be observed for symmetries described by an arbitrary compact Lie group. The SLD quantum Fisher information matrix (SLD-QFIM) serves as a measure of weak symmetry breaking [59]. On the

other hand, the symmetrized covariance matrix serves as a measure of strong symmetry breaking. These two quantities are related by a decomposition analogous to (118), namely,

$$V^{\text{sym}}(\rho) = \tilde{\mathcal{I}}^\rho + C^\rho \quad (122)$$

Here,  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}^\rho := \mathcal{I}^\rho/4$ , and the matrix  $C$  is the covariance matrix associated with the RLD metric, whose elements  $C_{ij}^\rho$  are defined as

$$C_{ij}^\rho = \sum_{k,l} p_k f_{RLD}(p_l/p_k) \langle k | X_{i,\rho} | l \rangle \langle l | X_{j,\rho} | k \rangle, \quad (123)$$

where  $X_{i,\rho} := X_i - I \text{Tr}[\rho X_i]$ .

As before, the symmetrized covariance matrix is conserved under strong covariant operations, whereas the SLD-QFIM decreases monotonically under such operations. Therefore, when symmetry is described by a compact Lie group, strong covariant time evolution preserves the total amount of symmetry breaking while irreversibly converting weak symmetry breaking into strong symmetry breaking.

## V. GENERALIZATION TO NON-INVERTIBLE SYMMETRIES

So far, our discussion has focused on ordinary symmetries described by a group  $G$ . Recently, it has been proposed that the same strategy extends to generalized symmetries [66, 67]. Their key observation is that, instead of a group, one can work with a finite-dimensional  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  of symmetry operators acting on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . Typical examples are the fusion algebra, tube algebra, or strip algebra associated with a fusion category describing the generalized symmetry.

Given such an algebra  $\mathcal{A}$ , one chooses a basis  $\{X_a\}$  and defines the symmetric bilinear form

$$K_{ab} := \text{Tr}(X_a X_b). \quad (124)$$

Let  $\tilde{K}$  denote the inverse matrix of  $K$ , and define the *symmetrizer*  $S_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ ,

$$S_{\mathcal{A}}(\rho) := \sum_{a,b} \tilde{K}_{ab} X_a \rho X_b, \quad (125)$$

which has the following properties:

- $S_{\mathcal{A}}$  is a projector:  $S_{\mathcal{A}}^2 = S_{\mathcal{A}}$ .
- $S_{\mathcal{A}}(\rho)$  commutes with all elements of  $\mathcal{A}$ , i.e. it is  $\mathcal{A}$ -symmetric.
- $S_{\mathcal{A}}(\rho) = \rho$  if and only if  $\rho$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -symmetric.
- $S_{\mathcal{A}}$  is a CPTP map.

In particular, when  $\mathcal{A}$  is the group algebra of a finite group  $G$ ,  $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{C}[G]$ , the symmetrizer (125) reduces to the familiar  $G$ -twirling channel (29). This construction thus provides the natural generalization of  $G$ -twirling to generalized symmetries.

Using  $S_{\mathcal{A}}$ , one defines the relative entropy of asymmetry for generalized symmetries as

$$A_{\mathcal{A}}(\rho) := S(\rho \parallel S_{\mathcal{A}}(\rho)) = S(S_{\mathcal{A}}(\rho)) - S(\rho), \quad (126)$$

in complete analogy with the group case.

The construction of strong entanglement asymmetry extends to this setting with minimal changes. Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is finite-dimensional and semisimple, the  $\mathcal{A}$ -symmetric state  $S_{\mathcal{A}}(\rho)$  can be decomposed into orthogonal ‘charge sectors’. Concretely, there exists a family of mutually orthogonal projectors  $\{P_r\}$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  such that

$$\sum_r P_r = \mathbf{1}, \quad S_{\mathcal{A}}(\rho) = \sum_r P_r S_{\mathcal{A}}(\rho) P_r. \quad (127)$$

The labels  $r$  correspond to the simple sectors (irreducible  $\mathcal{A}$ -modules) of the generalized symmetry. We can then define the sector probabilities and conditional states as

$$p_r := \text{Tr}(P_r S_{\mathcal{A}}(\rho)), \quad \rho_{\text{sym},r}^{(\mathcal{A})} := \frac{P_r S_{\mathcal{A}}(\rho) P_r}{p_r}. \quad (128)$$

States with support entirely in a single sector  $r$  behave as ‘strong symmetric’ states for the generalized symmetry, in direct analogy with the group case.

Motivated by our definition for ordinary groups, we introduce the strong entanglement asymmetry for a generalized symmetry algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  by

$$S_{\text{s-asym}}^{(\mathcal{A})}(\rho) := - \sum_r p_r \log p_r + A_{\mathcal{A}}(\rho). \quad (129)$$

The first term quantifies how much the state spreads over different strong symmetry sectors of  $\mathcal{A}$ , while  $A_{\mathcal{A}}(\rho)$  encodes the weak symmetry breaking measured by the relative entropy of asymmetry. When  $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{C}[G]$  is the group algebra of an ordinary symmetry group, the symmetrizer  $S_{\mathcal{A}}$  reduces to the  $G$ -twirling channel and the projectors  $\{P_r\}$  reduce to the usual projectors onto irreducible  $G$ -representations, so that  $S_{\text{s-asym}}^{(\mathcal{A})}$  reproduces our strong entanglement asymmetry  $S_{\text{s-asym}}$  defined in the previous section.

At present, the resource-theoretic understanding of non-invertible asymmetry is still incomplete, even in the case of weak symmetries. We plan to present a rigorous formulation of non-invertible asymmetry within the framework of resource theory in a forthcoming paper.

We can also extend the averaged logarithmic characteristic function (E16) to the generalized symmetries. A natural extension is

$$L^{(\mathcal{A})}(\rho) := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|} \sum_a (-\log |\text{Tr}[X_a \rho]|). \quad (130)$$

In the same spirit as (129), the definition (130) provides a natural generalization of the averaged logarithmic characteristic function. In practice, this quantity is tractable both from a theoretical and a computational viewpoint. Hence, regardless of whether one considers the weak or strong symmetry, it is an interesting direction to study symmetry breaking of generalized symmetries using the proposed quantity. A systematic resource-theoretic justification of this quantity will be presented elsewhere.

## VI. EXAMPLES

We have already seen a few illustrative examples following the definitions of various asymmetry monotones e.g. in sec. IV. In this section, we include more examples, illustrating the computation of strong asymmetry measure  $A_{G,\text{strong}}$  and other asymmetry monotones in a few analytically tractable setups. Finally, we discuss the strong-to-weak spontaneous symmetry breaking and how to capture that using these resource monotones.

### A. Vacuum reduced density matrix in CFT

Consider the vacuum state of a CFT reduced to a subsystem  $A$ ,

$$\rho_A = \text{Tr}_{\bar{A}} |0\rangle\langle 0|, \quad (131)$$

where  $\bar{A}$  is the complement of  $A$ . The vacuum is weak symmetric, so  $A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho_A)$  reduces to the Shannon entropy of the strong-charge distribution  $\{p_\alpha\}$ .

Following the same strategy as in the computation of symmetry-resolved entanglement entropy [68], the probability of finding the subsystem in the irreducible representation  $\alpha$  of  $G$  is

$$p_\alpha = \frac{d_\alpha^2}{|G|}, \quad (132)$$

where  $d_\alpha$  is the quantum dimension of  $\alpha$ . Hence

$$A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho_A) = - \sum_\alpha \frac{d_\alpha^2}{|G|} \log \frac{d_\alpha^2}{|G|}. \quad (133)$$

In particular, for  $G = \mathbb{Z}_n$  one obtains

$$A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho_A) = \log n. \quad (134)$$

Thus, while the vacuum respects weak symmetry, it maximally breaks strong symmetry in the sense of our resource measure.

### B. Global quantum quench

As a dynamical example, consider a global quench in a  $(1+1)$ -dimensional CFT [69]. The initial state is prepared from a conformal boundary state  $|B\rangle$  [70] as

$$|\varphi_0\rangle := e^{-\frac{\beta}{4}H} |B\rangle, \quad (135)$$

and then evolved with a  $G$ -symmetric Hamiltonian  $H$ ,

$$\rho_A(t) = \text{Tr}_{\bar{A}} [e^{-iHt} |\varphi_0\rangle\langle\varphi_0| e^{iHt}], \quad (136)$$

where  $A$  is an interval of length  $l$ . We take the regularization parameter  $\beta$  to be small. The entanglement asymmetry for weak symmetry in this setup was computed in [13].

For a symmetry-breaking conformal boundary, one finds

$$A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho_A(t)) = \begin{cases} 2 \log |G|, & 0 < t < \frac{l}{2}, \\ \log |G|, & t > \frac{l}{2}, \end{cases} \quad (137)$$

while for a symmetry-preserving boundary, one obtains

$$A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho_A(t)) = 0. \quad (138)$$

In the former case, the system starts from a state that maximally breaks both strong and weak symmetries and, upon local equilibration, relaxes to a state in which only weak symmetry is restored. In the latter case, strong symmetry is preserved throughout the time evolution.

### C. Thermal density matrix and strong asymmetry for rotation

In this subsection we consider thermal state of a  $(d-1)+1$ -dimensional CFT on a spatial manifold  $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ . The thermal density matrix

$$\rho_{th}(\beta) := \frac{\sum e^{-\beta E} |E\rangle\langle E|}{\sum e^{-\beta E}} \quad (139)$$

is naturally weak symmetric under rotational subgroup of the conformal group. On the hand, strong rotational symmetry is broken, since  $\rho_{th}$  contains states transforming under various irreps of the rotation group. In what follows, we will quantify the amount of strong symmetry breaking.

**Strong entanglement-asymmetry:** To be concrete, we will consider a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  subgroup of the rotation group  $SO(d-1)$ . Now the Hilbert space of states can be grouped into even spins and odd spins under  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ . In order to compute the asymmetry, let us first define some quantities, which will be useful later. We first define partition function  $Z(\beta)$  as

$$Z(\beta) := \sum_E e^{-\beta E}, \quad (140)$$

and we further define two refined partition functions,  $Z_+$  and  $Z_-$ , out of states with even spin and odd spin respectively:

$$Z_+(\beta) := \sum_{\text{even spin}} e^{-\beta E}, \quad Z_-(\beta) := \sum_{\text{odd spin}} e^{-\beta E}. \quad (141)$$

Clearly, we have  $Z(\beta) = Z_+(\beta) + Z_-(\beta)$ , and

$$\rho_{th}(\beta) = \frac{Z_+(\beta)}{Z(\beta)} \rho_{th,+}(\beta) + \frac{Z_-(\beta)}{Z(\beta)} \rho_{th,-}(\beta), \quad (142)$$

where we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{th,+}(\beta) &:= \frac{\sum_{\text{even spin}} e^{-\beta E} |E\rangle\langle E|}{Z_+(\beta)}, \\ \rho_{th,-}(\beta) &:= \frac{\sum_{\text{odd spin}} e^{-\beta E} |E\rangle\langle E|}{Z_-(\beta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (143)$$

The entanglement asymmetry of strong symmetry corresponding to this  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  is given by

$$A_{G,\text{strong}} = -\frac{Z_+(\beta)}{Z(\beta)} \log \frac{Z_+(\beta)}{Z(\beta)} - \frac{Z_-(\beta)}{Z(\beta)} \log \frac{Z_-(\beta)}{Z(\beta)}, \quad (144)$$

where we have used that for weak asymmetry,  $S_{\text{asym}} = 0$  for  $\rho_{th}$ . Now we can use thermal effective field theory [71] (originally initiated in [72–74], recently reincarnated in [75], see also [76–80]; see [81] for the application of thermal EFT to entanglement entropy) to derive

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{Z_+(\beta) - Z_-(\beta)}{Z_+(\beta) + Z_-(\beta)} &= \frac{\text{Tr } e^{-\beta H} (-1)^J}{\text{Tr } e^{-\beta H}} \\ &\underset{\beta \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \exp \left[ -\frac{f}{\beta^{d-1}} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2^d} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (145)$$

Here  $f$  is the leading Wilson coefficient appearing in the high temperature expansion of thermal partition function i.e.

$$f := \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \beta^{d-1} \log Z(\beta) \geq 0.$$

Physically,  $f$  quantifies the energy density in a thermal state. It follows from eq.(145) that the strong asymmetry is given by

$$A_{G,\text{strong}} \underset{\beta \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \log 2 - \frac{1}{2} \exp \left[ -\frac{2(1-2^{-d})f}{\beta^{d-1}} \right], \quad (146)$$

We end this subsection with four remarks:

1. In  $1+1$  dimensions,  $f$  is related to the central charge and given by  $f = \frac{\pi c L}{6}$  where  $L$  is the length of spatial circle and  $c$  is the central charge of the CFT.
2. The eq. (146) can easily be generalized to the  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  (with  $p$  being prime) subgroup of the rotational group following [71]:

$$A_{G,\text{strong}} \underset{\beta \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \log p - \frac{p-1}{2} \exp \left[ -\frac{2(1-p^{-d})f}{\beta^{d-1}} \right]. \quad (147)$$

It is possible to derive a formula for the strong asymmetry, given an arbitrary subgroup  $Z_m$ , where  $m$  is not necessarily restricted to being a prime.

3. In the  $\beta \rightarrow 0$  limit, the eq.(146) and (147) saturate the bound appropriate for weak symmetric density matrices.
4. Since the system has conformal symmetry, here the relevant dimensional quantity is  $\beta/R$ , where  $R$  is the size of the system i.e. radius of  $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ . Hence, both the thermodynamic limit and the high-temperature limit correspond to  $\beta/R \rightarrow 0$ . For notational simplicity, we have set  $R$  such that the volume of  $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$  is 1, and  $R$  does not appear explicitly in the above equations.

The physical upshot is that as we take the high temperature/thermodynamic limit, the Boltzmann weight approaches 1, all states become equally likely in thermal ensemble. Hence, one expects that  $\rho_{th}$  approaches  $\mathbb{I}$ , leading to breaking of strong symmetry. While this is indeed true for a finite dimensional quantum system, for a quantum field theory with infinite degrees of freedom, the state  $\mathbb{I}$  cannot be properly normalized. Albeit, the strong-asymmetry is still a meaningful quantity and can be computed reliably, confirming the intuition that strong symmetry is indeed broken in this limit.

**Averaged logarithmic characteristic function:** Given  $\rho_{th}$ , we can easily compute  $\mathcal{L}(\rho_{th})$  for the aforementioned  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetry using (145):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\rho_{th})(\beta) &= -\frac{1}{2} \log \frac{|Z_+(\beta) - Z_-(\beta)|}{Z(\beta)} \\ &\underset{\beta \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \frac{f}{\beta^{d-1}} \left( \frac{2^d - 1}{2^{d+1}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (148)$$

For  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  (with  $p$  being prime), the above formula is generalized to

$$\mathcal{L}(\rho_{th})(\beta) \underset{\beta \rightarrow 0}{\sim} (p-1) \frac{f}{\beta^{d-1}} \left( \frac{p^d - 1}{p^{d+1}} \right). \quad (149)$$

Once again, in the high temperature limit, the strong symmetry is broken, as evident from (148) and (149). Note that in the  $\beta \rightarrow 0$  limit, the averaged logarithmic characteristic function diverges, reflecting the fact that we are dealing with a quantum field theory with infinite degrees of freedom.

**Variance & strong asymmetry w.r.t  $U(1)$ :** Variance is a resource measure appropriate for compact Lie group  $G$ . Here we consider a CFT with the simplest Lie group  $G = U(1)$ , generated by one of the generators of rotational subgroup. Using thermal EFT [75](originally initiated in [72–74], recently reincarnated in [75], see also [76–80]), we can compute

$$\text{Tr } \rho_{th} e^{-\beta \omega J} \underset{\beta \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \exp \left[ \frac{f}{\beta^{d-1}} \frac{\omega^2}{(1-\omega^2)} \right] \quad (150)$$

The variance is given by

$$\langle J^2 \rangle - (\langle J \rangle)^2 \underset{\beta \rightarrow 0}{\sim} 2f\beta^{-(d+1)}. \quad (151)$$

We see that the variance blows up as we take the high temperature/thermodynamic limit. While non-zero variance implies breaking of strong symmetry, the divergent behavior is an imprint of the presence of infinite degrees of freedom in QFT.

#### D. Thermal density matrix and strong asymmetry for global symmetry

In this subsection, we consider a CFT with a global  $U(1)$  symmetry. We will show that thermal density matrix breaks the strong  $U(1)$  symmetry as the temperature becomes large.

We use thermal EFT [71, 79] a.k.a hydrodynamics [72–74, 76–78, 80] to show that (in particular, see Eq.1.7 of [79])

$$Z(\beta, g = e^{i\phi}) \sim \exp \left( f\beta^{-d+1} - \frac{b}{4}\phi^2\beta^{-d+1} \right), \quad (152)$$

where  $f$  quantifies the energy density in a thermal state and  $b \geq 0$  quantifies the tension of the domain wall, that generates the  $g$ -twisted sector. They should be thought of as Wilson coefficients of the effective field theory.

The variance is given by

$$\langle Q^2 \rangle - (\langle Q \rangle)^2 \underset{\beta \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \frac{b}{2}\beta^{-d+1}. \quad (153)$$

Once again, we see that the variance blows up as we take the high temperature/thermodynamic limit. The situation is exactly similar to that of spin. In the case  $U(1)$ , generated by spin,  $b$ -coefficient is in fact related to  $f$ . In contrast, for the global symmetry,  $b$  is a genuinely new quantity. This is expected because, unlike the global  $U(1)$  symmetry, the  $U(1)$  related to spin is part of space-time symmetry which includes Hamiltonian.

#### E. Strong-to-weak SSB in a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ spin chain

*Spontaneous symmetry breaking* (SSB) is among the most fundamental phenomena in many-body physics. Applications of entanglement asymmetry to SSB have been worked out in [17] (see also [66, 67] for extensions to generalized symmetries). They discuss the extent to which the “vacuum” satisfying cluster decomposition spontaneously breaks a given symmetry. In other words, instead of the “cat state”  $|0\cdots 0\rangle + |1\cdots 1\rangle$ , they study the physically realized vacua  $|0\cdots 0\rangle$  or  $|1\cdots 1\rangle$ , which are selected by an SSB, by means of the entanglement asymmetry. We note that the cat state itself is symmetric, and therefore its entanglement asymmetry vanishes.

The same line of reasoning extends naturally to mixed states. A phenomenon particular to mixed states is *strong-to-weak spontaneous symmetry breaking* (SW-SSB) [46]. As a concrete example, let us consider a

one-dimensional spin chain with a global  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetry generated by the spin-flip operator

$$X := \prod_i X_i, \quad (154)$$

where  $X_i$  is the Pauli operator acting at site  $i$ . A simple mixed state exhibiting SW-SSB is

$$\rho_0 \propto \mathbb{I} + X. \quad (155)$$

This state is strong symmetric, therefore,

$$A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho_0) = 0. \quad (156)$$

However, this state is unstable against arbitrarily small local perturbations that break strong symmetry in close analogy with standard SSB [46].

