

# The Spectral Gap of a Gaussian Quantum Markovian Generator

F. Fagnola<sup>(1)</sup>, D. Poletti<sup>(2)</sup>, E. Sasso<sup>(2)</sup>, V. Umanità<sup>(2)</sup>

May 9, 2024

## Abstract

Gaussian quantum Markov semigroups are the natural non-commutative extension of classical Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups. They arise in open quantum systems of bosons where canonical non-commuting random variables of positions and momenta come into play. If there exists a faithful invariant density we explicitly compute the optimal exponential convergence rate, namely the spectral gap of the generator, in non-commutative  $L^2$  spaces determined by the invariant density showing that the exact value is the lowest eigenvalue of a certain matrix determined by the diffusion and drift matrices. The spectral gap turns out to depend on the non-commutative  $L^2$  space considered, whether the one determined by the so-called GNS or KMS multiplication by the square root of the invariant density. In the first case, it is strictly positive if and only if there is the maximum number of linearly independent noises. While, we exhibit explicit examples in which it is strictly positive only with KMS multiplication. We do not assume any symmetry or quantum detailed balance condition with respect to the invariant density.

Keywords: Open quantum systems, Gaussian Markov Semigroup, Spectral Gap, quantum Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process.

## 1 Introduction

Classical Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups  $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$  on bounded measurable functions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  have the following explicit formula

$$(T_t f)(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d \det(\Sigma_t)}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(e^{tZ^*} x - y) \exp(-\langle y, \Sigma_t^{-1} y \rangle / 2) dy$$

where  $Z$  is the drift matrix and  $\Sigma_t$  the covariance matrix at time  $t$  given by  $\Sigma_t = \int_0^t e^{sZ^*} C e^{sZ} ds$  in terms of the symmetric matrix  $C$  of diffusion coefficients. Here, for simplicity, we assume that  $\Sigma_t$  is invertible and that the mean of the Markov process is zero. If we consider the function  $x \mapsto \exp(i\langle z, x \rangle)$  the above formula becomes

$$T_t \exp(i\langle z, \cdot \rangle) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \langle e^{sZ} z, C e^{sZ} z \rangle ds\right) \exp(i\langle e^{tZ} z, \cdot \rangle).$$

In applications to quantum theory one has to deal with random variables that do not commute, typically positions and momenta, vector spaces are complex and symplectic structures come into play, but a similar formula holds (see [15, 33] and the references therein). More precisely, for a system of  $d$  bosons, the natural variables are  $d$  position  $q_1, \dots, q_d$  and  $d$  momentum  $p_1 = -i\hbar/dq_1, \dots, p_d = -i\hbar/dq_d$  operators. Exponential functions are replaced by unitary Weyl operators  $W(x + iy) = \exp\left(-i\sqrt{2}\sum_{k=1}^d(x_k p_k - y_k q_k)\right)$  ( $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ) and one finds the explicit formula (9), Section 2 (with the further inclusion of a non-zero mean vector  $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^d$ ). There,  $z = x + iy$ ,  $Z, C$  are *real linear* operators on  $\mathbb{C}^d$  that can be viewed as complex linear operators on  $\mathbb{C}^{2d}$  as explained in Section 2, Remark 5. In this way, one can define a Gaussian quantum Markov semigroup (QMS), namely a weakly\*-continuous semigroups of completely positive, identity preserving maps on the von Neumann algebra of all bounded operators a Fock space (see Section 2 for precise definitions).

QMSs are essential tools in the mathematical modeling of open quantum systems (see [8, 27]). Starting from the seminal papers by Gorini, Kossakowski, Lindblad and Sudharshan (GKLS) in the seventies, they have been used in the physical literature ([15, 33]) and are now established as non-commutative extensions of classical Markov semigroups (see [11, 14, 22, 34, 35]). Gaussian QMSs, that are considered in this article, are a notable class of semigroups for many reasons: they include many semigroups that are interesting for physical applications (see [8, 21, 32] and the references therein), they are the natural non-commutative extension of classical Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups (see Section 2 and [1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 32]), they arise from quantum master equations and Fokker-Planck equations [4, 5] and they provide a well-behaved and workable class of semigroups acting on the algebra  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h})$  of all bounded operators on a Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{h}$ . Furthermore, they have countless applications to open quantum systems of bosons, but rather little is known about their properties, especially if one thinks of the wealth of results established in the classical case (see [25, 26] and the references therein).