Since an SW-SSB state is strong symmetric, the strong entanglement asymmetry vanishes for it, just as the entanglement asymmetry is zero for an SSB state (e.g., a cat state). Therefore, following [17], let us consider the strong entanglement asymmetry of the post-collapse state. Performing a  $Z$ -measurement at a single site  $i$  drives the state to the maximally mixed state through the SW-SSB,

$$\rho_0 \rightarrow \rho_{\text{mix}} \propto \mathbb{I}. \quad (157)$$

In the decomposition into strong-charge sectors, the post-measurement state has equal weights in the two strong symmetric states,

$$\rho_{\text{mix}} \propto \rho_+ + \rho_-, \quad (158)$$

where  $X\rho_{\pm} = \pm\rho_{\pm}$ . By our definition, the strong entanglement asymmetry reduces in this case to the Shannon entropy of the strong-charge distribution, and hence

$$A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho_{\text{mix}}) = - \sum_{\alpha=\pm} \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1}{2} = \log 2. \quad (159)$$

The above result holds quite generally. For any mixed state obtained after SW-SSB, the measure of SW-SSB is determined entirely by the statistical uncertainty over the strong-charge sectors. In other words, the strong entanglement asymmetry is given by the Shannon entropy of the corresponding sector probabilities,

$$A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho) = - \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \log p_{\alpha}, \quad p_{\alpha} = \text{Tr}(P_{\alpha} \rho), \quad (160)$$

where  $\{P_{\alpha}\}$  are the projectors onto the distinct strong symmetry sectors.

#### VII. CROSS-OVER: STRONG-MPEMBA

The quantum Mpemba effect refers to the following scenario: A system with more broken symmetry evolves more quickly towards a state where the symmetry gets

restored. The Quantum Mpemba effect is nicely captured by the weak entanglement asymmetry, which, as a function of time shows a cross-over, followed by eventual settling down at zero.

A natural question is whether such a phenomenon exists for strong-symmetry as well. However, this endeavor has an immediate conceptual obstruction. While restoration of weak symmetry is linked with system reaching the equilibrium, strong symmetry is not naturally connected to such a process. In fact, strong symmetry prohibits the exchange of charge between the system and the environment. Hence, the natural intuition would be that with generic interaction, strong symmetry gets broken rather than restored.

Given the fact that we should not expect that strong entanglement asymmetry asymptotes to 0 as the system relaxes due to generic interaction, the question remains regarding how to define Mpemba like effect for strong symmetry.

A natural way to define strong Mpemba effect is to look for *cross-over* in the evolution of  $A_{G,\text{strong}}(t)$ , as the system under consideration evolves towards the equilibrium configuration i.e. towards  $A_G = 0$ . If such a cross-over happens, we will say “Strong-Mpemba” has happened. We note that Strong-Mpemba may happen even if the usual Quantum Mpemba is absent. In what follows, we will show a simple example of Strong Mpemba phenomenon without the presence of usual Quantum Mpemba effect.

We consider a single qubit system, evolving under dephasing channel

$$\dot{\rho} = -\frac{k}{4}[Z, [Z, \rho(\vec{r}(t))]] \quad (161)$$

Here  $Z$  is the Pauli  $Z$  matrix, generating the  $\mathbb{Z}_2 / U(1)$  symmetry.

The density matrix  $\rho$  is parameterized by a Bloch vector  $\vec{r}$ , which moves inside the Bloch sphere as a function of time i.e. we have

$$\rho(\vec{r}(t)) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{1} + r_x(t)X + r_y(t)Y + r_zZ). \quad (162)$$

Solving the governing eq. (161), we find that the Bloch vector at time  $t$  is given by

$$\frac{r_x(t)}{r_x(0)} = \frac{r_y(t)}{r_y(0)} = e^{-kt}, \quad r_z(t) = r_z(0). \quad (163)$$

In the infinite time limit, the off-diagonal pieces die off:

$$\rho(\vec{r}(\infty)) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1+r_z}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1-r_z}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (164)$$

One can easily compute entanglement asymmetry and strong entanglement asymmetry as a function of time:

$$\begin{aligned} A_G(t) &= f(|\vec{r}(t)|) - f(r_z), \\ A_{G,\text{strong}}(t) &= \log 2 - 2f(r_z) + f(|\vec{r}(t)|), \end{aligned} \quad (165)$$




FIG. 3. Dashed blue line denotes the evolution of strong asymmetry for  $\rho_1$  and the thick black line denotes the evolution of strong asymmetry for  $\rho_2$ . There is a cross-over under evolution by (161) (here  $k = 1$ ). See eqs. (167), (165) and (166).

where  $f : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  is given by

$$f(x) = \frac{1+x}{2} \log(1+x) + \frac{1-x}{2} \log(1-x). \quad (166)$$

Now we choose two density matrices  $\rho_1(0)$  and  $\rho_2(0)$ , parametrized by the Bloch-vectors at time  $t = 0$ :

$$\vec{r}_1(0) = (1/\sqrt{2}, 0, 1/\sqrt{2}), \quad \vec{r}_2(0) = (1/2, 0, 1/2). \quad (167)$$

We let them evolve under (161) and observe that eventually cross-over in  $A_{G,\text{strong}}(t)$  does happen (see fig. 3) i.e. we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0.832 &\approx A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho_1(0)) > A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho_2(0)) \approx 0.708 \\ 0.416 &\approx A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho_1(\infty)) < A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho_2(\infty)) \approx 0.562, \end{aligned} \quad (168)$$

which shows the ordering of  $A_{G,\text{strong}}$  for these density matrices gets flipped eventually. Note that the weak asymmetry  $A_G(t)$  asymptotes to 0 for both density matrices without any Mpemba-like effect for weak symmetry in this example, see fig. 4.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

YK is supported by the INAMORI Frontier Program at Kyushu University and JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 23K20046. HT was supported by JSPS Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research No. JP25K00924, and MEXT KAKENHI Grant-in-Aid for Transformative Research Areas B “Quantum Energy Innovation” Grant Numbers 24H00830 and 24H00831, JST MOONSHOT No. JP-MJMS2061, and JST FOREST No. JPMJFR2365. SP thanks all the participants of the workshop *Entanglement asymmetry across energy scales* at LPTHE, especially Francesco Benini, Giuseppe Di Giulio, Victor Godet, Sara Murciano for discussion on various topics related to entanglement asymmetry. SP thanks Shu-heng Shao for introducing him to the notion of strong symmetry.




FIG. 4. Dashed blue line denotes the evolution of weak asymmetry for  $\rho_1$  and the thick black line denotes the evolution of weak asymmetry for  $\rho_2$ . The evolution happens according to (161) (here  $k = 1$ ). Both asymptotes to 0 without having any cross-over. See eqs. (167), (165) and (166).

## Appendix A: Properties of the logarithmic fidelity-based characteristic functions for weak symmetry

Here we show that the logarithmic fidelity-based characteristic functions

$$LF_{G,g}(\rho) := -\log F(\rho, U_g \rho U_g^\dagger) \quad (\text{A1})$$

satisfy the properties (i)–(v) as the resource monotones. More precisely, for any  $g \in G$ ,  $LF_{G,g}(\rho)$  satisfies (i) *the minimal requirements (i-a) and (i-b) as a resource monotone*, (iii) *Convexity*, (iv) *Strong monotonicity*, and (v) *Additivity*. And the set  $\{LF_{G,g}(\rho)\}_{g \in G}$  satisfies (ii) *Faithfulness*:  $\rho \in \mathcal{F}_G$  iff  $LF_{G,g}(\rho) = 0$  for any  $g \in G$ .

*Proof.* (i-a): By definition, each  $LF_{G,g}(\rho)$  is non-negative. And when  $\rho \in \mathcal{F}_G$ ,  $U_g \rho U_g^\dagger = \rho$  holds, and thus  $LF_{G,g}(\rho) = 0$ .

(i-b): For any  $(U, U')$ -covariant operation  $\Lambda$ , the following relation holds

$$\begin{aligned} F(\rho, U_g \rho U_g^\dagger) &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} F(\Lambda(\rho), \Lambda(U_g \rho U_g^\dagger)) \\ &\leq F(\Lambda(\rho), U'_g \Lambda(\rho) U_g^\dagger), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

which implies the monotonicity of  $LF_{G,g}(\rho)$ . Here, we used the monotonicity of fidelity in (a).

(ii): Since  $F(\rho, \sigma) = 1$  iff  $\rho = \sigma$ , if  $LF_{G,g}(\rho) = 0$  for any  $g \in G$ ,  $\rho$  is symmetric. The converse is guaranteed by (i-a).

(iii): Due to  $F(\sum_j p_j \rho_j, \sum_j p_j \sigma_j) \geq \sum_j p_j F(\rho_j, \sigma_j)$ , we obtain

$$F\left(\sum_j p_j \rho_j, U_g \sum_j p_j \rho_j U_g^\dagger\right) \geq \sum_j p_j F(\rho_j, U_g \rho_j U_g^\dagger). \quad (\text{A3})$$

Therefore, due to the convexity of the function  $-\log$ , we obtain the convexity of  $LF_{G,g}(\rho)$ , which implies the convexity of

(iv): When a set of CP maps  $\{\Psi_k\}$  is a  $(U, U')$ -covariant measurement, the CPTP map  $\Psi(\cdot) := \sum_k \Psi_k(\cdot)$  is a  $(U, U')$ -covariant operation. Hence,  $LF_{G,g}(\rho) \geq LF_{G,g}(\Psi(\rho))$  is valid. Since  $LF_{G,g}$  satisfies convexity and since  $\Psi(\rho) = \sum_k p_k \rho_k$  where  $p_k := \text{Tr}[\Psi_k(\rho)]$  and  $\rho_k := \Psi_k(\rho)/p_k$ , the strong monotonicity is valid for each  $LF_{G,g}$ .

(v): Due to  $F(\rho \otimes \sigma, \rho' \otimes \sigma') = F(\rho, \rho')F(\sigma, \sigma')$ , we obtain the additivity of  $LF_{G,g}(\rho)$  for product states.  $\square$

## Appendix B: Rényi-2 proxies are not resource monotones

In this appendix, we give an explicit counterexample showing that the second Rényi version of the relative entropy of asymmetry is not a resource monotone under  $G$ -covariant channels, already in the simplest setting of a single qubit with a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetry.

### 1. Setup: $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry generated by $X$

Consider a single qubit with Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H} \simeq \mathbb{C}^2$ . We take the symmetry group to be  $G = \mathbb{Z}_2 = \{e, g\}$  with unitary representation

$$U_e = \mathbf{1}, \quad U_g = X, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where  $X$  is the Pauli- $X$  matrix. The corresponding twirling channel is

$$\mathcal{G}_X(\rho) := \frac{1}{2}(\rho + X \rho X). \quad (\text{B2})$$

The second Rényi entropy of a state  $\rho$  is

$$S^{(2)}(\rho) := -\log \text{Tr}(\rho^2), \quad (\text{B3})$$

and we define the second Rényi asymmetry with respect to  $X$  as

$$A_X^{(2)}(\rho) := S^{(2)}(\mathcal{G}_X(\rho)) - S^{(2)}(\rho) = \log \frac{\text{Tr}(\rho^2)}{\text{Tr}(\mathcal{G}_X(\rho)^2)}. \quad (\text{B4})$$

By construction  $A_X^{(2)}(\rho) \geq 0$  and  $A_X^{(2)}(\rho) = 0$  if and only if  $\rho$  is invariant under conjugation by  $X$ . The question is whether  $A_X^{(2)}$  is non-increasing under all  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -covariant CPTP maps.

### 2. Z-dephasing as an $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -covariant channel

Let us consider the dephasing channel in the  $Z$  basis,

$$\Delta_Z(\rho) := \sum_{s=\pm 1} P_s \rho P_s, \quad P_\pm := \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{1} \pm Z), \quad (\text{B5})$$

where  $Z$  is the Pauli- $Z$  matrix. This is a CPTP map that removes the off-diagonal elements in the eigenbasis of  $Z$ . We claim that  $\Delta_Z$  is  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -covariant.

Indeed, using  $XZX = -Z$  one checks that

$$XP_\pm X = P_\mp. \quad (\text{B6})$$

Then, for any state  $\rho$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_Z(X \rho X) &= \sum_{s=\pm 1} P_s X \rho X P_s \\ &= X \Delta_Z(\rho) X, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B7})$$

i.e. it is  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -covariant and hence a free operation in the resource theory of asymmetry for this symmetry.

### 3. Explicit counterexample

We now exhibit a state  $\rho$  such that

$$A_X^{(2)}(\Delta_Z(\rho)) > A_X^{(2)}(\rho), \quad (\text{B8})$$

showing that  $A_X^{(2)}$  is not a resource monotone.

It is convenient to use the Bloch-sphere representation

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{1} + r_x X + r_y Y + r_z Z) \quad (\text{B9})$$

with Bloch vector  $\vec{r} = (r_x, r_y, r_z)$  satisfying  $|\vec{r}| \leq 1$ . Here,  $X, Y, Z$  are the Pauli matrices. In this parametrization, one has

$$\text{Tr}(\rho^2) = \frac{1 + |\vec{r}|^2}{2}. \quad (\text{B10})$$

The twirling channel  $\mathcal{G}_X$  implements the average over conjugation by  $X$ , under which the Bloch vector transforms as

$$(r_x, r_y, r_z) \mapsto (r_x, -r_y, -r_z). \quad (\text{B11})$$

Thus,

$$\mathcal{G}_X(\rho) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{1} + r_x X), \quad (\text{B12})$$

so that

$$\text{Tr}(\mathcal{G}_X(\rho)^2) = \frac{1 + r_x^2}{2}. \quad (\text{B13})$$

Therefore

$$A_X^{(2)}(\rho) = \log \frac{\text{Tr}(\rho^2)}{\text{Tr}(\mathcal{G}_X(\rho)^2)} = \log \frac{1 + r_x^2 + r_y^2 + r_z^2}{1 + r_x^2}. \quad (\text{B14})$$

Next, we apply the  $Z$ -dephasing channel  $\Delta_Z$ . This map sets the  $X$  and  $Y$  components of the Bloch vector to zero,

$$\Delta_Z(\rho) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{1} + r_z Z), \quad (\text{B15})$$

so that

$$\text{Tr}(\Delta_Z(\rho)^2) = \frac{1 + r_z^2}{2}. \quad (\text{B16})$$

Twirling this dephased state with respect to  $X$  simply removes the  $Z$  component,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_X(\Delta_Z(\rho)) &= \frac{1}{2}, \\ \text{Tr}(\mathcal{G}_X(\Delta_Z(\rho))^2) &= \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B17})$$

Hence

$$A_X^{(2)}(\Delta_Z(\rho)) = \log \frac{\text{Tr}(\Delta_Z(\rho)^2)}{\text{Tr}(\mathcal{G}_X(\Delta_Z(\rho))^2)} = \log(1 + r_z^2). \quad (\text{B18})$$

The condition

$$A_X^{(2)}(\Delta_Z(\rho)) > A_X^{(2)}(\rho) \quad (\text{B19})$$

is therefore equivalent to

$$\log(1 + r_z^2) > \log \frac{1 + r_x^2 + r_y^2 + r_z^2}{1 + r_x^2}, \quad (\text{B20})$$

or, after exponentiating and simplifying,

$$r_x^2 r_z^2 > r_y^2. \quad (\text{B21})$$

This inequality is satisfied for a large set of Bloch vectors. As a simple explicit choice, take

$$\vec{r} = (r, 0, r), \quad 0 < r < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad (\text{B22})$$

so that  $|\vec{r}|^2 = 2r^2 < 1$  and  $\rho$  is a valid quantum state. Then

$$r_x^2 r_z^2 = r^4 > 0 = r_y^2, \quad (\text{B23})$$

and therefore

$$A_X^{(2)}(\Delta_Z(\rho)) > A_X^{(2)}(\rho). \quad (\text{B24})$$

For instance, choosing  $r = 1/2$  one obtains

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{1} + \frac{1}{2}X + \frac{1}{2}Z) = \begin{pmatrix} 0.75 & 0.25 \\ 0.25 & 0.25 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{B25})$$

for which

$$\begin{aligned} A_X^{(2)}(\rho) &= \log \frac{6}{5} \approx 0.1823, \\ A_X^{(2)}(\Delta_Z(\rho)) &= \log \frac{5}{4} \approx 0.2231. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B26})$$

Thus the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -covariant dephasing channel  $\Delta_Z$  strictly *increases* the second Rényi asymmetry.

This provides a concrete counterexample to the monotonicity of  $A_X^{(2)}$  under  $G$ -covariant operations. In particular, the second Rényi version of the relative entropy of asymmetry cannot be regarded as a resource monotone for weak symmetry breaking, even in the simplest qubit example.

Note that for the same  $\rho$ , the relative entropy of asymmetry is given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_X(\rho) &\approx 0.1458, \\ A_X(\Delta_Z(\rho)) &\approx 0.1308, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B27})$$

and hence

$$A_X(\Delta_Z(\rho)) < A_X(\rho). \quad (\text{B28})$$

Therefore,  $A_X$  indeed satisfies monotonicity, unlike  $A_X^{(2)}$ .

In fact, for a general density matrix  $\rho$ , one can show that

$$A_X(\Delta_Z(\rho)) - A_X(\rho) = f(r_x) + f(r_z) - f\left(\sqrt{r_x^2 + r_y^2 + r_z^2}\right), \quad (\text{B29})$$

where  $f : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_{\geq 0}$  is given by

$$f(x) = \frac{1+x}{2} \log(1+x) + \frac{1-x}{2} \log(1-x). \quad (\text{B30})$$

First of all note that  $f(x)$  is an even function of  $x$ . So it suffices to restrict our attention to  $x \geq 0$ .

Now note that

$$\frac{f(x)}{x^2} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^{2n}}{2(n+1)(2n+1)}, \quad (\text{B31})$$

from which it follows that  $\frac{f(x)}{x^2}$  is an increasing function of  $x$  for  $x \geq 0$ . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f(r_x)}{r_x^2} &\leq \frac{f\left(\sqrt{r_x^2 + r_y^2 + r_z^2}\right)}{r_x^2 + r_y^2 + r_z^2}, \\ \frac{f(r_z)}{r_z^2} &\leq \frac{f\left(\sqrt{r_x^2 + r_y^2 + r_z^2}\right)}{r_x^2 + r_y^2 + r_z^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B32})$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} &f(r_x) + f(r_z) \\ &\leq \frac{r_x^2 + r_z^2}{r_x^2 + r_y^2 + r_z^2} f\left(\sqrt{r_x^2 + r_y^2 + r_z^2}\right) \\ &\leq f\left(\sqrt{r_x^2 + r_y^2 + r_z^2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B33})$$

Hence it follows that

$$A_X(\Delta_Z(\rho)) - A_X(\rho) \leq 0. \quad (\text{B34})$$

It is important to stress that this ad hoc Rényi asymmetry  $A_G^{(n)}$  should *not* be confused with the  $\alpha$ -Rényi asymmetry measure of relative entropy introduced in [82]. The latter is a genuine resource monotone under  $G$ -covariant operations, but completely different from  $A_G^{(n)}$ .