Several properties of gaussian QMS have been recently established: the characterization as the unique class of quantum Markov semigroups preserving quantum gaussian states [30], the structure of the subalgebra where they act as \*-homomorphisms [1], the characterization of irreducibility (under a regularity assumption [17]) and, in the symmetric case, gradient flow properties and entropy inequalities [11], and the expression of the generator as a sum of squares of derivations [34].

The main result of this paper is the explicit calculation of the spectral gap of a gaussian QMS as the lowest eigenvalue of a certain matrix determined by the diffusion and drift parameters (Theorem 18). As for the classical Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process, assuming that the matrix  $Z$  is stable, namely all eigenvalues have strictly negative real part, every initial state converges to the invariant one [18]. It is therefore natural to study the speed of convergence towards that invariant state in view of applications to problems such as return to equilibrium and limit theorems and dynamical phase transitions (see [23]).

A natural approach, motivated by the analogue in classical Markov semi-

groups theory, is to embed the set of bounded operators in the Hilbert space of Hilbert-Schmidt operators,  $\mathfrak{J}_2(\mathfrak{h})$ , by multiplying them by the square root of the invariant density. In this way, one obtains a contraction semigroup (see [9]) and one can analyse its generator by spectral analytic tools. However, due to the non-commutative nature of operators, multiplication by the invariant density can be done in multiple ways, obtaining different embeddings. In this paper, first of all, we work with GNS embedding

$$i_2 : \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h}) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{J}_2(\mathfrak{h}), \quad i_2(x) = x\rho^{1/2}$$

We also consider the KMS embedding (see [9])

$$i_{1/2,2} : \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h}) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{J}_2(\mathfrak{h}), \quad i_{1/2,2}(x) = \rho^{1/4}x\rho^{1/4}$$

and show that, in this case we get a different result (Theorem 26) for the explicit expression of the spectral gap. In particular, the spectral gap could be strictly positive for the KMS embedding and zero for the GNS embedding (see the example in subsection 7.1). This is a typical feature of non-commutativity. Our results are first presented for the  $i_2$  embedding because computations are somewhat more direct from the explicit formula of the characteristic function of a quantum gaussian state.

Once chosen the GNS embedding, since  $i_2$  has dense range, the next step is to extend  $\mathcal{T}$  to a strongly continuous contraction semigroup  $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$  on  $\mathfrak{J}_2(\mathfrak{h})$  by setting

$$T_t(x\rho^{1/2}) = \mathcal{T}_t(x)\rho^{1/2} \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h}), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Clearly  $\rho^{1/2}$  is an invariant vector for  $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ . Denoting by  $\langle x, y \rangle_2 = \text{tr}(x^*y)$  the Hilbert-Schmidt scalar product and by  $\|\cdot\|_2 = \langle x, x \rangle_2^{1/2}$  the norm, we define the *spectral gap* of this semigroup in the following way

**Definition 1.** *If there exists  $g > 0$  such that*

$$\|T_t(x) - \langle \rho^{1/2}, x \rangle_2 \rho^{1/2}\|_2 \leq e^{-gt} \|x - \langle \rho^{1/2}, x \rangle_2 \rho^{1/2}\|_2 \quad \forall x \in \mathfrak{J}_2(\mathfrak{h}), \quad \forall t > 0 \quad (1)$$

*we say the semigroup  $T$  has a spectral gap. In that case, we call the spectral gap of the semigroup the biggest constant  $g > 0$  that satisfies (1).*

The spectral gap for the KMS embedding is defined in a similar way.