---

[1] J.A. Vaccaro, F. Anselmi, H.M. Wiseman and K. Jacobs, *Tradeoff between extractable mechanical work, accessible entanglement, and ability to act as a reference system, under arbitrary superselection rules*, *Phys. Rev. A* **77** (2008) 032114 [[quant-ph/0501121](#)].

[2] G. Gour, I. Marvian and R.W. Spekkens, *Measuring the quality of a quantum reference frame: the relative entropy of frameness*, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 012307 (2009) **80** (2009) 012307 [[0901.0943](#)].

[3] G. Gour and R.W. Spekkens, *The resource theory of quantum reference frames: manipulations and monotones*, *New Journal of Physics* **10** (2008) 033023 [[0711.0043](#)].

[4] I. Marvian, *Coherence distillation machines are impossible in quantum thermodynamics*, *Nature Communications* **11** (2020) 25 [[1805.01989](#)].

[5] I. Marvian, *Operational Interpretation of Quantum Fisher Information in Quantum Thermodynamics*, *Physical Review Letters* **129** (2022) 190502 [[2112.04694](#)].

[6] T. Shitara, Y. Mitsuhashi and H. Tajima, *The i.i.d. state convertibility in the resource theory of asymmetry for finite groups*, [2312.15758](#).

[7] K. Yamaguchi, Y. Mitsuhashi, T. Shitara and H. Tajima, *Quantum geometric tensor determines the i.i.d. conversion rate in the resource theory of asymmetry for any compact lie group*, [2411.04766](#).

[8] F. Ares, S. Murciano and P. Calabrese, *Entanglement asymmetry as a probe of symmetry breaking*, *Nature Communications* **14**, 2036 (2023) **14** (2022) [[2207.14693](#)].

[9] S. Murciano, F. Ares, I. Klich and P. Calabrese, *Entanglement asymmetry and quantum mpemba effect in the xy spin chain*, *J. Stat. Mech.* (2024) 013103 **2024** (2023) 013103 [[2310.07513](#)].

[10] F. Ares, S. Murciano, E. Vernier and P. Calabrese, *Lack of symmetry restoration after a quantum quench: an entanglement asymmetry study*, *SciPost Phys.* **15**, 089 (2023) **15** (2023) [[2302.03330](#)].

[11] M. Lastres, S. Murciano, F. Ares and P. Calabrese, *Entanglement asymmetry in the critical xxz spin chain*, *J. Stat. Mech.* (2025) 013107 **2025** (2024) 013107 [[2407.06427](#)].

[12] M. Fossati, C. Rylands and P. Calabrese, *Entanglement asymmetry in cft with boundary symmetry breaking*, [2411.10244](#).

[13] Y. Kusuki, S. Murciano, H. Ooguri and S. Pal, *Entanglement asymmetry and symmetry defects in boundary conformal field theory*, *JHEP* **01** (2025) 057 **2025** (2024) [[2411.09792](#)].

[14] H.-H. Chen and Z.-J. Tang, *Entanglement asymmetry in the hayden-preskill protocol*, [2411.17695](#).

[15] F. Ares, S. Murciano, L. Piroli and P. Calabrese, *An entanglement asymmetry study of black hole radiation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, L061901 (2024) **110** (2023) L061901 [[2311.12683](#)].

[16] A. Russotto, F. Ares and P. Calabrese, *Non-abelian entanglement asymmetry in random states*, *JHEP* **06** (2025) 149 **2025** (2024) [[2411.13337](#)].

[17] L. Capizzi and M. Mazzoni, *Entanglement asymmetry in the ordered phase of many-body systems: the ising field theory*, *JHEP* **2023**, 144 (2023) (2023) [[2307.12127](#)].

[18] L. Capizzi and V. Vitale, *A universal formula for the entanglement asymmetry of matrix product states*, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **57** 45LT01 **2024** **57** (2023) 45LT01 [[2310.01962](#)].

[19] M. Fossati, F. Ares, J. Dubail and P. Calabrese, *Entanglement asymmetry in cft and its relation to non-topological defects*, *JHEP* **2024**, 59 (2024) **2024** (2024) [[2402.03446](#)].

[20] M. Chen and H.-H. Chen, *Renyi entanglement asymmetry in 1+1-dimensional conformal field theories*, [2310.15480](#).

[21] A. Florio and S. Murciano, *Entanglement asymmetry in gauge theories: chiral anomaly in the finite temperature massless Schwinger model*, [2511.01966](#).

[22] F. Benini, V. Godet and A.H. Singh, *Entanglement asymmetry in conformal field theory and holography*, *PTEP* **2025** (2025) 6 [[2407.07969](#)].

[23] F. Ares, V. Vitale and S. Murciano, *The quantum mpemba effect in free-fermionic mixed states*, *Phys. Rev. B* **111**, 104312 (2025) **111** (2024) 104312 [[2405.08913](#)].

[24] C. Rylands, K. Klobas, F. Ares, P. Calabrese, S. Murciano and B. Bertini, *Microscopic origin of the quantum mpemba effect in integrable systems*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133**, 010401 (2024) **133** (2023) 010401 [[2310.04419](#)].

[25] S. Yamashita, F. Ares and P. Calabrese, *Entanglement asymmetry and quantum mpemba effect in two-dimensional free-fermion systems*, *Phys. Rev. B* **110**, 085126 (2024) **110** (2024) 085126 [[2403.04486](#)].

[26] X. Turkeshi, P. Calabrese and A. De Luca, *Quantum mpemba effect in random circuits*, [2405.14514](#).

[27] S. Liu, H.-K. Zhang, S. Yin and S.-X. Zhang, *Symmetry restoration and quantum mpemba effect in symmetric random circuits*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133**, 140405 (2024) **133** (2024) 140405 [[2403.08459](#)].

[28] S. Liu, H.-K. Zhang, S. Yin, S.-X. Zhang and H. Yao, *Quantum mpemba effects in many-body localization systems*, *Science Bulletin* **70** (23), 3991-3996 (2025) **70** (2024) 3991 [[2408.07750](#)].

[29] K. Chalas, F. Ares, C. Rylands and P. Calabrese, *Multiple crossing during dynamical symmetry restoration and implications for the quantum mpemba effect*, *J. Stat. Mech.* (2024) 103101 **2024** (2024) 103101 [[2405.04436](#)].

[30] F. Caceffo, S. Murciano and V. Alba, *Entangled multiplets, asymmetry, and quantum mpemba effect in dissipative systems*, *J. Stat. Mech.* (2024) 063103 **2024** (2024) 063103 [[2402.02918](#)].

[31] C. Rylands, E. Vernier and P. Calabrese, *Dynamical symmetry restoration in the heisenberg spin chain*, [2409.08735](#).

[32] S. Yamashita, P. Calabrese and F. Ares, *Quenching from superfluid to free bosons in two dimensions: entanglement, symmetries, and quantum mpemba effect*, *Physical Review A* **111** (2024) 043304 [[2410.14299](#)].

[33] L.K. Joshi, J. Franke, A. Rath, F. Ares, S. Murciano, F. Kranzl et al., *Observing the quantum mpemba effect in quantum simulations*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133**, 010402, **2024** (2024) [[2401.04270](#)].

[34] G. Di Giulio, X. Turkeshi and S. Murciano,

*Measurement-Induced Symmetry Restoration and Quantum Mpemba Effect*, *Entropy* **27** (2025) 407 [2502.19506].

[35] F. Ares, P. Calabrese and S. Murciano, *The quantum Mpemba effects*, *Nature Rev. Phys.* **7** (2025) 451 [2502.08087].

[36] S. Aditya, A. Summer, P. Sierant and X. Turkeshi, *Mpemba Effects in Quantum Complexity*, **2509.22176**.

[37] A. Summer, M. Moroder, L.P. Bettmann, X. Turkeshi, I. Marvian and J. Goold, *A resource theoretical unification of Mpemba effects: classical and quantum*, **2507.16976**.

[38] M. Mazzoni, L. Capizzi and L. Piroli, *Breaking global symmetries with locality-preserving operations*, **2508.15892**.

[39] S. Yamashita, S. Endo and H. Tajima, *Quantum fisher information as a measure of symmetry breaking in quantum many-body systems*, **2509.07468**.

[40] B. Buca and T. Prosen, *A note on symmetry reductions of the lindblad equation: transport in constrained open spin chains*, *New Journal of Physics* **14** (2012) 073007 **14** (2012) 073007 [1203.0943].

[41] C. de Groot, A. Turzillo and N. Schuch, *Symmetry protected topological order in open quantum systems*, *Quantum* **6**, 856 (2022) **6** (2021) 856 [2112.04483].

[42] R. Ma and C. Wang, *Average symmetry-protected topological phases*, *Phys. Rev. X* **13**, 031016 (2023) **13** (2022) 031016 [2209.02723].

[43] J.-Y. Lee, Y.-Z. You and C. Xu, *Symmetry protected topological phases under decoherence*, *Quantum* **9**, 1607 (2025) **9** (2022) 1607 [2210.16323].

[44] J.-H. Zhang, Y. Qi and Z. Bi, *Fidelity strange correlators for average symmetry-protected topological phases*, **2210.17485**.

[45] R. Ma, J.-H. Zhang, Z. Bi, M. Cheng and C. Wang, *Topological phases with average symmetries: the decohered, the disordered, and the intrinsic*, *Phys. Rev. X* **15**, 021062 (2025) **15** (2023) 021062 [2305.16399].

[46] L.A. Lessa, R. Ma, J.-H. Zhang, Z. Bi, M. Cheng and C. Wang, *Strong-to-weak spontaneous symmetry breaking in mixed quantum states*, *PRX Quantum* **6** (2025) 010344 [2405.03639].

[47] P. Sala, S. Gopalakrishnan, M. Oshikawa and Y. You, *Spontaneous strong symmetry breaking in open systems: Purification perspective*, *Phys. Rev. B* **110** (2024) 155150 [2405.02402].

[48] C.H. Bennett, H.J. Bernstein, S. Popescu and B. Schumacher, *Concentrating partial entanglement by local operations*, *Phys. Rev. A* **53** (1995) 2046 [quant-ph/9511030].

[49] I. Marvian Mashhad, *Symmetry, Asymmetry and Quantum Information*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Waterloo, Sept., 2012.

[50] I. Marvian and R.W. Spekkens, *The theory of manipulations of pure state asymmetry: I. Basic tools, equivalence classes and single copy transformations*, *New Journal of Physics* **15** (2013) 033001 [1104.0018].

[51] I. Marvian and S. Lloyd, *From clocks to cloners: Catalytic transformations under covariant operations and recoverability*, Aug., 2016. 10.48550/ARXIV.1608.07325.

[52] C.W. Helstrom, *Quantum detection and estimation theory*, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **1** (1969) 231.

[53] F. Hansen, *Metric adjusted skew information*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **105** (2008) 9909 [math-ph/0607049].

[54] B. Yadin and V. Vedral, *General framework for quantum macroscopicity in terms of coherence*, *Phys. Rev. A* **93** (2016) 022122.

[55] K. Yamaguchi and H. Tajima, *Beyond i.i.d. in the resource theory of asymmetry: An information-spectrum approach for quantum fisher information*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131** (2023) 200203 [2204.08439].

[56] K. Yamaguchi and H. Tajima, *Smooth Metric Adjusted Skew Information Rates*, *Quantum* **7** (2023) 1012 [2211.12522].

[57] J.P. Provost and G. Vallee, *Riemannian structure on manifolds of quantum states*, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **76** (1980) 289.

[58] M.V. Berry, *The quantum phase, five years after*, in *Geometric Phases in Physics*, vol. 5, pp. 3–28, World Scientific Singapore (1989).

[59] D. Kudo and H. Tajima, *Fisher information matrix as a resource measure in resource theory of asymmetry with general connected lie group symmetry*, *Physical Review A* **107** (2022) 062418 [2205.03245].

[60] F. Ferro, F. Ares and P. Calabrese, *Non-equilibrium entanglement asymmetry for discrete groups: the example of the xy spin chain*, *J. Stat. Mech.* (2024) 023101 **2024** (2023) 023101 [2307.06902].

[61] H. Fujimura and S. Shimamori, *Entanglement Asymmetry and Quantum Mpemba Effect for Non-Abelian Global Symmetry*, **2509.05597**.

[62] E. Zapusek, K. Kirova, W. Hahn, M. Marthaler and F. Reiter, *Variational quantum thermalizers based on weakly-symmetric nonunitary multi-qubit operations*, *Quantum Science and Technology* (2025) [2502.09698].

[63] S. Yu, *Quantum fisher information as the convex roof of variance*, Feb., 2013. 10.48550/ARXIV.1302.5311.

[64] P. Gibilisco, D. Imparato and T. Isola, *Uncertainty principle and quantum fisher information. ii.*, *Journal of mathematical physics* **48** (2007) [math-ph/0701062].

[65] P. Gibilisco and T. Isola, *On a refinement of heisenberg uncertainty relation by means of quantum fisher information*, *Journal of mathematical analysis and applications* **375** (2011) 270.

[66] S.A. Ahmad, M.S. Klinger and Y. Wang, *The many faces of non-invertible symmetries*, **2509.18072**.

[67] F. Benini, P. Calabrese, M. Fossati, A.H. Singh and M. Venuti, *Entanglement asymmetry for higher and noninvertible symmetries*, **2509.16311**.

[68] Y. Kusuki, S. Murciano, H. Ooguri and S. Pal, *Symmetry-resolved entanglement entropy, spectra & boundary conformal field theory*, *JHEP* **2023**, 216 (2023) **2023** [2309.03287].

[69] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, *Quantum quenches in 1+1 dimensional conformal field theories*, *J. Stat. Mech.* (2016) 064003 **2016** (2016) 064003 [1603.02889].

[70] J. Cardy, *Boundary conformal field theory*, *Encyclopedia of Mathematical Physics*, (Elsevier, 2006) (2004) [hep-th/0411189].

[71] N. Benjamin, J. Lee, S. Pal, D. Simmons-Duffin and Y. Xu, *Angular fractals in thermal QFT*, *JHEP* **11** (2024) 134 [2405.17562].

[72] N. Banerjee, J. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharyya, S. Jain, S. Minwalla and T. Sharma, *Constraints on Fluid Dynamics from Equilibrium Partition Functions*, *JHEP* **09** (2012) 046 [1203.3544].

[73] S. Bhattacharyya, S. Lahiri, R. Loganayagam and S. Minwalla, *Large rotating AdS black holes from fluid mechanics*, *JHEP* **09** (2008) 054 [[0708.1770](#)].

[74] K. Jensen, M. Kaminski, P. Kovtun, R. Meyer, A. Ritz and A. Yarom, *Towards hydrodynamics without an entropy current*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109** (2012) 101601 [[1203.3556](#)].

[75] N. Benjamin, J. Lee, H. Ooguri and D. Simmons-Duffin, *Universal asymptotics for high energy CFT data*, *JHEP* **03** (2024) 115 [[2306.08031](#)].

[76] S. Bhattacharyya, *Constraints on the second order transport coefficients of an uncharged fluid*, *JHEP* **07** (2012) 104 [[1201.4654](#)].

[77] J. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharyya and M. Rangamani, *Non-dissipative hydrodynamics: Effective actions versus entropy current*, *JHEP* **02** (2013) 153 [[1211.1020](#)].

[78] E. Shaghoulian, *Black hole microstates in AdS*, *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (2016) 104044 [[1512.06855](#)].

[79] M.J. Kang, J. Lee and H. Ooguri, *Universal formula for the density of states with continuous symmetry*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023) 026021 [[2206.14814](#)].

[80] H. Anand, N. Benjamin, V. Kumar, S. Minwalla, J. Mukherjee, S. Pal et al., *Semi-universality of CFT<sub>d</sub>* *entropy at large spin*, [2512.00158](#).

[81] Y. Kusuki, H. Ooguri and S. Pal, *Universality of Rényi Entropy in Conformal Field Theory*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **135** (2025) 061603 [[2503.24353](#)].

[82] L. Gao, M. Junge and N. LaRacuente, *Unifying entanglement with uncertainty via symmetries of observable algebras*, [1710.10038](#).

[83] M. Hayashi, *Group representation for quantum theory*, Springer (2017).

[84] W.F. Stinespring, *Positive functions on  $c^*$ -algebras*, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **6** (1955) 211.

[85] E.B. Davies, *Quantum Theory of Open Systems*, Academic Press (1976).

[86] M.A. Nielsen and I.L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition*, Dec., 2010. 10.1017/cbo9780511976667.

[87] R. Arratia and M. Earnest, *A countdown process, with application to the rank of random matrices over  $\mathcal{U}_q(n)$* , [1605.04352](#).

[88] A. Winter, *Coding theorem and strong converse for quantum channels*, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **45** (1999) 2481 [[1409.2536](#)].

**Supplemental Material for  
“Resource-Theoretic Quantifiers of Weak and Strong Symmetry Breaking:  
Strong Entanglement Asymmetry and Beyond”**

Yuya Kusuki<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Sridip Pal<sup>4</sup> and Hiroyasu Tajima<sup>5,6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute for Advanced Study, Kyushu University, Fukuoka 819-0395, Japan.*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, Kyushu University, Fukuoka 819-0395, Japan.*

<sup>3</sup>*RIKEN Interdisciplinary Theoretical and Mathematical Sciences (iTHEMS), Wako, Saitama 351-0198, Japan.*

<sup>3</sup>*Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques (IHES), 91440 Bures-sur-Yvette, France.*

<sup>4</sup>*Department of Informatics, Faculty of Information Science and Electrical Engineering, Kyushu University, Fukuoka 819-0395, Japan.*

<sup>5</sup>*JST, FOREST, 4-1-8 Honcho, Kawaguchi, Saitama, 332-0012, Japan.*

**Appendix C: Preliminaries: Groups and (projective) unitary representations**

Let  $G$  be a group. A *unitary representation* of  $G$  on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  is a homomorphism

$$U : G \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}), \quad g \mapsto U_g, \quad (C1)$$

satisfying the exact group composition rule

$$U_g U_h = U_{gh}, \quad U_e = \mathbb{I}, \quad (C2)$$

where  $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$  denotes the unitary group acting on  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $e$  is the identity element of  $G$ .

In quantum theory, symmetries are often represented not by exact unitary representations but by *projective unitary representations*. A projective unitary representation  $U : G \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$  satisfies

$$U_g U_h = \omega(g, h) U_{gh}, \quad (C3)$$

where  $\omega(g, h)$  is a phase factor known as a *2-cocycle*, obeying the associativity condition

$$\omega(g, h) \omega(gh, k) = \omega(h, k) \omega(g, hk), \quad (C4)$$

for all  $g, h, k \in G$ .

When  $\{U_g\}$  is a projective unitary representation,  $U_e = I$  does not always hold. In general,  $U_e = cI$  is always valid, where  $c$  is a complex number whose absolute value is 1. However, taking  $\alpha(g) : G \rightarrow U(1)$  satisfying  $\alpha(e) = c^{-1}$ , we can always redefine  $\{U_g\}$  as  $\tilde{U}_g := \alpha(g)U_g$ . Then,  $\tilde{U}_g$  becomes another projective unitary representation since it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{U}_g \tilde{U}_h &= \alpha(g)\alpha(h)\omega(g, h)U_{gh} \\ &= \tilde{\omega}(g, h)\tilde{U}_{gh}, \end{aligned} \quad (C5)$$

$$\tilde{\omega}(g, h) := \alpha(g)\alpha(h)\alpha(gh)^{-1}\omega(g, h). \quad (C6)$$

By definition,  $\{\tilde{U}_g\}$  satisfies  $\tilde{U}_e = I$  which implies that its cocycle satisfies  $\tilde{\omega}(g, e) = \tilde{\omega}(e, g) = 1$ . Therefore, in this supplementary materials, we assume that  $U_e = I$  (and  $\omega(g, e) = \omega(e, g) = 1$ ).

In this Supplementary Material, we assume that the group  $G$  is compact. We also focus on (projective) unitary representations which have the following irreducible decomposition:

$$U_g = \bigoplus_{\nu} U_g^{\nu} \otimes I^{m_{\nu}}. \quad (C7)$$

Here  $m_{\nu}$  denotes the multiplicity of the irrep  $\nu$ . We also use the irreducible decomposition of the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  induced by  $\{U_g\}_{g \in G}$ :

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{\nu} \mathcal{H}_{\nu} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m_{\nu}}. \quad (C8)$$

In the decomposition of a projective unitary representation  $U_g = \bigoplus_\nu U_g^{(\nu)} \otimes I^{m_\nu}$ , the cocycle of each irreducible representation is the same. To be concrete, for any irreducible representation  $U_g^{(\mu)}$  in the decomposition, its cocycle  $\omega^{(\mu)}$  satisfies

$$\omega^{(\mu)}(g, h) = \omega(g, h), \quad (\text{C9})$$

where  $\omega$  is the cocycle of  $\{U_g\}$ .

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(g, h)U_{gh} &= U_gU_h \\ &= \bigoplus_\mu U_g^{(\mu)}U_h^{(\mu)} \otimes I^{m_\mu} \\ &= \bigoplus_\mu \omega^{(\mu)}(g, h)U_{gh}^{(\mu)} \otimes I^{m_\mu} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C10})$$

Multiplying the both sides by  $P^{(\mu)}$  that is the projection to  $\mathcal{H}_\mu \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m_\mu}$  on the right, we obtain

$$\omega(g, h)U_{gh}^{(\mu)} \otimes I^{m_\mu} = \omega^{(\mu)}(g, h)U_{gh}^{(\mu)} \otimes I^{m_\mu}. \quad (\text{C11})$$

Since  $U_{gh}^{(\mu)} \otimes I^{m_\mu}$  is an invertible matrix, we obtain  $\omega(g, h) = \omega^{(\mu)}(g, h)$ .  $\square$

Even for such projective unitary representations, Schur's lemma and Schur's orthogonality theorem remain valid.

**Lemma 2** (Schur's lemma). *Let  $G$  be a group, and let  $\{U_g\}$  and  $\{U'_g\}$  be irreducible (projective) unitary representations acting on  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{H}'$ . Let  $T$  be a linear map from  $\mathcal{H}$  to  $\mathcal{H}'$  satisfying*

$$TU_g = U'_g T, \quad \forall g \in G. \quad (\text{C12})$$

*Then, (a)  $T$  is a zero map or (b)  $T$  is bijection and  $T = cV$ , where  $c$  is a scalar satisfying  $|c| > 0$  and  $V$  is a unitary map from  $\mathcal{H}$  to  $\mathcal{H}'$ , and the irreducible representations  $\{U_g\}$  and  $\{U'_g\}$  satisfy  $U'_g = VU_gV^\dagger$ , i.e. they are equivalent to each other.*

*Proof.* When  $T = 0$  is valid, (C12) is also clearly valid. Therefore, below we assume that  $T$  is a non-zero map, and show that (b) is valid. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(g, h)TU_{gh} &= TU_gU_h \\ &= U'_gU'_hT \\ &= \omega'(g, h)U'_{gh}T \\ &= \omega'(g, h)TU_{gh}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C13})$$

Since  $T$  is a non-zero map, there exists  $|\psi\rangle$  s.t.  $T|\psi\rangle \neq 0$ . Then, multiplying the both sides of (C13) by  $U_{gh}^\dagger|\psi\rangle$  on the right, we obtain  $\omega(g, h)T|\psi\rangle = \omega'(g, h)T|\psi\rangle$ , which implies

$$\omega(g, h) = \omega'(g, h). \quad (\text{C14})$$

Due to (C14), we can define a group  $\tilde{G} := U(1) \times G$  whose element  $(z, g)$  satisfies

$$(z, g) \cdot (z', g') = (zz' \omega(g, g'), gg') \quad (\text{C15})$$

and non-projective unitary representations  $\tilde{U}$  and  $\tilde{U}'$  of  $\tilde{G}$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{H}'$

$$\tilde{U}_{z,g} := zU_g, \quad \tilde{U}'_{z,g} := zU'_g. \quad (\text{C16})$$

Then,  $\tilde{U}$  is irreducible iff  $U$  is irreducible, and  $\tilde{U}'$  is irreducible iff  $U'$  is irreducible. Therefore, (C12) implies

$$T\tilde{U}_{z,g} = U'_{z,g}T, \quad \forall (z, g) \in \tilde{G}. \quad (\text{C17})$$

Therefore, because of Schur's lemma for non-projective unitary representation [83], (b) must be valid.  $\square$

**Lemma 3** (Schur's orthogonality theorem). *Let  $G$  be a group, and let  $U^{(\mu)}$  and  $U^{(\lambda)}$  be irreducible (projective) unitary representations of  $G$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$  and  $\mathcal{H}_\lambda$ , respectively. If the cocycles of  $U^{(\mu)}$  and  $U^{(\lambda)}$  are the same, the following relations hold:*

(a): *When  $U^{(\mu)}$  and  $U^{(\lambda)}$  are not equivalent,*

$$\int_G dg \langle j|_\mu (U_g^{(\mu)})^\dagger |i\rangle_\mu \langle k|_\lambda U_g^{(\lambda)} |l\rangle_\lambda = 0, \quad (\text{C18})$$

*where  $\{|i\rangle_\mu\}$  and  $\{|k\rangle_\lambda\}$  are arbitrary orthonormal basis of  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$  and  $\mathcal{H}_\lambda$ , respectively.*

(b): *When  $U^{(\mu)}$  and  $U^{(\lambda)}$  are equivalent,*

$$\int_G dg \langle j|_\mu (U_g^{(\mu)})^\dagger |i\rangle_\mu \langle k|_\lambda U_g^{(\lambda)} |l\rangle_\lambda = \frac{\delta_{i,k} \delta_{j,l}}{d_\mu}, \quad (\text{C19})$$

*where  $d_\mu$  is the dimension of  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$ , and  $\{|i\rangle_\mu\}$  and  $\{|k\rangle_\lambda\} := \{V|k\rangle_\mu\}$  are orthonormal basis of  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$  and  $\mathcal{H}_\lambda$ , respectively, where  $V$  is a unitary satisfying  $U_g^{(\lambda)} = VU_g^{(\mu)}V^\dagger$ .*

*Proof.* Since cocycles of  $U^{(\mu)}$  and  $U^{(\lambda)}$  are the same, again we can define the group  $\tilde{G}$  and its non-projective unitary representations  $\tilde{U}^{(\mu)}$  and  $\tilde{U}^{(\lambda)}$  as  $\tilde{G}$ ,  $\tilde{U}$  and  $\tilde{U}'$  in the proof of Lemma 2, respectively. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{U(1)} dz \int_G dg \langle j|_\mu (U_{z,g}^{(\mu)})^\dagger |i\rangle_\mu \langle k|_\lambda U_{z,g}^{(\lambda)} |l\rangle_\lambda &= \int_{U(1)} dz |z|^2 \int_G dg \langle j|_\mu (U_g^{(\mu)})^\dagger |i\rangle_\mu \langle k|_\lambda U_g^{(\lambda)} |l\rangle_\lambda \\ &= \int_G dg \langle j|_\mu (U_g^{(\mu)})^\dagger |i\rangle_\mu \langle k|_\lambda U_g^{(\lambda)} |l\rangle_\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C20})$$

Therefore, from Schur's orthogonality theorem for non-projective unitary representations [83], we obtain (a) and (b).  $\square$

#### Appendix D: Properties of strong symmetric states, single-sector states and strong covariant operations

In this section, we give the basic properties of strong symmetric states, single-sector states and strong covariant operations. For the readers' convenience, we repeat the definitions:

**Free states: Strong symmetric states.** Let  $S$  be a quantum system, and let  $G$  be a group with a (projective) unitary representation  $U$  acting on  $S$ . A state  $\rho$  on  $S$  is said to be strong symmetric with respect to  $U$  if it satisfies

$$U_g \rho = e^{i\theta_{g,\rho}} \rho, \quad \forall g \in G, \quad (\text{D1})$$

where  $\theta_{g,\rho}$  is a real-valued function of  $g$  and  $\rho$ . We refer to the whole set of strong symmetric states as  $\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$ .

**Additional class of states: Single-sector states.** Let  $S$  be a quantum system, and let  $G$  be a group with a (projective) unitary representation  $U$  acting on  $S$ . We assume that  $U_{g \in G}$  admits the following irreducible decomposition:

$$U_g = \bigoplus_\nu U_g^{(\nu)} \otimes I_{m_\nu}, \quad (\text{D2})$$

where  $m_\nu$  denotes the multiplicity of the irrep labeled by  $\nu$ . Correspondingly, the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  can be decomposed as

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_\nu \mathcal{H}_\nu \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m_\nu}. \quad (\text{D3})$$

A state  $\rho$  on  $S$  is said to be *single-sector* with respect to  $U$  if it is weak symmetric with respect to  $U$  and satisfies

$$\exists \nu \text{ such that } P_\nu \rho P_\nu = \rho, \quad (\text{D4})$$

where  $P_\nu$  is the projection operator onto  $\mathcal{H}_\nu \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m_\nu}$ . We refer to the whole set of single-sector states as  $\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{single}}$ .

**Free operations: strong covariant operations.** Let  $G$  be a group, and let  $U$  and  $U'$  be (projective) unitary representations of  $G$  acting on two Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{H}'$ , respectively. A CPTP map  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$  is said to be  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant if it satisfies

$$\Lambda(U_g \dots) = U'_g \Lambda(\dots) \quad \forall g \in G. \quad (\text{D5})$$

We refer to the whole set of strong covariant operations as  $\mathcal{O}_{G,\text{strong}}$ .

For strong covariant operations, the following lemma holds:

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $G$  be a (compact) group, and let  $U : G \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H})$  and  $U' : G \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H}')$  be (projective) unitary representations acting on Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{H}'$ , respectively. Suppose that there is a  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant operation  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$ . Then, the cocycles  $\omega(g, h)$  and  $\omega'(g, h)$  of  $U$  and  $U'$  coincide:*

$$\omega(g, h) = \omega'(g, h), \quad \forall g, h \in G \quad (\text{D6})$$

*Proof.* Since  $\Lambda$  is  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant, the following relations hold for an arbitrary state  $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ , and thus the cocycles of  $U$  and  $U'$  coincide:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega'(g, h) &= \text{Tr}[U'^{\dagger}_{gh} U'_g U'_h \Lambda(\rho)] \\ &= \text{Tr}[\Lambda(U'^{\dagger}_{gh} U'_g U'_h \rho)] \\ &= \omega(g, h). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D7})$$

□

### 1. Properties as free states and free operations

We firstly show that either the combination of  $(\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}, \mathcal{O}_{G,\text{strong}})$  or  $(\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{single}}, \mathcal{O}_{G,\text{strong}})$  satisfies the minimal requirements of the resource theory.

**Theorem 11.** *Let  $G$  be a (compact) group, and let  $U$ ,  $U'$  and  $U''$  be (projective) unitary representations acting on Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}'$  and  $\mathcal{H}''$ , respectively. Then, the following three are valid:*

- (i) *The identity operation on  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is  $(U, U)$ -strong covariant.*
- (ii) *If  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$  and  $\Lambda' : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}') \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}'')$  are  $(U, U')$ - and  $(U', U'')$ -strong covariant, respectively,  $\Lambda' \circ \Lambda$  is also  $(U, U'')$ -strong covariant.*
- (iii) *If  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$  is a  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant CPTP map, the following relations hold:*

$$\rho \in \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}} \Rightarrow \Lambda(\rho) \in \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}, \quad (\text{D8})$$

$$\rho \in \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{single}} \Rightarrow \Lambda(\rho) \in \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{single}}. \quad (\text{D9})$$

**Proof of Theorem 11.** The properties (i) and (ii) directly follow from the definition of strong covariant operations.

Let us prove (iii). We first prove (D8). Let  $\rho$  be a state on  $S$  that is strong symmetric with respect to  $U$ . Then, there exists a real-valued function  $\theta_{g,\rho}$  such that  $U_g \rho = e^{i\theta_{g,\rho}} \rho$  holds for all  $g \in G$ . Since  $\Lambda$  is  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant, we have

$$U'_g \Lambda(\rho) = \Lambda(U_g \rho) = e^{i\theta_{g,\rho}} \Lambda(\rho), \quad (\text{D10})$$

which shows that  $\Lambda(\rho)$  is also strong symmetric with respect to  $\{U'_g\}$ .

Next, let us prove (D9). Due to Lemma 4, the cocycles of  $U$  and  $U'$  coincide, and thus we can take the irreducible decompositions of  $U$ ,  $U'$ ,  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{H}'$  as

$$U_g = \bigoplus_{\nu} U_g^{(\nu)} \otimes I_{m_{\nu}}, \quad (\text{D11})$$

$$U'_g = \bigoplus_{\nu'} U'_g^{(\nu')} \otimes I_{m'_{\nu'}}, \quad (\text{D12})$$

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{\nu} \mathcal{H}_{\nu} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m_{\nu}}, \quad (\text{D13})$$

$$\mathcal{H}' = \bigoplus_{\nu'} \mathcal{H}'_{\nu'} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m'_{\nu'}}, \quad (\text{D14})$$

where, irreducible representations labeled by the same index  $\nu$  are understood to be identical, i.e.,  $U^{(\nu)} = U'^{(\nu)}$ , and the cocycles of irreducible representations  $U^{(\nu)}$  ( $U'^{(\nu)}$ ) in the decomposition of  $U$  ( $U'$ ) coincide with each others. Here, using Schur's orthogonality theorem, we obtain

$$\int \chi_\nu(g)^* U_g^{(\nu)} dg = \frac{\delta_{\nu,\nu'} I_\nu}{d_\nu}, \quad (\text{D15})$$

where  $d_\nu := \dim \mathcal{H}_\nu$ ,  $\chi_\nu(g) := \text{Tr}[U_g^{(\nu)}]$  and  $I_\nu$  is the identity operator on  $\mathcal{H}_\nu$ . Using this theorem and  $U^{(\nu)} = U'^{(\nu)}$ , we can rewrite the projection  $P_\nu$  to  $\mathcal{H}_\nu \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m_\nu}$  and  $P'_{\nu'}$  to  $\mathcal{H}_{\nu'} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m'_{\nu'}}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} P_\nu &= I_\nu \otimes I_{m_\nu} \\ &= d_\nu \int \chi_\nu(g)^* \bigoplus_{\nu'} \left( U_g^{(\nu')} \otimes I_{m_{\nu'}} \right) dg \\ &= d_\nu \int \chi_\nu(g)^* U_g dg, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D16})$$

$$P'_{\nu'} = d_{\nu'} \int \chi_{\nu'}(g)^* U'_g dg. \quad (\text{D17})$$

Therefore, for any  $\rho$  on  $S$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} p'_\nu(\rho) &:= \text{Tr}[P'_\nu \Lambda(\rho)] \\ &= \text{Tr}[d_\nu \int_G dg \chi_\nu(g)^* U'_g \Lambda(\rho)] \\ &= \text{Tr}[d_\nu \int_G dg \chi_\nu(g)^* \Lambda(U_g \rho)] \\ &= \text{Tr}[\Lambda(P_\nu \rho)] \\ &= \text{Tr}[P_\nu \rho] = p_\nu(\rho), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D18})$$

which is also given by Ref. [62] in a different context. Therefore, when  $\rho$  is a single sector state, the support of  $\Lambda(\rho)$  is in an irreducible component  $\mathcal{H}'_\nu \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m'_\nu}$ . Since  $\Lambda$  is strong covariant,  $\Lambda$  is also weak covariant, and thus  $\Lambda(\rho)$  is weak symmetric if  $\rho$  is a single sector state. Therefore,  $\Lambda(\rho)$  is a single sector state.  $\square$

## 2. Stinespring representations and Kraus representations of the strong-covariant operations

In this subsection, we clarify the properties of Stinespring representations and Kraus representations of strong covariant operations.

**Theorem 12.** *Let  $G$  be a (compact) group, and let  $U$  and  $U'$  be (projective) unitary representations acting on Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{H}'$ , respectively. Let  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$  be a  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant CPTP map. Then, any Kraus representation  $\{K_m\}$  of  $\Lambda$  satisfies*

$$K_m U_g = U'_g K_m, \quad \forall g \in G. \quad (\text{D19})$$

Conversely, when a CPTP map  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$  has a Kraus representation satisfying (D19), it is  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant.

**Proof of Theorem 12.** Due to the Stinespring's dilation theorem, there exists a *minimal* Stinespring representation of  $\Lambda^\dagger$  [84, 85]. Namely, there exists a quantum system  $E'$  with Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_{E'}$  and an isometry  $W : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}' \otimes \mathcal{H}_{E'}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^\dagger(Y) &= W^\dagger(Y \otimes 1_{E'}) W, \quad \forall Y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{S'}) \\ \mathcal{H}_{S'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{E'} &= \overline{\text{span}}\{(Y \otimes 1_{E'}) W |\psi\rangle \mid Y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{S'}), |\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D20})$$

where  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{S'})$  is the whole set of bounded operators of  $\mathcal{H}_{S'}$ .