Note that, as usual in the theory of Markov processes and with a little abuse of terminology, the name spectral gap for the above constant  $g$ , should be more precisely referred to as the spectrum of the symmetric part of the generator of  $T$ . In this case, indeed, it is the distance from 0 of the remaining part of the spectrum.

The spectral gap  $g$  is explicitly computed for both the above embeddings (Theorem 18, and Theorem 26). In the first case, it turns out to be strictly positive under the assumption that there is noise in all the non-commutative coordinates. In the second case, this condition is no more necessary. In particular, we give explicit examples in which it is strictly positive only for the KMS embedding in subsection 7.1.

It is important to note that, due to the nature of gaussian QMSs, the computation of the spectral gap, as other problems (see [1, 2, 3]), can be reduced to linear algebraic one. However, it is worth noticing that the final result is not a straightforward generalization of the classical one because one can find classical Ornstein-Uhlenbeck subprocesses with strictly positive spectral gap of a quantum Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process with  $g = 0$  (see the example at the end of Section 6).

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to the formal introduction of all the necessary mathematical preliminaries, including the definition of gaussian QMSs. In Section 3 we discuss the relationship between gaussian QMSs and classical Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups, showing how the latter emerge from suitable restrictions of the former. Section 4 contains the main result on the spectral gap for the GNS embedding. Section 5 contains some further insight on the sufficient conditions used for the spectral gap, showing that they are not very restrictive when looking for a positive spectral gap. In Section 6 we present a class of examples with  $d = 1$  depending on some parameters. The study of the spectral gap for the KMS embedding is undertaken in Section 7. More technical material and some computations are collected in Appendixes A, B and C.

## 2 Gaussian Quantum Markov Semigroups

In this section we introduce gaussian QMSs starting from their generators and fix some notation.

Let  $\mathfrak{h}$  be the Fock space  $\mathfrak{h} = \Gamma(\mathbb{C}^d)$  which is isometrically isomorphic to  $\Gamma(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \dots \otimes \Gamma(\mathbb{C})$  with canonical orthonormal basis  $(e(n_1, \dots, n_d))_{n_1, \dots, n_d \geq 0}$  (with  $e(n_1, \dots, n_d)$  the symmetrized version of  $e_{n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{n_d}$ ). Let  $a_j, a_j^\dagger$  be the creation and annihilation operators of the Fock representation of the  $d$ -dimensional Canonical Commutation Relations (CCR)

$$\begin{aligned} a_j e(n_1, \dots, n_d) &= \sqrt{n_j} e(n_1, \dots, n_{j-1}, n_j - 1, \dots, n_d), \\ a_j^\dagger e(n_1, \dots, n_d) &= \sqrt{n_j + 1} e(n_1, \dots, n_{j-1}, n_j + 1, \dots, n_d), \end{aligned}$$

The CCRs are written as  $[a_j, a_k^\dagger] = \delta_{jk} \mathbb{1}$ , where  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  denotes the commutator, or, more precisely,  $[a_j, a_k^\dagger] \subseteq \delta_{jk} \mathbb{1}$  because the domain of the operator in the left-hand side is smaller.

Linear combinations of both creation and annihilation operators are denoted as follows:

$$a(v) = \sum_{j=1}^d \bar{v}_j a_j, \quad a^\dagger(u) = \sum_{j=1}^d u_j a_j^\dagger$$

for all  $u^T = [u_1, \dots, u_d], v^T = [v_1, \dots, v_d] \in \mathbb{C}^d$ .