Since  $\Lambda$  is  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant, for any operator  $Y$ ,

$$\Lambda^\dagger(U_g^\dagger Y) = U_g^\dagger \Lambda^\dagger(Y), \quad \forall g \in G. \quad (\text{D21})$$

Therefore,

$$U_g^\dagger W^\dagger (Y \otimes 1_{E'}) W = W^\dagger (U_g'^\dagger Y \otimes 1_{E'}) W, \quad \forall g \in G. \quad (\text{D22})$$

By multiplying the equation from the right by  $|\psi\rangle$ , allowing  $Y$  and  $|\psi\rangle$  to vary freely, and then taking linear combinations, we obtain the following:

$$U_g^\dagger W^\dagger = W^\dagger (U_g'^\dagger \otimes 1_{E'}) \quad (\text{D23})$$

Let us take an orthonormal basis  $\{|m\rangle\}$  of  $E'$  and define  $\{K_m\}$  as

$$K_m := \langle m | W \quad (\text{D24})$$

We remark that since  $W$  is a map from  $\mathcal{H}$  to  $\mathcal{H}' \otimes \mathcal{H}_{E'}$ , and thus  $\langle m | W$  is a map from  $\mathcal{H}$  to  $\mathcal{H}'$ .

The operators  $\{K_m\}$  satisfy

$$\Lambda(\dots) = \text{Tr}_{E'}[W \dots W^\dagger] = \sum_m \langle m | W \dots W^\dagger | m \rangle = \sum_m K_m \dots K_m^\dagger. \quad (\text{D25})$$

$$\sum_m K_m^\dagger K_m = W^\dagger 1_{S'} \otimes \sum_m |m\rangle \langle m | W = W^\dagger 1_{S'} \otimes 1_{E'} W = 1_S. \quad (\text{D26})$$

Therefore,  $\{K_m\}$  is a Kraus representation of  $\Lambda$ . And due to (D23) and (D24), we obtain  $K_m U_g = U_g' K_m$  for any  $g \in G$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} K_m U_g &= \langle m | W U_g \\ &= \langle m | 1_{E'} \otimes U_g' W \\ &= U_g' \langle m | W \\ &= U_g' K_m. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D27})$$

Therefore,  $\{K_m\}$  satisfies (D19). Furthermore, any other Kraus representation  $\{K'_l\}$  of  $\Lambda$  can be written as

$$K'_l = \sum_m u_{l,m} K_m, \quad (\text{D28})$$

$\{K'_l\}$  also satisfies (D19).

The converse part is obvious. When a CPTP map  $\Lambda$  from  $S$  to  $S'$  admits a Kraus representation  $\{K_m\}$  satisfying (D19), the map  $\Lambda$  is strong covariant, since

$$U_g' \Lambda(\dots) = U_g' \sum_m K_m \dots K_m^\dagger = \sum_m K_m U_g \dots K_m^\dagger = \Lambda(U_g \dots). \quad (\text{D29})$$

□

**Theorem 13.** *Let  $G$  be a (compact) group, and let  $U$  be a (projective) unitary representation acting on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . Let  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  be a  $(U, U)$ -strong covariant CPTP map. Then, there exists an auxiliary Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_E$ , a unitary operator  $V$  on  $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$ , and a state  $\sigma_E \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_E)$  such that*

$$(U_g \otimes I^{(E)}) V = V (U_g \otimes I^{(E)}) \quad \forall g \in G, \quad (\text{D30})$$

$$\Lambda(\rho) = \text{Tr}_E [V(\rho \otimes \sigma_E) V^\dagger]. \quad (\text{D31})$$

Conversely, when a CPTP map  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  can be realized by  $(V, \sigma_E)$  satisfying (D30) and (D31), the map is  $(U, U)$ -strong covariant.

**Proof of Theorem 13.** Due to the proof of Theorem 12, when  $\Lambda$  is strong covariant, there is a Kraus representation  $\{K_m\}_{m=1,\dots,d_\Lambda}$  satisfying (D19). Let us take quantum systems  $E$  satisfying  $\dim \mathcal{H}_E = d_\Lambda + 1$ , and take an orthonormal basis  $\{|m\rangle\}_{m=0,1,\dots,d_\Lambda}$ . Using them, we define a partial isometry  $W'$  from  $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$  to  $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$  as

$$W' := \sum_{m=1}^{d_\Lambda} K_m \otimes |m\rangle \langle 0|_E \quad (\text{D32})$$

This  $W'$  is indeed a partial isometry, since  $W'^\dagger W' = 1_S \otimes |0\rangle_E \langle 0|_E$  and  $(W'W'^\dagger)^2 = W'W'^\dagger$ , i.e., both  $W'^\dagger W'$  and  $W'W'^\dagger$  are projections.

Since  $W'W'^\dagger$  and  $W'^\dagger W'$  are orthogonal to each other, the following  $Q$  is also a projection:

$$Q := I_{SE} - W'^\dagger W' - W'W'^\dagger, \quad (\text{D33})$$

where  $I_{SE}$  is the identity of  $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$ . Because of  $[U_g \otimes 1_E, W'^\dagger W'] = 0$  and  $[U_g \otimes 1_E, W'W'^\dagger] = 0$ , the projection  $Q$  satisfies

$$[U_g \otimes 1_E, Q] = 0. \quad (\text{D34})$$

It is also a projection which is orthogonal to  $W'^\dagger W'$  and  $W'W'^\dagger$ , and thus it satisfies

$$\|QW'\|_2^2 = \text{Tr}[W'^\dagger QW'] = \text{Tr}[QW'W'^\dagger] = 0, \quad (\text{D35})$$

$$\|W'Q\|_2^2 = \text{Tr}[QW'^\dagger W'Q] = \text{Tr}[QW'^\dagger W'] = 0, \quad (\text{D36})$$

which imply  $QW' = W'Q = 0$ .

Now, let us define

$$V := W' + W'^\dagger + Q. \quad (\text{D37})$$

By definition,

$$V^\dagger V = (W' + W'^\dagger + Q)^2 = VV^\dagger. \quad (\text{D38})$$

$V$  is a unitary, since

$$\begin{aligned} V^\dagger V &= (W'^\dagger + W' + Q)^2 \\ &= W'^\dagger W' + W'W'^\dagger + Q = I_{SE}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D39})$$

Here we used  $QW' = W'Q = 0$  and  $W'W' = 0$ .

Furthermore, due to (D19) and  $[U_g \otimes 1_E, Q] = 0$ , we obtain

$$[U_g \otimes 1_E, V] = 0. \quad (\text{D40})$$

By defining  $\sigma_E := |0\rangle \langle 0|_E$ ,

$$\text{Tr}_E V \dots \otimes \sigma_E V^\dagger = \sum_m K_m \dots K_m^\dagger = \Lambda(\dots). \quad (\text{D41})$$

Therefore, we have proved the former part of the theorem. The latter part is straightforward. When a Kraus representation  $\{K_m\}$  of  $\Lambda$  satisfies (D19),

$$U_g \Lambda(\dots) = U_g \sum_m K_m \dots K_m^\dagger = \sum_m K_m U_g \dots K_m^\dagger = \Lambda(U_g \dots). \quad (\text{D42})$$

Therefore,  $\Lambda$  is strong covariant.  $\square$

### 3. GKSL equation realizing strong covariant operations

**Theorem 14.** *Let  $S$  be a quantum system whose dynamics obey the following GKSL equation:*

$$\partial_t \rho = -i[H, \rho] + \sum_k \left( L_k \rho L_k^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{L_k^\dagger L_k, \rho\} \right). \quad (\text{D43})$$

*Let  $G$  and  $U$  be a group and its (projective) unitary representation on  $\mathcal{H}$ , the Hilbert space of  $S$ . We also assume that the CPTP map  $\Lambda_t : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  realized by the master equation is  $(U, U)$ -strong covariant for any  $t$ , and that  $[H, U_g] = 0$ . Then, any jump operators  $\{L_k\}$  of the GKSL equation satisfy*

$$[L_k, U_g] = 0, \quad \forall g \in G. \quad (\text{D44})$$

*Proof.* Let  $\Lambda_{dt}$  denote the CPTP map describing the time evolution over an infinitesimal time  $dt$  according to the given GKSL equation. Note that  $\Lambda_{dt}(\dots)$  is  $(U, U)$ -strong covariant. Therefore, for any Kraus representation satisfying  $\Lambda_{dt}(\dots) = \sum_j K_{j,dt} \dots K_{j,dt}^\dagger$ ,  $[U_g, K_{j,dt}] = 0$  holds. Choosing the Kraus representation properly, we can take one satisfying

$$K_{j,dt} = L_j \sqrt{dt}, \quad (j \neq 0) \quad (\text{D45})$$

$$K_{0,dt} = I + \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq 0} L_j^\dagger L_j + iH \right) dt. \quad (\text{D46})$$

These operators commute with  $U_g$  for any  $g \in G$ . Therefore,  $[L_j, U_g] = 0$  for any  $j$  and  $g \in G$ .  $\square$

#### 4. The proof of Lemma 1

When the system  $S$  has a larger Hilbert-space dimension than  $S'$ , a strong covariant operation from  $S$  to  $S'$  does not necessarily exist. This already becomes evident in the case of  $U(1)$  symmetry. For example, the following lemma holds.

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{H}'$  be Hilbert spaces whose dimensions are  $d$  and  $d'$ , respectively, and assume  $d > d'$ . Let  $U : U(1) \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H})$  and  $U' : U(1) \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H}')$  be unitary representations which are defined as  $U_t := e^{-iHt}$  and  $U'_t := e^{-iH't}$ , respectively. If  $H$  has strictly more distinct eigenvalues than  $H'$ , then there exists no  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant operation  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$ .*

*Proof.* By assumption, there exists a real number  $E$  that is an eigenvalue of  $H$  but not an eigenvalue of  $H'$ . Let  $|E\rangle$  be an eigenstate of  $H$  whose eigenvalue is  $E$ . Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that there exists a strong covariant map  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$ , i.e.,

$$\Lambda(e^{-iHt} \dots) = e^{-iH't} \Lambda(\dots).$$

Then in particular,

$$e^{-iH't} \Lambda(|E\rangle\langle E|) = e^{-iEt} \Lambda(|E\rangle\langle E|). \quad (\text{D47})$$

Differentiating (D47) at  $t = 0$  yields

$$H' \Lambda(|E\rangle\langle E|) = E \Lambda(|E\rangle\langle E|). \quad (\text{D48})$$

Let  $|\psi\rangle$  be any eigenstate of  $\Lambda(|E\rangle\langle E|)$  with a nonzero eigenvalue. Right-multiplying both sides of (D48) by  $|\psi\rangle$  gives

$$H' |\psi\rangle = E |\psi\rangle. \quad (\text{D49})$$

This implies that  $E$  is an eigenvalue of  $H'$ , contradicting the assumption. Therefore, no such strong covariant operation  $\Lambda$  can exist.  $\square$

#### Appendix E: resource measures of symmetry-breaking for strong symmetry

In this section, we introduce resource measures of strong symmetry breaking. Unless otherwise stated, in this section, we treat the strong symmetric states as the free states. When the single-sector states are taken as the free states, it will be explicitly mentioned.

Since the symmetry depends on the choice of the (projective) unitary representation, all quantities introduced in this section are functions of the representation. For simplicity, we omit the explicit dependence on the unitary representation whenever it is clear from the context, and specify it only when necessary. In particular, we write a measure  $M$  as  $M(\rho)$  when the representation is omitted, and write it as  $M(\rho \parallel \{U_g\})$  when the representation is explicitly indicated.

### 1. measure for general-group symmetry

In this subsection, we introduce two measures which are applicable to a general group  $G$ .

**Definition 4** (Entanglement asymmetry of strong symmetry breaking). *Let  $G$  be a group, and let  $U$  be its (projective) unitary representation acting on a system  $S$ . We assume that  $G$  has Haar measure  $\int_G dg = 1$  and that  $U$  has the irreducible decomposition*

$$U_g = \bigoplus_{\nu} U_g^{(\nu)} \otimes I_{m_{\nu}}. \quad (\text{E1})$$

Then, we define  $A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho) &:= H\{p_{\nu}(\rho)\} + S(\mathcal{G}(\rho)) - S(\rho), \\ &= H\{p_{\nu}(\rho)\} + A_G(\rho), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E2})$$

where

$$S(\rho) := -\text{Tr}[\rho \log \rho], \quad (\text{E3})$$

$$\mathcal{G}(\rho) := \int_G dg U_g \rho U_g^{\dagger}, \quad (\text{E4})$$

$$p_{\nu}(\rho) := \text{Tr}[P_{\nu} \mathcal{G}(\rho)] = \text{Tr}[P_{\nu} \rho], \quad (\text{E5})$$

$$H\{p_{\nu}\} := - \sum_{\nu} p_{\nu} \log p_{\nu}, \quad (\text{E6})$$

and  $P_{\nu}$  is the projection to  $\mathcal{H}_{\nu} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m_{\nu}}$  in the decomposition of  $\mathcal{H}$  under  $U$ :

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{\nu} \mathcal{H}_{\nu} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m_{\nu}}. \quad (\text{E7})$$

**Theorem 15.** *The quantity  $A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho)$  satisfies the following features*

**(A):**  *$A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho)$  is a resource measure. Namely, (i-a) it is non-negative, and when  $\rho$  is strong symmetric, it is zero, and (i-b) when a CPTP map  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$  is  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant,*

$$A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho \| U) \geq A_{G,\text{strong}}(\Lambda(\rho) \| U') \quad (\text{E8})$$

**(B):** *It is faithful when we employ  $\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{single}}$  as free states. In other words,  $A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho) = 0$  if and only if  $\rho$  is a single-sector state.*

**(C):** *It is not always faithful when we employ  $\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$  as free states. In other words, there exists a resource state  $\rho$  (=state which is not strong symmetric) satisfying  $A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho) = 0$ .*

**(D):** *When we employ collective representation, it is not additive for product states. In other words, for two systems  $A$  and  $B$ , there exists unitary representations  $U^A$  and  $U^B$  and states  $\rho_A$  and  $\sigma_B$  satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho_A \otimes \sigma_B \| U^A \otimes U^B) \\ \neq A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho_A \| U^A) + A_{G,\text{strong}}(\sigma_B \| U^B). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E9})$$

**(E):** *When  $S$  is a finite-dimension system and  $G$  is a compact Lie group or a finite group, for any  $\rho$  on  $S$  and any representation  $U$  of  $G$  acting on  $S$ ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho^{\otimes n} \| U^{\otimes n})}{n} = 0. \quad (\text{E10})$$

**Proof of Theorem 15.** (A): We first show (i-a). The term  $S(\mathcal{T}(\rho)) - S(\rho)$  is equal to the relative entropy of asymmetry (=entanglement asymmetry)  $A_G(\rho) := D(\rho \| \mathcal{T}(\rho))$  [2]. Hence,  $A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho)$  can be written as

$$A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho) = H\{p_{\nu}(\rho)\} + A_G(\rho). \quad (\text{E11})$$

Due to (E11),  $A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho)$  is clearly nonnegative.

To show  $\rho \in \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$ , note that any strong symmetric state  $\rho$  is weak symmetric (i.e.  $A_G(\rho) = 0$ ) and is single-sector (i.e.  $H\{p_\nu(\rho)\} = 0$ ). Therefore, for any strong symmetric state  $\rho$ ,  $A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho) = 0$ .

For (i-b), let  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$  be  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant. Then, due to (D18),  $p_\mu(\rho) = p_\mu(\Lambda(\rho))$  holds, and thus the term  $H\{p_\nu\}$  does not change via  $\Lambda$ . Since any strong covariant operation is also weak covariant,  $\Lambda$  is weak covariant, and thus  $A_G(\rho) \geq A_G(\Lambda(\rho))$ . Therefore, we obtain  $A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho) \geq A_{G,\text{strong}}(\Lambda(\rho))$ .

(B): For any single-sector state  $\rho$ ,  $H\{p_\mu(\rho)\} = 0$ . Since any single-sector state is also a weak symmetric state,  $A_G(\rho) = 0$  is also valid. Therefore, for any single-sector state  $\rho$ ,  $A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho) = 0$ . Conversely, since  $H\{p_\mu(\rho)\}$  and  $A_G(\rho)$  are non-negative, if  $A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho) = 0$  is valid,  $H\{p_\mu(\rho)\} = 0$  and  $A_G(\rho) = 0$  also hold, which imply  $\rho$  is a single-sector state.

(C): Because of (B),  $A_{G,\text{strong}}(\rho) = 0$  for any single-sector state. Therefore, we only have to show that there is a single-sector state which is not strong symmetric. Such an example has already been given in the main text: we consider the situation where the system of interest is a qubit,  $G$  is  $SU(2)$ , and  $U$  is the natural irreducible unitary representation of  $SU(2)$  acting on the qubit:  $U_g := e^{-i\frac{\theta_g}{2}\vec{n}_g \cdot \vec{\sigma}}$ , where  $\theta_g$  is a real parameter describing the rotation angle,  $\vec{n}_g$  is a real vector parameter defined as  $\vec{n}_g := (n_x(g), n_y(g), n_z(g))$  describing the rotation axis, and  $\vec{\sigma} := (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$  denotes the Pauli operators. Then, for any strong symmetric state  $\eta$ , the condition  $U_g \eta U_g^\dagger = \eta$  must hold for all  $g \in G$ . Since the representation  $U$  is irreducible, it follows that  $\eta = I/2$ . However, since the representation  $U$  includes  $\sigma_x$ , we have  $\sigma_x \eta = \sigma_x/2 \not\propto \eta$ . This leads to a contradiction, and hence there is no strong symmetric state in this case. And clearly,  $I/2$  is a single-sector state in this case. Therefore,  $I/2$  is single-sector but not strong symmetric, and thus  $A_{G,\text{strong}}$  is not faithful for  $\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$ .

(D) and (E): For any compact Lie group or finite group  $G$ , its any (projective) unitary representation  $U$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}$ , and any pure state  $\psi$ , the strong entanglement asymmetry can be converted as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{G,\text{strong}}(\psi) &= H\{p_\mu(\psi)\} + S(\mathcal{G}(\psi)) - S(\psi) \\ &= H\{p_\mu(\psi)\} + S(\mathcal{G}(\psi)) \\ &= H\{p_\mu(\psi)\} + S\left(\sum_\mu p_\mu(\psi) \rho_\mu\right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E12})$$

where each  $\rho_\mu$  is a single-sector state corresponding to the irreducible representation in  $U$  labeled by  $\mu$ , which is written as  $\rho_\mu = \frac{I_\mu}{d_\mu} \otimes \rho_{m_\mu}$ . Note that for any probability distribution  $\{r_j\}$  and states  $\{\rho_j\}$  satisfying  $F(\rho_j, \rho_{j'}) = 0$ , the following relation holds [86]:

$$S\left(\sum_j r_j \rho_j\right) = H\{r_j\} + \sum_j r_j S(\rho_j) \quad (\text{E13})$$

Since  $\rho_\mu$  is orthogonal to  $\rho_\nu$  when  $\nu \neq \mu$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S\left(\sum_\mu p_\mu(\psi) \rho_\mu\right) &= H\{p_\mu(\psi)\} + \sum_\mu p_\mu(\psi) S(\rho_\mu) \\ &\geq H\{p_\mu(\psi)\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E14})$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$A_{G,\text{strong}}(\psi) \leq 2A_G(\psi) \quad (\text{E15})$$

And for any state  $\rho$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_G(\rho^{\otimes n})/n = 0$  [2], which also implies  $A_G$  is not additive. Therefore, (iv) and (v) clearly hold.  $\square$

The second one is given by the logarithmic characteristic function, which is the complete measure of the weak symmetry breaking for the finite-group case [6].

**Definition 5** (Averaged logarithmic characteristic function). *Let  $G$  be a group, and let  $\{U_g\}$  be its (projective) unitary representation acting on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . We assume that  $G$  has Haar measure  $\int_G dg = 1$  and that  $U_g$  has the irreducible decomposition (E1). Then, we define  $L(\rho)$  as*

$$L(\rho) := \int_G dg L_{g,\text{strong}}(\rho), \quad (\text{E16})$$

where

$$L_{g,\text{strong}}(\rho) := -\log |\text{Tr}[U_g \rho]|, \quad (\text{E17})$$

and when  $G$  is finite,  $\int_G dg$  becomes  $\frac{1}{|G|} \sum_g$ .

**Theorem 16.** The quantity  $L(\rho)$  satisfies the following features

- (A):  $L(\rho)$  is a resource measure. Namely, (i-a) it is non-negative, and when  $\rho$  is strong symmetric, it is zero, and (i-b) when  $\Lambda$  is  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant, the inequality  $L(\rho) \geq L(\Lambda(\rho))$  holds. More precisely,  $L(\rho) = L(\Lambda(\rho))$ .
- (B): It is faithful for  $\mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$ . In other words,  $L(\rho) = 0$  if and only if  $\rho$  is strong symmetric.
- (C): When we employ collective representation, it is additive for product states. In other words, for two systems  $A$  and  $B$  and (projective) unitary representations  $U^A$  and  $U^B$  on them, any states  $\rho_A$  and  $\sigma_B$  satisfy

$$L(\rho_A \otimes \sigma_B \| U^A \otimes U^B) = L(\rho_A \| U^A) + L(\sigma_B \| U^B). \quad (\text{E18})$$

Consequently,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L(\rho^{\otimes n} \| U^{\otimes n})}{n} = L(\rho) \quad (\text{E19})$$

holds.

**Remark:** Each  $L_{g,\text{strong}}(\rho)$  is also a resource measure and additive, but it is not faithful.

**Proof of Theorem 16.** (A): To show the non-negativity, we only have to show

$$|\text{Tr}[U_g \rho]| \leq 1. \quad (\text{E20})$$

Let  $\rho = \sum_j p_j |\psi_j\rangle \langle \psi_j|$  be a spectral decomposition of  $\rho$ . We obtain (E20) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{Tr}[U_g \rho]| &= \left| \sum_j p_j \text{Tr}[U_g |\psi_j\rangle \langle \psi_j|] \right| \\ &\leq \sum_j p_j |\langle \psi_j | U_g | \psi_j \rangle| \\ &\leq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E21})$$

Also, since any strong symmetric state  $\rho$  satisfies  $|\text{Tr}[U_g \rho]| = 1$ , any strong symmetric state  $\rho$  satisfies  $L(\rho) = 0$ .

For (i-b), let a CPTP map  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$  be  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant. Then, any Kraus representation  $\{K_m\}$  of  $\Lambda$  satisfies  $K_m U_g = U'_g K_m$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}[U'_g \Lambda(\rho)] &= \sum_m \text{Tr}[U'_g K_m \rho K_m^\dagger] \\ &= \sum_m \text{Tr}[K_m^\dagger K_m U_g \rho] \\ &= \text{Tr}[U_g \rho]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E22})$$

Therefore,  $L(\rho) = L(\Lambda(\rho))$  and thus (i-b) holds.

(B): We only have to show  $L(\rho) = 0$  implies that  $\rho$  is strong symmetric. Let us assume that  $L(\rho) = 0$  holds. Then,

$$|\text{Tr}[U_g \rho]| = 1, \quad \forall g \in G. \quad (\text{E23})$$

Due to (E21), the equation (E23) requires

$$U_g |\psi_j\rangle = c_{g,j} |\psi_j\rangle \quad (\text{E24})$$

where  $C_{g,j}$  is a complex number satisfying  $|c_{g,j}| = 1$ . Then,  $\text{Tr}[U_g \rho] = \sum_j p_j c_{j,g}$ . Due to (E23),  $c_{j,g} = c_{j',g} =: c_g$  for any  $j$  and  $j'$ . Therefore, we obtain  $U_g \rho = c_g \rho$ , and thus  $\rho$  is strong symmetric.

(C): the additivity immediately follows from

$$|\text{Tr}[\rho \otimes \sigma U_g^A \otimes U_g^B]| = |\text{Tr}[\rho U_g^A]| |\text{Tr}[\sigma U_g^B]|. \quad (\text{E25})$$

□

## 2. measure for compact-Lie-group symmetry

Next, we introduce a resource measure that works particularly well when the group  $G$  is a compact Lie group:

**Definition 6** (Non-symmetrized and symmetrized covariance matrices). *Let  $G$  be a compact Lie group, and let  $\dim G$  denote the dimension of  $G$  as a smooth manifold. Then, elements in the neighborhood of the identity  $e \in G$  can be parametrized as  $g(\lambda) = e^{i \sum_{j=1}^{\dim G} \lambda^j A_j}$  with a basis  $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^{\dim G}$  of the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Let  $U$  be a (projective) unitary representation of  $G$  acting on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . We assume that  $U$  is differentiable, and introduce Hermitian operators*

$$X_j := -i \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda^j} U(g(\lambda)) \Big|_{\lambda=0} \quad (\text{E26})$$

for  $j = 1, \dots, \dim G$ , which corresponds to  $L(A_j)$ , where  $L$  is the Lie algebra representation defined as  $L(A) := -i \frac{d}{dt} U(e^{itA})|_{t=0}$ . Then, we define two types of covariance matrices associated with  $\rho$ .

1. **Non-symmetrized covariance matrix.** The non-symmetrized covariance matrix  $V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho)$  is defined by

$$(V^{\text{n-sym}})_{i,j} := \text{Tr}[\rho X_i X_j] - \langle X_i \rangle_\rho \langle X_j \rangle_\rho, \quad (\text{E27})$$

where  $\langle X \rangle_\rho := \text{Tr}[\rho X]$ .

2. **Symmetrized covariance matrix.** The symmetrized covariance matrix  $V^{\text{sym}}(\rho)$  is defined by

$$(V^{\text{sym}}(\rho))_{i,j} := \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[\rho \{X_i, X_j\}] - \langle X_i \rangle_\rho \langle X_j \rangle_\rho, \quad (\text{E28})$$

where  $\{X_i, X_j\} := X_i X_j + X_j X_i$  denotes the anti-commutator.

**Theorem 17.** The covariance matrices  $V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho)$  and  $V^{\text{sym}}(\rho)$  satisfy the following features

(A):  $V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho)$  and  $V^{\text{sym}}(\rho)$  are resource measures. Namely, (i-a) they are positive-semidefinite matrices, and when  $\rho$  is strong symmetric, it is zero, and (i-b) when  $\Lambda$  is  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant, the inequalities  $V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho) \geq V^{\text{n-sym}}(\Lambda(\rho))$  and  $V^{\text{sym}}(\rho) \geq V^{\text{sym}}(\Lambda(\rho))$  hold. More precisely,  $V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho) = V^{\text{n-sym}}(\Lambda(\rho))$  and  $V^{\text{sym}}(\rho) = V^{\text{sym}}(\Lambda(\rho))$  are valid.

(B): When  $G$  is connected, they are faithful for  $\mathcal{F}_{G, \text{strong}}$ . In other words,

$$V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho) = 0 \Leftrightarrow V^{\text{sym}}(\rho) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \rho \in \mathcal{F}_{G, \text{strong}}. \quad (\text{E29})$$

Using (i-a) of  $V^{\text{sym}}$  and  $V^{\text{n-sym}}$ , we can equivalently state

$$\sum_i V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho)_{ii} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \sum_i V^{\text{sym}}(\rho)_{ii} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \rho \in \mathcal{F}_{G, \text{strong}}. \quad (\text{E30})$$

(C): When we employ collective representation, they are additive for product states. In other words, for two systems  $A$  and  $B$  and unitary representations  $U^A$  and  $U^B$  on them, any states  $\rho_A$  and  $\sigma_B$  satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho_A \otimes \sigma_B \| U^A \otimes U^B) \\ = V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho_A \| U^A) + V^{\text{n-sym}}(\sigma_B \| U^B), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E31})$$

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\text{sym}}(\rho_A \otimes \sigma_B \| U^A \otimes U^B) \\ = V^{\text{sym}}(\rho_A \| U^A) + V^{\text{sym}}(\sigma_B \| U^B) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E32})$$

Consequently,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho^{\otimes n} \| U^{\otimes n})/n = V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho)$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V^{\text{sym}}(\rho^{\otimes n} \| U^{\otimes n})/n = V^{\text{sym}}(\rho)$  hold.

**Proof of Theorem 17.** (A): By definition,  $V^{\text{n-sym}}$  and  $V^{\text{sym}}$  are always positive-semidefinite, and thus we obtain that  $V^{\text{n-sym}}$  and  $V^{\text{sym}}$  are positive-semidefinite.

Next, let us assume  $\rho$  to be strong symmetric, i.e.  $U_g \rho = e^{i\theta_g} \rho$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} X_i \rho &= -i \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda^i} U(g(\lambda)) \Big|_{\lambda=0} \rho \\ &= \frac{\partial \theta_g}{\partial \lambda^i} \Big|_{\lambda=0} \rho. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E33})$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$(V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho))_{i,j} = (V^{\text{sym}}(\rho))_{i,j} = \frac{\partial \theta_g}{\partial \lambda^i} \Big|_{\lambda=0} \frac{\partial \theta_g}{\partial \lambda^j} \Big|_{\lambda=0} - \frac{\partial \theta_g}{\partial \lambda^j} \Big|_{\lambda=0} \frac{\partial \theta_g}{\partial \lambda^i} \Big|_{\lambda=0} = 0. \quad (\text{E34})$$

Next let us show the property (i-b), i.e., monotonicity. Let  $\Lambda$  be a  $(U, U')$ -strong covariant operation, and let  $\{K_m\}$  be the Kraus representation of it. Then, due to  $U'_g K_m = K_m U_g$ , we obtain

$$X'_i K_m = K_m X_i, \quad \forall m, \quad \forall i, \quad (\text{E35})$$

where  $\{X'_i\}$  and  $\{X_i\}$  are generators of  $U'$  and  $U$ , respectively. Furthermore, since  $\Lambda$  is CPTP,  $\sum_m K_m^\dagger K_m = I$  is valid. Therefore, we obtain

$$\text{Tr}[\Lambda(\rho) X'_i] = \text{Tr}[\sum_m K_m^\dagger K_m X_i \rho] = \text{Tr}[X_i \rho] = \text{Tr}[\rho X_i], \quad (\text{E36})$$

$$\text{Tr}[\Lambda(\rho) X'_i X'_j] = \text{Tr}[\rho X_i \sum_m K_m^\dagger K_m X_j] = \text{Tr}[\rho X_i X_j], \quad (\text{E37})$$

which hold when  $\Lambda$  is strong covariant.

(B): Due to (A), we only have to show that when either  $V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho) = 0$  or  $V^{\text{sym}}(\rho) = 0$  holds,  $\rho$  is strong symmetric. Let us define  $\Delta X_i := X_i - \text{Tr}[X_i \rho] I$ . Note that either  $V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho) = 0$  or  $V^{\text{sym}}(\rho) = 0$  holds,

$$\text{Tr}[\rho(\Delta X_i)^2] = 0. \quad (\text{E38})$$

Hence, we obtain  $\Delta X_i \sqrt{\rho} = 0$ , and thus  $\Delta X_i \rho = 0$ . Therefore, we have

$$X_i \rho = \text{Tr}[\rho X_i] \rho. \quad (\text{E39})$$

Therefore, for any element  $A = \sum_i \lambda_i A_i$  in the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ ,

$$U_{\exp[A]} \rho = e^{i \sum_i \lambda_i \text{Tr}[\rho X_i]} \rho. \quad (\text{E40})$$

Note that since  $G$  is connected, for any  $g \in G$  can be written as  $\exp[A^{(1)}] \dots \exp[A^{(m)}]$ . Therefore, for any  $g \in G$ , there exist a real number  $\theta_g$  such that

$$U_g \rho = e^{i \theta_g} \rho \quad (\text{E41})$$

which implies that  $\rho$  is strong symmetric.

(C): By definition, the variances  $V^{\text{n-sym}}(\rho)$  and  $V^{\text{sym}}(\rho)$  are additive for product states.  $\square$

## Appendix F: Complete resource measure for the case of $U(1)$

In this section, we identify the complete measure for i.i.d. conversion between pure states for the  $U(1)$ -symmetry. We also show that the same measure determines the i.i.d. conversion between weak symmetric states.

### 1. Formulation of i.i.d. conversion in $U(1)$ -symmetry

We consider quantum systems with finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. On each system, which is a copy of system  $S$  with Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , we consider an identical unitary representation  $U := \{e^{-iHt}\}$  of  $U(1)$ , and assume that the smallest eigenvalue of  $H$  is equal to zero. Hereafter, we define the period of a state  $\rho$  on  $S$  as

$$\tau(\rho) := \inf\{t > 0 : e^{-iHt} \rho e^{iHt} = \rho\}. \quad (\text{F1})$$

Furthermore, we formulate

$$\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho) := \inf\{t > 0 : \exists \theta \in \mathbb{R}, e^{-iHt} \rho = e^{i\theta} \rho\}. \quad (\text{F2})$$

To formulate the i.i.d. conversion, we consider  $n$  copies of the system  $S$  as  $S^{(n)}$ , whose Hilbert space is  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ , and consider the collective unitary representation  $U^{(n)} : \{e^{-iH_{\text{tot}}^{(n)}t}\}$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ , where

$$H_{\text{tot}}^{(n)} := \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} I^{\otimes j} \otimes H \otimes I^{\otimes n-j-1}. \quad (\text{F3})$$

In other words,  $U^{(n)} = U^{\otimes n}$ .

We define the optimal conversion rate  $R(\rho \rightarrow \sigma)$  by allowing an additional reference system in which we can store a free state after the state conversion. To be concrete, we define the optimal rate  $R(\rho \rightarrow \sigma)$  as the supremum of the following achievable rate  $r$ : the rate  $r$  is achievable when there are sequence of additional Hilbert spaces  $\{\mathcal{H}_{A_N}\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ , sequence of unitary representations  $\{U_{A_N} := \{e^{-iH_{A_N}t}\}_t\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $U(1)$  acting on the Hilbert spaces, and the sequence of  $(U^{(N)}, U^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)} \otimes U_{A_N})$ -strong covariant operations  $\{\Phi_N\}$  such as

$$\Phi_N : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A_N}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A_N}), \quad N \in \mathbb{N} \quad (\text{F4})$$

and

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \Phi_N(\rho^{\otimes N}) - \sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N} \right\|_1 = 0, \quad (\text{F5})$$

where  $\eta_{A_N}$  is a strong symmetric state in  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{A_N})$ .

The above definition allows us to consider, instead of a direct conversion from  $\rho^{\otimes N}$  to  $\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}$ , a conversion to the tensor product  $\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}$  with some free state  $\eta_{A_N}$ . In other standard resource theories, where appending free states and performing partial traces are regarded as free operations, this modification does not change the value of  $R(\rho \rightarrow \sigma)$ . Therefore, our definition of the optimal conversion rate is consistent with the conventional one.

## 2. i.i.d. state conversion between pure states

When  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$  are pure, the optimal ratio  $R(\rho \rightarrow \sigma)$  is determined by two quantities: the variance and the expectation value of  $H$ .

**Theorem 18.** *Let  $S$  be a finite dimensional system with Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , and let  $\{e^{-iHt}\}$  be a unitary representation of  $U(1)$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}$ , where the smallest eigenvalue of  $H$  is equal to zero. For any pure states  $\psi$  and  $\phi$  on  $S$  satisfying  $\tau(\psi) = \tau(\phi)$ ,  $\psi \notin \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$  and  $\phi \notin \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$ , the optimal conversion rate  $R(\psi \rightarrow \phi)$  satisfies*

$$R(\psi \rightarrow \phi) = \frac{V_H(\psi)}{V_H(\phi)}, \quad (\text{F6})$$

where  $V_H(\rho) := \text{Tr}[\rho H^2] - \text{Tr}[\rho H]^2$ .