The above operators are obviously defined on the linear manifold  $D$  spanned by the elements  $(e(n_1, \dots, n_d))_{n_1, \dots, n_d \geq 0}$  of the canonical orthonormal basis of  $\mathfrak{h}$  that turns out to be an essential domain for all the operators considered so far. This also happens for field operators

$$q(u) = (a(u) + a^\dagger(u)) / \sqrt{2} \quad u \in \mathbb{C}^d \quad (2)$$

that are symmetric and essentially self-adjoint on the domain  $D$  by Nelson's theorem on analytic vectors ([31] Th. X.39 p. 202). If the vector  $u$  has real (resp. purely imaginary) components one finds position (resp. momentum) operators and the commutation relation  $[q(u), q(v)] \subseteq i\Im\langle u, v \rangle \mathbb{1}$  (where  $\Im$  and  $\Re$  denote the imaginary and real part of complex number and vectors). Momentum operators, i.e. fields  $q(ir)$  with  $r \in \mathbb{R}^d$  are also denoted by  $p(r) = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq d} r_j p_j$  where  $p_j = i(a_j^\dagger - a_j)/\sqrt{2}$ . In a similar way we write  $q(r) = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq d} r_j q_j$  with  $q_j = q(e_j) = (a_j^\dagger + a_j)/\sqrt{2}$ .

Another set of operators that will play an important role in this paper are the Weyl operators  $W(z), z \in \mathbb{C}^d$ , which generate the entirety of  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h})$ . They satisfy the CCR in the exponential form, namely, for every  $z, z' \in \mathbb{C}^d$ ,

$$W(z)W(z') = e^{-i\Im\langle z, z' \rangle} W(z + z'). \quad (3)$$

It is well-known that  $W(z)$  is the exponential of the anti self-adjoint operator  $-i\sqrt{2}q(iz)$

$$W(z) = e^{-i\sqrt{2}q(iz)} = e^{za^\dagger - \bar{z}a}. \quad (4)$$

A QMS  $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{T}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a weakly\*-continuous semigroup of completely positive, identity preserving, weakly\*-continuous maps on  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h})$ . The predual semigroup  $\mathcal{T}_* = (\mathcal{T}_{*t})_{t \geq 0}$  on the predual space of trace class operators on  $\mathfrak{h}$  is a strongly continuous contraction semigroup.

Gaussian QMSs can be defined either through their explicit action on Weyl operators or through their generator, as we will do. Let  $L_\ell, H$  be the operators on  $\mathfrak{h}$  defined on the domain  $D$  by

$$H = \sum_{j,k=1}^d \left( \Omega_{jk} a_j^\dagger a_k + \frac{\kappa_{jk}}{2} a_j^\dagger a_k^\dagger + \frac{\overline{\kappa_{jk}}}{2} a_j a_k \right) + \sum_{j=1}^d \left( \frac{\zeta_j}{2} a_j^\dagger + \frac{\bar{\zeta}_j}{2} a_j \right), \quad (5)$$

$$L_\ell = \sum_{k=1}^d \left( \overline{v_{\ell k}} a_k + u_{\ell k} a_k^\dagger \right) \quad (6)$$

where  $1 \leq m \leq 2d$ ,  $\Omega := (\Omega_{jk})_{1 \leq j,k \leq d} = \Omega^*$  and  $\kappa := (\kappa_{jk})_{1 \leq j,k \leq d} = \kappa^T \in M_d(\mathbb{C})$ , are  $d \times d$  complex matrices with  $\Omega$  Hermitian and  $\kappa$  symmetric,  $V = (v_{\ell k})_{1 \leq \ell \leq m, 1 \leq k \leq d}$ ,  $U = (u_{\ell k})_{1 \leq \ell \leq m, 1 \leq k \leq d} \in M_{m \times d}(\mathbb{C})$  are  $m \times d$  matrices and  $\zeta = (\zeta_j)_{1 \leq j \leq d} \in \mathbb{C}^d$ . We assume also  $\ker(V^*) \cap \ker(U^T) = \{0\}$  so that the operators  $L_\ell$ , called Kraus' operators, are linearly independent (see [1], Proposition 2.2). The above operators are closable and we will denote their closure by the same symbol.

For all  $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h})$  consider the quadratic form with domain  $D \times D$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(x)[\xi', \xi] &= i \langle H\xi', x\xi \rangle - i \langle \xi', xH\xi \rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^m (\langle \xi', xL_\ell^* L_\ell \xi \rangle - 2 \langle L_\ell \xi', xL_\ell \xi \rangle + \langle L_\ell^* L_\ell \xi', x\xi \rangle) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

This is a natural way to make sense of a Gorini, Kossakowski, Lindblad-Sudarshan (GKLS) representation of the generator (see [30] Theorems 5.1, 5.2 and also

[15, 33]) in a generalized form since operators  $L_\ell, H$  are unbounded. Indeed, in other models, when these operators are bounded, one writes the generator as

$$\mathcal{L}(x) = i[H, x] - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^m (L_\ell^* L_\ell x - 2L_\ell^* x L_\ell + x L_\ell^* L_\ell), \quad x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h}). \quad (8)$$

Gaussian QMSs are then defined by the following Theorem, whose proof can be found in [2], Appendix A.

**Theorem 2.** *There exists a unique QMS,  $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{T}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  such that, for all  $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h})$  and  $\xi, \xi' \in D$ , the function  $t \mapsto \langle \xi', \mathcal{T}_t(x)\xi \rangle$  is differentiable and*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle \xi', \mathcal{T}_t(x)\xi \rangle = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}_t(x))[\xi', \xi] \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

One can derive as in [2], Theorem 2.4, the following formula for the action of a gaussian semigroup on Weyl operators.

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $(\mathcal{T}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be the quantum Markov semigroup with generalized GKLS generator associated with  $H, L_\ell$  as above. For all Weyl operator  $W(z)$  we have*

$$\mathcal{T}_t(W(z)) = \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \Re \langle e^{sZ} z, C e^{sZ} z \rangle ds + i \int_0^t \Re \langle \zeta, e^{sZ} z \rangle ds \right) W(e^{tZ} z) \quad (9)$$

where the real linear operators  $Z, C$  on  $\mathbb{C}^d$  are

$$Zz = [(U^T \bar{U} - V^T \bar{V}) / 2 + i\Omega] z + [(U^T V - V^T U) / 2 + i\kappa] \bar{z}, \quad (10)$$

$$Cz = (U^T \bar{U} + V^T \bar{V}) z + (U^T V + V^T U) \bar{z}. \quad (11)$$

Note that the operators  $Z, C$  that appear in the previous Theorem are only real linear since they inherit the real vector space structure of  $\mathbb{C}^d$  as argument of the Weyl operators.

For  $d = 1$  special cases of gaussian QMSs have been considered as quantum analogues of classical Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups (see [10, 14]). The multi-dimensional case has also been extensively studied [11, 34, 35] under symmetry or detailed balance conditions.

The natural duality between  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h})$  and trace class operators on  $\mathfrak{h}$  given by  $(\rho, x) \mapsto \text{tr}(\rho x)$ , together with the weak\* continuity of the QMS  $(\mathcal{T}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  allows one to define the pre-adjoint QMS  $(\mathcal{T}_{*t})_{t \geq 0}$  on trace class operators on  $\mathfrak{h}$ . Operators  $\mathcal{T}_{*t}$  act on positive operators with unit trace, called density matrices and representing quantum states, that play the role of classical probability densities on  $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ . A state is called *faithful* if  $\rho \xi = 0$  implies  $\xi = 0$ ; this is the analogue of a classical density with full support.

One of the defining properties of gaussian QMSs is that operators  $\mathcal{T}_{*t}$  preserve the set of quantum gaussian states. A quantum state is gaussian if its quantum characteristic function  $\hat{\rho}$  has a similar expression to the one of classic gaussian multivariate random variables

$$\hat{\rho}(z) := \text{tr}(\rho W(z)) = \exp \left( -i\Re \langle \mu, z \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \Re \langle z, Sz \rangle \right) \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{C}^d \quad (12)$$

for some  $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}$  and real linear, bounded, positive and invertible operator  $S$  on  $\mathfrak{h}$  (we write  $S \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{h})$ ). We denote this state as  $\rho = \rho_{(\mu, S)}$ . One can prove as in [30] Theorem 5.1 that