**Proof of Theorem 18.** It suffices to show that  $r$  is achievable iff the following relation holds:

$$r = \frac{V_H(\psi)}{V_H(\phi)}. \quad (\text{F7})$$

Let us show the converse part, i.e., if  $r$  is achievable, the relation (F7) must hold. Let us assume that  $r$  is achievable. Then, there exist the sequence of additional Hilbert spaces  $\{\mathcal{H}_{A_N}\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ , the sequence of unitary representations  $\{U_{A_N} := \{e^{-iH_{A_N}t}\}_t\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $U(1)$  acting on the Hilbert spaces, and the sequence of  $(U^{(N)}, U^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)} \otimes U_{A_N})$ -strong covariant operations  $\{\Phi_N\}$  satisfying (F4) and (F5). Due to (D18), the  $(U^{(N)}, U^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)} \otimes U_{A_N})$ -strong covariant CPTP map  $\Phi_N$  satisfy the following relation for any  $\rho$  in  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N})$  and  $e \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$p_{\rho}^{(N)}(e) = p_{\Phi_N(\rho)}'^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}(e). \quad (\text{F8})$$

Here we used the definitions  $p_{\sigma}^{(m)}(f) := \text{Tr}[\sigma P_f^{(m)}]$  and  $p_{\sigma}'^{(m)}(f) := \text{Tr}[\sigma P_f'^{(m)}]$ , where  $P_f^{(m)}$  and  $P_f'^{(m)}$  are the projections to the eigenspace of  $H_{\text{tot}}^{(m)}$  and  $H_{\text{tot}}^{(m)} \otimes I_{A_m} + I_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m}} \otimes H_{A_m}$  whose eigenvalue is  $f$ . Because of (F8), for the pure initial state  $\psi$  in  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ ,

$$p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}^{(N)}(e) = p_{\Phi_N(\psi^{\otimes N})}'^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}(e). \quad (\text{F9})$$

Furthermore, since  $\tau(\psi) = \tau(\phi)$  holds and since the smallest eigenvalue of  $H$  is zero, any  $E$  satisfying  $p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}^{(N)}(E) \neq 0$  and/or  $p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}(E) \neq 0$  can be written as

$$E = m \frac{2\pi}{\tau(\psi)}, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (\text{F10})$$

Therefore, we can rewrite the distributions  $p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}^{(N)}, p_{\Phi_N(\psi^{\otimes N})}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}$  as the distributions on  $\mathbb{Z}$ :

$$p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}(m) := p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}^{(N)}(E_m), \quad (\text{F11})$$

$$p_{\Phi_N(\psi^{\otimes N})}(m) := p_{\Phi_N(\psi^{\otimes N})}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}(E_m), \quad (\text{F12})$$

where  $E_m := m \frac{2\pi}{\tau(\psi)}$ . Then, due to (F9),

$$p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}(m) = p_{\Phi_N(\psi^{\otimes N})}(m) \quad (\text{F13})$$

Furthermore, since  $\eta_{A_N}$  is strong symmetric, it is an eigenstate of  $H_{A_N}$  that we denote  $a_N$ , and thus for the distribution  $p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}(F) \neq 0$  holds only when  $F$  can be written as

$$F = m' \frac{2\pi}{\tau(\psi)} + a_N, \quad m' \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (\text{F14})$$

Hence, if  $a_N$  cannot be written as  $a_N = m'' \frac{2\pi}{\tau(\psi)}$  with some integer  $m''$ ,  $p_{\Phi_N(\psi^{\otimes N})}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}$  has no overlap with  $p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}$ . Therefore, due to (F5), there exists a natural number  $N_0$  and for any  $N \geq N_0$ ,  $a_N$  can be written as

$$a_N = m''_N \frac{2\pi}{\tau(\psi)}, \quad (\text{F15})$$

and thus we can rewrite  $p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}$  as the distribution on  $\mathbb{Z}$ :

$$p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}(m) := p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}(E_m). \quad (\text{F16})$$

Now, let us define the total variation distance between two distributions  $p$  and  $q$  on  $\mathbb{Z}$  as

$$d_{\text{TV}}(p, q) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_m |p(m) - q(m)|. \quad (\text{F17})$$

Then, the distribution  $p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}$  is the  $N$ -fold convolution of the probability distribution  $p_\psi$ . Therefore, it is known that the following relation holds [5]:

$$d_{\text{TV}} \left( p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}, TP \left( N \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} E_H(\psi), n \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} V_H(\psi) \right) \right) \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{Nb - 1/2}} + \frac{2}{N \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} V_H(\psi)}, \quad (\text{F18})$$

where  $E_H(\rho) := \text{Tr}[\rho H]$ , and  $b$  and  $c$  are finite real numbers independent of  $N$  (and  $b$  satisfies  $b \leq 1/2$ ), and  $TP(x, y)$  is the translated Poisson distribution that is defined as

$$TP(x, y)(m) := \begin{cases} P_{y+\gamma}(m-s) & (m \geq s) \\ 0 & (m < s) \end{cases}, \quad (\text{F19})$$

$$P_z(l) := e^{-z} \frac{z^l}{l!}, \quad (\text{F20})$$

$$\gamma := x - y - \lfloor x - y \rfloor, \quad (\text{F21})$$

$$s := \lfloor x - \sqrt{y} \rfloor \quad (\text{F22})$$

Furthermore, since the distribution  $p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}$  is obtained by shifting the distribution  $p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}}$  by  $m''_N$ , the following relation holds:

$$d_{\text{TV}} \left( p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}, TP \left( \lfloor rN \rfloor \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} E_H(\phi) + m''_N, \lfloor rN \rfloor \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} V_H(\phi) \right) \right) \leq \frac{c'}{\sqrt{\lfloor rN \rfloor b' - 1/2}} + \frac{2}{\lfloor rN \rfloor \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} V_H(\phi)}, \quad (\text{F23})$$

where  $b'$  and  $c'$  are finite real numbers independent of  $N$  (and  $b'$  satisfies  $b' \leq 1/2$ )

Note that the Poisson distribution on  $\mathbb{Z}$  satisfies [5]

$$d_{\text{TV}}(P_z, P_{z'}) \leq \frac{|z - z'|}{\min\{z, z'\}}, \quad (\text{F24})$$

and satisfies the following relation for any integer  $s$

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_m |P_z(m) - P_{z'}(m+s)| \leq |s| P_z(\lfloor z \rfloor). \quad (\text{F25})$$

which is obtained by the triangle inequality and the following relation [87]

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_m |P_z(m) - P_{z'}(m+1)| = P_z(\lfloor z \rfloor). \quad (\text{F26})$$

Therefore, combining Stirling's formula, the definition of the translated Poisson distribution, (F24) and (F25), the following relation holds:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} d_{\text{TV}}(TP(Nx, Ny), TP(\lfloor rN \rfloor x'_N, \lfloor rN \rfloor y')) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \left( x = r \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} x'_N \right) \wedge (y = ry'). \quad (\text{F27})$$

Hence, if (F7) does not hold, for any sequence  $\{m''_N\}$ , there exist a real number  $\delta > 0$  such that for any  $N' \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $N > N'$  satisfying

$$d_{\text{TV}} \left( TP \left( N \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} E_H(\psi), N \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} V_H(\psi) \right), TP \left( \lfloor rN \rfloor \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} E_H(\phi) + m''_N, \lfloor rN \rfloor \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} V_H(\phi) \right) \right) > \delta. \quad (\text{F28})$$

Due to (F18), (F23), (F28) and the existence of  $N_0$ , for any sequence  $\{\eta_{A_N}\}$ , there exists a real number  $\delta > 0$  such that for any  $N' \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $N > N'$  satisfying

$$d_{\text{TV}} \left( p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}, p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}} \right) > \frac{\delta}{2}. \quad (\text{F29})$$

Therefore, due to (F13),

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\Phi_N(\psi^{\otimes N}) - \phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}\|_1 \geq d_{\text{TV}}(p_{\Phi_N(\psi^{\otimes N})}, p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}}) > \frac{\delta}{2}. \quad (\text{F30})$$

This contradicts (F5). Therefore, if  $r$  is achievable, (F7) must hold.

Next, we show that the direct part, i.e., if (F7) holds,  $r$  is achievable. Let us assume that (F7) holds. Since  $\tau(\psi) = \tau(\phi)$ , again we can define the distribution  $p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}$  on  $\mathbb{Z}$  satisfying (F11). To define  $\mathcal{H}_{A_N}$ ,  $H_{A_N}$  and  $\eta_{A_N}$ , we firstly define

$$m_N^{\max} := \max \{m \mid p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}^{(N)}(E_m) \neq 0 \vee p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}(E_m) \neq 0\}. \quad (\text{F31})$$

Then we define  $\mathcal{H}_{A'_N}$  as a  $4m_N^{\max} + 1$ -dimensional Hilbert space and define  $H_{A'_N}$  as

$$H_{A'_N} := \sum_{m=-2m_N^{\max}}^{2m_N^{\max}} E_m |m\rangle \langle m|_{A'_N}. \quad (\text{F32})$$

Then we define  $\eta_{A'_N}$  as a pure state

$$|\eta_{A'_N}\rangle := |m''_N\rangle_{A_N}, \quad (\text{F33})$$

$$m''_N := \left\lfloor N \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} E_H(\psi) - \lfloor rN \rfloor \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} E_H(\phi) \right\rfloor \quad (\text{F34})$$

Using  $\mathcal{H}_{A'_N}$ ,  $H_{A'_N}$  and  $\eta_{A'_N}$ , we define  $\mathcal{H}_{A_N}$ ,  $H_{A_N}$  and  $\eta_{A_N}$  as

$$\mathcal{H}_{A_N} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{H}_{A'_N} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor \geq N) \\ \mathcal{H}_{A'_N} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes N - \lfloor rN \rfloor} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor < N) \end{cases} \quad (\text{F35})$$

$$H_{A_N} = \begin{cases} H_{A'_N} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor \geq N) \\ H_{A'_N} \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N - \lfloor rN \rfloor}} + I_{A'_N} \otimes H_{\text{tot}}^{(N - \lfloor rN \rfloor)} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor < N) \end{cases} \quad (\text{F36})$$

$$\eta_{A_N} = \begin{cases} \eta_{A'_N} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor \geq N) \\ \eta_{A'_N} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^{\otimes N - \lfloor rN \rfloor} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor < N) \end{cases} \quad (\text{F37})$$

Then, we can rewrite  $p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}'$  as the distribution  $p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}$  on  $\mathbb{Z}$  satisfying (F16). Then, due to (F18), (F23) and (F27),

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} d_{TV}(p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}, p_{\phi^{\lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}) = 0. \quad (\text{F38})$$

To construct the sequence  $\{\Phi_N\}$ , note that for any system  $A$ , any Hermitian  $X := \sum_x \Pi_x$  and any pure state  $|\eta\rangle$  on  $A$ , there exists a unitary  $V$  such that [50]

$$V|\eta\rangle = \sum_x \sqrt{p(x, \eta)} |x\rangle, \quad (\text{F39})$$

$$[V, X] = 0 \quad (\text{F40})$$

where  $|x\rangle$  is an eigenvector of  $X$  whose eigenvalue is  $x$  and  $p(x, \eta) := \text{Tr}[\eta \Pi_x]$ . Therefore, there exist unitary operations  $U_{\psi, N}$  on  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N}$  and  $U_{\phi, r, N}$  on  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}$  such that

$$U_{\psi, N} |\psi\rangle^{\otimes n} = \sum_m \sqrt{p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}(m)} |m\rangle_{S^{(N)}}, \quad (\text{F41})$$

$$U_{\phi, r, N} |\phi\rangle^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} = \sum_m \sqrt{p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}}(m)} |m\rangle_{S^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}}, \quad (\text{F42})$$

$$[U_{\psi, N}, H_{\text{tot}}^{(n)}] = 0, \quad (\text{F43})$$

$$[U_{\phi, r, N}, H_{\text{tot}}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}] = 0, \quad (\text{F44})$$

where  $|m\rangle_{S^{(l)}}$  is an eigenvector of  $H_{\text{tot}}^{(l)}$  whose eigenvalue  $E_m$  and where

$$p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}}(m) := p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}(E_m). \quad (\text{F45})$$

Due to  $\psi \notin \mathcal{F}_{G, \text{strong}}$  and  $\phi \notin \mathcal{F}_{G, \text{strong}}$ , the variances  $V_H(\psi)$  and  $V_H(\phi)$  are strictly larger than 0, and thus the following relations hold:

$$0 < E_H(\psi) < m^{(1)}, \quad (\text{F46})$$

$$0 < E_H(\phi) < m^{(1)}, \quad (\text{F47})$$

where  $m^{(l)}$  is the maximum value of  $m$  such that  $E_m$  is an eigenvalue of  $H_{\text{tot}}^{(l)}$ . Therefore, we can define a real positive number  $\Delta$  as

$$\Delta := \frac{1}{4} \min \left\{ \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} E_H(\psi), r \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} E_H(\phi), m^{(1)} - \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} E_H(\psi), rm^{(1)} - r \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} E_H(\phi) \right\}. \quad (\text{F48})$$

Then, for any  $N > 2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r} \frac{2m^{(1)}}{m^{(1)} - \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} E_H(\phi)} \right\}$ , the following relation holds:

$$0 \leq \min \left\{ \left\lfloor \lfloor rN \rfloor \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} E_H(\phi) - 2\Delta N \right\rfloor, \left\lfloor N \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} E_H(\psi) - 2\Delta N \right\rfloor \right\} \quad (\text{F49})$$

$$\left\lfloor \lfloor rN \rfloor \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} E_H(\phi) + 2\Delta N \right\rfloor \leq m^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)} \quad (\text{F50})$$

$$\left\lfloor N \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} E_H(\psi) + 2\Delta N \right\rfloor \leq m^{(N)} \quad (\text{F51})$$

We also define

$$M_N := \left\{ m \mid \left\lfloor N \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} E_H(\psi) - \Delta N \right\rfloor \leq m \leq \left\lfloor N \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} E_H(\psi) + \Delta N \right\rfloor \right\}, \quad (\text{F52})$$

$$\Pi_{M_N}^{(N)} := \sum_{m \in M_N} \Pi_m^{(N)}, \quad (\text{F53})$$

where  $\Pi_m^{(N)}$  is the projection to the eigenspace of  $H_{\text{tot}}^{(N)}$  whose eigenvalue is  $E_m$ . Then, due to the large-deviation principle for the i.i.d. state,  $\epsilon_N := 1 - \sum_{m \in M_N} p_{\psi \otimes N}(m)$  satisfies

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_N \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{F54})$$

We also define  $\mathcal{H}_{A_N''}$ ,  $H_{A_N''}$  and  $|0\rangle_{A_N''}$  as

$$\mathcal{H}_{A_N''} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{H}_{A_N'} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor - N} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor > N) \\ \mathcal{H}_{A_N'} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor \leq N) \end{cases} \quad (\text{F55})$$

$$H_{A_N''} = \begin{cases} H_{A_N'} \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor - N}} + I_{A_N'} \otimes H_{\text{tot}}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor - N)} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor > N) \\ H_{A_N'} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor \leq N) \end{cases} \quad (\text{F56})$$

$$|0\rangle_{A_N''} = \begin{cases} |0\rangle_{A_N'} \otimes |0\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor - N} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor > N) \\ |0\rangle_{A_N'} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor \leq N) \end{cases} \quad (\text{F57})$$

Then,  $\mathcal{H}_{A_N''}$  and  $H_{A_N''}$  satisfy

$$\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A_N''} = \mathcal{H}^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A_N}, \quad (\text{F58})$$

$$H_{\text{tot}}^{(N)} + H_{A_N''} = H_{\text{tot}}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)} + H_{A_N}. \quad (\text{F59})$$

Because of the definitions of  $m_N''$ ,  $\Delta$  and  $M_N$ , for any  $N > 2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r} \frac{2m^{(1)}}{m^{(1)} - \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} E_H(\phi)} \right\}$ ,

$$m \in M_N \Rightarrow 0 \leq m - m_N'' \leq m^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}. \quad (\text{F60})$$

Therefore, for any  $N > 2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r} \frac{2m^{(1)}}{m^{(1)} - \frac{\tau(\psi)}{2\pi} E_H(\phi)} \right\}$  and any  $m \in M_N$ , the state  $|m - m_N''\rangle_{S(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}$  is well-defined. Therefore, we can take a unitary  $W_{\psi, \phi, r, N}$  on  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A_N''}$  satisfying

$$W_{\psi, \phi, r, N} |m\rangle_{S(N)} \otimes |0\rangle_{A_N''} = \begin{cases} |m - m_N''\rangle_{S(\lfloor rN \rfloor)} \otimes |\eta_{A_N}\rangle_{A_N} & (m \in M_N) \\ |m\rangle_{S(N)} \otimes |0\rangle_{A_N''} & (m \notin M_N) \end{cases}, \quad (\text{F61})$$

$$[W_{\psi, \phi, r, N}, H_{\text{tot}}^{(N)} + H_{A_N}] = 0. \quad (\text{F62})$$

Now, let us define a unitary on  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A_N''}$  ( $= \mathcal{H}^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A_N}$ ) as

$$V_{\psi, \phi, r, N} := \left( U_{\phi, r, N}^\dagger \otimes I_{A_N} \right) W_{\psi, \phi, r, N}. \quad (\text{F63})$$

By definition, the unitary  $V_{\psi, \phi, r, N}$  satisfies

$$[V_{\psi, \phi, r, N}, H_{\text{tot}}^{(N)} + H_{A_N}] = 0. \quad (\text{F64})$$

Therefore, since  $e^{-iH_{A_N''}t} |0\rangle_{A_N''} = |0\rangle_{A_N''}$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , the following CPTP map  $\Phi_N$  is strong covariant:

$$\Phi_N(\cdot) := \mathcal{V}_{\psi, \phi, r, N} \circ \Lambda_N \circ \mathcal{U}_{\psi, N}(\cdot), \quad (\text{F65})$$

$$\Lambda_N(\cdot) := (\cdot) \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_{A_N''} \quad (\text{F66})$$

The map  $\Phi_N$  also satisfies

$$\Phi_N(\Pi_{M_N}^{(N)} \psi^{\otimes N} \Pi_{M_N}^{(N)}) = |\tilde{\Psi}'_N\rangle \langle \tilde{\Psi}'_N| \otimes \eta_{A_N}, \quad (\text{F67})$$

$$|\tilde{\Psi}'_N\rangle := U_{\phi, r, N}^\dagger \sum_{m \in M_N} \sqrt{p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}(m)} |m - m''_N\rangle_{S^{\lfloor \lfloor rN \rfloor \rfloor}} \quad (\text{F68})$$

Due to the definition of  $\epsilon_N$ , we obtain

$$\langle \psi |^{\otimes N} \Pi_{M_N}^{(N)} | \psi \rangle^{\otimes N} = 1 - \epsilon_N. \quad (\text{F69})$$

Therefore, using the gentle measurement lemma [88], we obtain

$$\|\psi^{\otimes N} - \Pi_{M_N}^{(N)} \psi^{\otimes N} \Pi_{M_N}^{(N)}\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon_N} \quad (\text{F70})$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\left\| \Phi_N(\psi^{\otimes N}) - \tilde{\Psi}'_N \otimes \eta_{A_N} \right\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon_N} \quad (\text{F71})$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} | \otimes \langle \eta_{A_N} |_{A_N} | \tilde{\Psi}'_N \rangle \otimes | \eta_{A_N} \rangle_{A_N}| &= \sum_{m \in M_N} \sqrt{p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}(m) p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}(m)} \\ &\geq \sum_m \sqrt{p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}(m) p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}(m)} - \sum_{m \notin M_N} \sqrt{p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}(m) p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}(m)} \\ &\geq \sum_m \sqrt{p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}(m) p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}(m)} - \sqrt{\sum_{m \notin M_N} p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}(m)} \sqrt{\sum_{m \notin M_N} p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}(m)} \\ &\geq \sum_m \sqrt{p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}(m) p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}(m)} - \sqrt{\epsilon_N} \\ &\geq 1 - d_{TV}(p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}, p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}) - \sqrt{\epsilon_N} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F72})$$

Therefore,

$$|\langle \phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} | | \tilde{\Psi}'_N \rangle \otimes | \eta_{A_N} \rangle_{A_N}|^2 \geq 1 - 2(\delta_N + \sqrt{\epsilon_N}), \quad (\text{F73})$$

where  $\delta_N := d_{TV}(p_{\psi^{\otimes N}}, p_{\phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}})$ . Again, using the gentle measurement lemma, we obtain

$$\|\tilde{\Psi}'_N \otimes \eta_{A_N} - \phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{2} \sqrt{\delta_N + \sqrt{\epsilon_N}}. \quad (\text{F74})$$

Due to (F71) and (F74),

$$\|\Phi_N(\psi^{\otimes N}) - \phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon_N} + 2\sqrt{2} \sqrt{\delta_N + \sqrt{\epsilon_N}}. \quad (\text{F75})$$

Therefore, due to (F38) and (F54) holds,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\Phi_N(\psi^{\otimes N}) - \phi^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}\|_1 = 0, \quad (\text{F76})$$

which implies the rate  $r$  is achievable.  $\square$

### 3. i.i.d. state conversion between weak symmetric states

When  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$  are weak symmetric (not necessarily pure), the optimal ratio  $R(\rho \rightarrow \sigma)$  is determined by the variance and the expectation value of  $H$ .

**Theorem 19.** Let  $S$  be a finite dimensional system with Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , and let  $\{e^{-iHt}\}$  be a unitary representation of  $U(1)$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}$ , where the smallest eigenvalue of  $H$  is equal to zero. For any weak symmetric states  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$  on  $S$  satisfying  $\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho) = \tau_{\text{strong}}(\sigma)$ ,  $\rho \notin \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$  and  $\sigma \notin \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$ , the optimal conversion rate  $R(\rho \rightarrow \sigma)$  satisfies

$$R(\rho \rightarrow \sigma) = \frac{V_H(\rho)}{V_H(\sigma)}. \quad (\text{F77})$$

The proof is almost identical to that of Theorem 18:

**Proof of Theorem 19.** It suffices to show that  $r$  is achievable iff the following relation holds:

$$r = \frac{V_H(\rho)}{V_H(\sigma)}. \quad (\text{F78})$$

Let us show the converse part, i.e., if  $r$  is achievable, the relation (F78) must hold. Let us assume that  $r$  is achievable. Then, there exist the sequence of additional Hilbert spaces  $\{\mathcal{H}_{A_N}\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ , the sequence of unitary representations  $\{U_{A_N} := \{e^{-iH_{A_N}t}\}_t\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $U(1)$  acting on the Hilbert spaces, and the sequence of  $(U^{(N)}, U^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)} \otimes U_{A_N})$ -strong covariant operations  $\{\Phi_N\}$  satisfying (F4) and (F5). Due to (D18), the  $(U^{(N)}, U^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)} \otimes U_{A_N})$ -strong covariant CPTP map  $\Phi_N$  satisfy the following relation for any  $\xi$  in  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N})$  and  $e \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$p_{\xi}^{(N)}(e) = p_{\Phi_N(\xi)}'(\lfloor rN \rfloor)(e). \quad (\text{F79})$$

Here we used the definitions  $p_{\chi}^{(m)}(f) := \text{Tr}[\chi P_f^{(m)}]$  and  $p_{\chi}^{\prime(m)}(f) := \text{Tr}[\chi P_f^{\prime(m)}]$ , where  $P_f^{(m)}$  and  $P_f^{\prime(m)}$  are the projections to the eigenspace of  $H_{\text{tot}}^{(m)}$  and  $H_{\text{tot}}^{(m)} \otimes I_{A_m} + I_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m}} \otimes H_{A_m}$  whose eigenvalue is  $f$ . Because of (F79), for the weak symmetric initial state  $\rho$  in  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ ,

$$p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}^{(N)}(e) = p_{\Phi_N(\rho^{\otimes N})}'(\lfloor rN \rfloor)(e). \quad (\text{F80})$$

Furthermore, since  $\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho) = \tau_{\text{strong}}(\sigma)$  holds and since the smallest eigenvalue of  $H$  is zero, any  $E$  satisfying  $p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}^{(N)}(E) \neq 0$  and/or  $p_{\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}}'(\lfloor rN \rfloor)(E) \neq 0$  can be written as

$$E = m \frac{2\pi}{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (\text{F81})$$

Therefore, we can rewrite the distributions  $p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}^{(N)}$ ,  $p_{\Phi_N(\rho^{\otimes N})}'(\lfloor rN \rfloor)$  as the distributions on  $\mathbb{Z}$ :

$$p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}(m) := p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}^{(N)}(E_m), \quad (\text{F82})$$

$$p_{\Phi_N(\rho^{\otimes N})}(m) := p_{\Phi_N(\rho^{\otimes N})}'(\lfloor rN \rfloor)(E_m), \quad (\text{F83})$$

where  $E_m := m \frac{2\pi}{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}$ . Then, due to (F80),

$$p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}(m) = p_{\Phi_N(\rho^{\otimes N})}(m) \quad (\text{F84})$$

Furthermore, since  $\eta_{A_N}$  is strong symmetric, it is an eigenstate of  $H_{A_N}$  that we denote  $a_N$ , and thus the distribution  $p_{\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}'(\lfloor rN \rfloor)(F) \neq 0$  holds only when  $F$  can be written as

$$F = m' \frac{2\pi}{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)} + a_N, \quad m' \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (\text{F85})$$

Hence, if  $a_N$  cannot be written as  $a_N = m'' \frac{2\pi}{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}$  with some integer  $m''$ ,  $p_{\Phi_N(\rho^{\otimes N})}'(\lfloor rN \rfloor)$  has no overlap with  $p_{\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}'(\lfloor rN \rfloor)$ . Therefore, due to (F5), there exists a natural number  $N_0$  and for any  $N \geq N_0$ ,  $a_N$  can be written as

$$a_N = m''_N \frac{2\pi}{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}, \quad (\text{F86})$$

and thus we can rewrite  $p_{\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}'(\lfloor rN \rfloor)$  as the distribution on  $\mathbb{Z}$ :

$$p_{\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}(m) := p_{\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}'(\lfloor rN \rfloor)(E_m). \quad (\text{F87})$$

Now, let us define the total variation distance between two distributions  $p$  and  $q$  on  $\mathbb{Z}$  as

$$d_{\text{TV}}(p, q) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_m |p(m) - q(m)|. \quad (\text{F88})$$

Then, in the same way as the derivation of (F18) and (F23), we obtain:

$$d_{\text{TV}} \left( p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}, TP \left( N \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} E_H(\rho), n \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} V_H(\rho) \right) \right) \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{Nb - 1/2}} + \frac{2}{N \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} V_H(\rho)} \quad (\text{F89})$$

$$d_{\text{TV}} \left( p_{\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}, TP \left( \lfloor rN \rfloor \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} E_H(\sigma) + m''_N, \lfloor rN \rfloor \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} V_H(\sigma) \right) \right) \leq \frac{c'}{\sqrt{\lfloor rN \rfloor b' - 1/2}} + \frac{2}{\lfloor rN \rfloor \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} V_H(\sigma)} \quad (\text{F90})$$

where  $E_H(\rho) := \text{Tr}[\rho H]$  and where  $b, b', c$  and  $c'$  are finite real numbers independent of  $n$  (and  $b$  and  $b'$  satisfy  $b \geq 1/2$  and  $b' \geq 1/2$ ), and  $TP(x, y)$  is the translated Poisson distribution.

As shown in the proof of Theorem 18, the translated Poisson distributions satisfy:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} d_{\text{TV}}(TP(Nx, Ny), TP(\lfloor rN \rfloor x'_N, \lfloor rN \rfloor y')) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \left( x = r \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} x'_N \right) \wedge (y = ry'). \quad (\text{F91})$$

Hence, if (F78) does not hold, for any sequence  $\{m''_N\}$ , there exist a real number  $\delta > 0$  such that for any  $N' \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $N > N'$  such that

$$d_{\text{TV}} \left( TP \left( N \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} E_H(\rho), N \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} V_H(\rho) \right), TP \left( \lfloor rN \rfloor \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} E_H(\sigma) + m''_N, \lfloor rN \rfloor \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} V_H(\sigma) \right) \right) > \delta. \quad (\text{F92})$$

Due to (F89), (F90), (F92) and the existence of  $N_0$ , for any sequence  $\{\eta_{A_N}\}$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for any  $N' \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $N > N'$  satisfying

$$d_{\text{TV}} \left( p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}, p_{\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}} \right) > \frac{\delta}{2}. \quad (\text{F93})$$

Therefore, due to (F84),

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\Phi_N(\rho^{\otimes N}) - \sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}\|_1 \geq d_{\text{TV}}(p_{\Phi_N(\rho^{\otimes N})}, p_{\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}}) > \frac{\delta}{2}. \quad (\text{F94})$$

This contradicts to (F5). Therefore, if  $r$  is achievable, (F78) must hold.

Next, we show that the direct part, i.e., if (F78) holds,  $r$  is achievable. Let us assume that (F78) holds. Since  $\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho) = \tau_{\text{strong}}(\sigma)$ , again we can define the distribution  $p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}$  on  $\mathbb{Z}$  satisfying (F82). To define  $\mathcal{H}_{A_N}$ ,  $H_{A_N}$  and  $\eta_{A_N}$ , we firstly define

$$m_N^{\max} := \max\{m | p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}^{(N)}(E_m) \neq 0 \vee p_{\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}(E_m) \neq 0\}. \quad (\text{F95})$$

Then we define  $\mathcal{H}_{A'_N}$  as a  $4m_N^{\max} + 1$ -dimensional Hilbert space and define  $H_{A'_N}$  as

$$H_{A'_N} := \sum_{m=-2m_N^{\max}}^{2m_N^{\max}} E_m |m\rangle \langle m|_{A'_N}. \quad (\text{F96})$$

Then we define  $\eta_{A'_N}$  as a pure state

$$|\eta_{A'_N}\rangle := |m''_N\rangle_{A_N}, \quad (\text{F97})$$

$$m''_N := \left\lfloor N \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} E_H(\rho) - \lfloor rN \rfloor \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} E_H(\sigma) \right\rfloor \quad (\text{F98})$$

We define  $\mathcal{H}_{A_N}$ ,  $H_{A_N}$  and  $\eta_{A_N}$  as

$$\mathcal{H}_{A_N} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{H}_{A'_N} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor \geq N) \\ \mathcal{H}_{A'_N} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes N - \lfloor rN \rfloor} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor < N) \end{cases} \quad (\text{F99})$$

$$H_{A_N} = \begin{cases} H_{A'_N} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor \geq N) \\ H_{A'_N} \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N - \lfloor rN \rfloor}} + I_{A'_N} \otimes H_{\text{tot}}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor - N)} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor < N) \end{cases} \quad (\text{F100})$$

$$\eta_{A_N} = \begin{cases} \eta_{A'_N} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor \geq N) \\ \eta_{A'_N} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^{\otimes N - \lfloor rN \rfloor} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor < N) \end{cases} \quad (\text{F101})$$

Then, we can rewrite  $p_{\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}}^{\prime(\lfloor rN \rfloor)} \otimes \eta_{A_N}$  as the distribution  $p_{\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}} \otimes \eta_{A_N}$  on  $\mathbb{Z}$  satisfying (F87). Then, due to (F89), (F90) and (F91),

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} d_{TV}(p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}, p_{\sigma^{\lfloor rN \rfloor}} \otimes \eta_{A_N}) = 0. \quad (\text{F102})$$

Due to  $\rho \notin \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$  and  $\sigma \notin \mathcal{F}_{G,\text{strong}}$ , the variances  $V_H(\rho)$  and  $V_H(\sigma)$  are strictly larger than 0, and thus the following relations hold:

$$0 < E_H(\rho) < m^{(1)}, \quad (\text{F103})$$

$$0 < E_H(\sigma) < m^{(1)}, \quad (\text{F104})$$

where  $m^{(l)}$  is the maximum value of  $m$  such that  $E_m$  is an eigenvalue of  $H_{\text{tot}}^{(l)}$ . Therefore, we can define a real positive number  $\Delta$  as

$$\Delta := \frac{1}{4} \min \left\{ \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} E_H(\rho), r \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} E_H(\sigma), m^{(1)} - \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} E_H(\rho), rm^{(1)} - r \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} E_H(\sigma) \right\}. \quad (\text{F105})$$

Then, for any  $N > 2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r} \frac{2m^{(1)}}{m^{(1)} - \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} E_H(\sigma)} \right\}$ , the following relation holds:

$$0 \leq \min \left\{ \left\lfloor \lfloor rN \rfloor \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} E_H(\sigma) - 2\Delta N \right\rfloor, \left\lfloor N \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} E_H(\rho) - 2\Delta N \right\rfloor \right\} \quad (\text{F106})$$

$$\left\lfloor \lfloor rN \rfloor \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} E_H(\sigma) + 2\Delta N \right\rfloor \leq m^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)} \quad (\text{F107})$$

$$\left\lfloor N \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} E_H(\rho) + 2\Delta N \right\rfloor \leq m^{(N)} \quad (\text{F108})$$

We also define

$$M_N := \left\{ m \mid \left\lfloor N \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} E_H(\rho) - \Delta N \right\rfloor \leq m \leq \left\lfloor N \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} E_H(\rho) + \Delta N \right\rfloor \right\}, \quad (\text{F109})$$

$$\Pi_{M_N}^{(N)} := \sum_{m \in M_N} \Pi_m^{(N)}, \quad (\text{F110})$$

where  $\Pi_m^{(N)}$  is the projection to the eigenspace of  $H_{\text{tot}}^{(N)}$  whose eigenvalue is  $E_m$ . Then, due to the large-deviation principle for the i.i.d. state,  $\epsilon_N := 1 - \sum_{m \in M_N} p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}(m)$  satisfies

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_N \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{F111})$$

We also define  $\mathcal{H}_{A''_N}$ ,  $H_{A''_N}$  and  $|0\rangle_{A''_N}$  as

$$\mathcal{H}_{A''_N} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{H}_{A'_N} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor - N} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor > N) \\ \mathcal{H}_{A'_N} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor \leq N) \end{cases} \quad (\text{F112})$$

$$H_{A''_N} = \begin{cases} H_{A'_N} \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor - N}} + I_{A'_N} \otimes H_{\text{tot}}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor - N)} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor > N) \\ H_{A'_N} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor \leq N) \end{cases} \quad (\text{F113})$$

$$|0\rangle_{A''_N} = \begin{cases} |0\rangle_{A'_N} \otimes |0\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor - N} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor > N) \\ |0\rangle_{A'_N} & (\lfloor rN \rfloor \leq N) \end{cases} \quad (\text{F114})$$

Then,  $\mathcal{H}_{A'_N}$  and  $H_{A''_N}$  satisfy

$$\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A'_N} = \mathcal{H}^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A_N}, \quad (\text{F115})$$

$$H_{\text{tot}}^{(N)} + H_{A'_N} = H_{\text{tot}}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)} + H_{A_N}. \quad (\text{F116})$$

To define  $\Phi_N$ , note that we can decompose  $\rho^{\otimes N}$  and  $\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}$  as

$$\rho^{\otimes N} = \sum_m p_{\rho^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}}(m) \rho_{N,m} \quad (\text{F117})$$

$$\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} = \sum_m p_{\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor}}(m) \sigma_{r,N,m}, \quad (\text{F118})$$

where  $\rho_{N,m}$   $\sigma_{r,N,m}$  is eigenstates of  $H_{\text{tot}}^{(N)}$  and  $H_{\text{tot}}^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}$  whose eigenvalue is  $E_m$ , respectively. Because of the definitions of  $m''_N$ ,  $\Delta$  and  $M_N$ , for any  $N > 2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r} \frac{2m^{(1)}}{m^{(1)} - \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} E_H(\sigma)} \right\}$ ,

$$m \in M_N \Rightarrow 0 \leq m - m''_N \leq m^{(\lfloor rN \rfloor)}. \quad (\text{F119})$$

Therefore, for any  $N > 2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r} \frac{2m^{(1)}}{m^{(1)} - \frac{\tau_{\text{strong}}(\rho)}{2\pi} E_H(\sigma)} \right\}$  and any  $m \in M_N$ , the state  $\sigma_{r,N,m-m''_N}$  is well-defined. Using these symbols, we define  $\Phi_N$  as

$$\Phi_N(\cdot) := \sum_{m \in M_N} \text{Tr}[\Pi_m^{(N)} \cdot] \sigma_{r,N,m-m''_N} \otimes \eta_{A_N} + \sum_{m \notin M_N} \text{Tr}[\Pi_m^{(N)} \cdot] \rho_{N,m} \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_{A''_N} \quad (\text{F120})$$

By definition, it is a strong covariant CPTP. Furthermore, it satisfies

$$\Phi_N(\Pi_{M_N}^{(N)} \rho^{\otimes N} \Pi_{M_N}^{(N)}) = \sum_{m \in M_N} p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}(m) \sigma_{r,N,m-m''_N} \otimes \eta_{A_N}. \quad (\text{F121})$$

Because of  $[\Pi_{M_N}^{(N)} \rho^{\otimes N} \Pi_{M_N}^{(N)}, \rho^{\otimes N}] = 0$  and the definition of  $\epsilon_N$ ,

$$\|\Pi_{M_N}^{(N)} \rho^{\otimes N} \Pi_{M_N}^{(N)} - \rho^{\otimes N}\|_1 = \epsilon_N \quad (\text{F122})$$

and thus

$$\|\Phi_N(\Pi_{M_N}^{(N)} \rho^{\otimes N} \Pi_{M_N}^{(N)}) - \Phi_N(\rho^{\otimes N})\|_1 \leq \epsilon_N. \quad (\text{F123})$$

We also evaluate  $\|\Phi_N(\Pi_{M_N}^{(N)} \rho^{\otimes N} \Pi_{M_N}^{(N)}) - \sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}\|_1$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi_N(\Pi_{M_N}^{(N)} \rho^{\otimes N} \Pi_{M_N}^{(N)}) - \sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}\|_1 &= \|\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N} - \sum_{m \in M_N} p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}(m) \sigma_{r,N,m-m''_N} \otimes \eta_{A_N}\|_1 \\ &= \sum_{m \in M_N} |p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}(m) - p_{\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}(m)| + \sum_{m \notin M_N} p_{\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}(m) \\ &\leq \sum_{m \in M_N} |p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}(m) - p_{\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}(m)| + \sum_{m \notin M_N} |p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}(m) - p_{\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}(m)| \\ &\quad + \sum_{m \notin M_N} p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}(m) \\ &= 2d_{TV}(p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}, p_{\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}) + \epsilon_N \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F124})$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\Phi_N(\rho^{\otimes N}) - \sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}\|_1 &\leq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (2d_{TV}(p_{\rho^{\otimes N}}, p_{\sigma^{\otimes \lfloor rN \rfloor} \otimes \eta_{A_N}}) + 2\epsilon_N) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F125})$$

which implies that  $r$  is achievable.  $\square$