**Proposition 4.** *If  $\mathcal{T}$  is a gaussian QMS, then  $\mathcal{T}_{*t}(\rho_{(\mu, S)}) = \rho_{(\mu_t, S_t)}$  with*

$$\mu_t = e^{tZ^\sharp} \mu - \int_0^t e^{sZ^\sharp} \zeta ds, \quad S_t = e^{tZ^\sharp} S e^{tZ} + \int_0^t e^{sZ^\sharp} C e^{sZ} ds \quad (13)$$

where  $Z^\sharp$  denotes the adjoint of  $Z$  with respect to the scalar product  $\Re\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ .

The adjoint  $Z^\sharp$  of  $Z$  with respect to the scalar product  $\Re\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is explicitly given by  $Z^\sharp z = Z_1^* z + Z_2^T \bar{z}$  where  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$  are the operators in (10) acting on  $z$  and  $\bar{z}$ . Here, however, further clarifications and remarks on properties of real linear operators that are useful to better explain the computations performed in the following sections are in order.

*Remark 5.* In general a real linear operator  $A$  on  $\mathbb{C}^d$  can be written as

$$Az = A_1 z + A_2 \bar{z}, \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{C}^d,$$

where now  $A_1, A_2$  are complex linear operators. In order to better understand the action of such operators we can exploit the isomorphism of  $(\mathbb{C}^d, \Re\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$  as a real vector space with  $(\mathbb{R}^{2d}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ , through the decomposition of a complex vector  $z = x + iy$  in its real and imaginary part. On this new vector space  $A$  takes the form

$$A_{2d} = \begin{bmatrix} \Re A_1 + \Re A_2 & \Im A_2 - \Im A_1 \\ \Im A_1 + \Im A_2 & \Re A_1 - \Re A_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

and  $A_{2d}$  is a *real linear* operator on  $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ . This isomorphism will also be useful when considering the complexification of the operator  $A$ . Indeed it is much simpler to work with the complexification  $\mathbf{A}$  of  $A_{2d}$

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \Re A_1 + \Re A_2 & \Im A_2 - \Im A_1 \\ \Im A_1 + \Im A_2 & \Re A_1 - \Re A_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

now acting on  $(\mathbb{C}^{2d}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ , than it is to consider the complexification of  $A$ . For this reason whenever the complexification of a real linear operator is needed we will think of it as acting on  $(\mathbb{C}^{2d}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ . We also have

$$\Re\langle z, Aw \rangle = \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \end{bmatrix}, A_{2d} \begin{bmatrix} \Re w \\ \Im w \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle = \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{A} \begin{bmatrix} \Re w \\ \Im w \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle \quad \forall z, w \in \mathbb{C}^d, \quad (14)$$

where the scalar products are the canonical ones on  $\mathbb{C}^d, \mathbb{R}^{2d}, \mathbb{C}^{2d}$  respectively. The adjoint operations are denoted  $A^\sharp, A_{2d}^T, \mathbf{A}^*$ , respectively.

A notable example of real linear operator is  $Jz = -iz$  to which is associated

$$\mathbf{J} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{1} \\ -\mathbb{1} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in M_{2d}(\mathbb{C}).$$

It is easy to prove that the following equality holds

$$\Re \langle z, Aw \rangle + i \Im \langle z, w \rangle = \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \end{bmatrix}, (\mathbf{A} + i\mathbf{J}) \begin{bmatrix} \Re w \\ \Im w \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle \quad \forall z, w \in \mathbb{C}^d, \quad (15)$$

and

$$\left\langle \begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{A} \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle = \Re \langle \zeta_1, A\xi_1 \rangle + \Re \langle \zeta_2, A\xi_2 \rangle + i \Re \langle \zeta_1, A\xi_2 \rangle - i \Re \langle \zeta_2, A\xi_1 \rangle \quad (16)$$

for all  $z_1, z_2, w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{C}^d$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_1 &= \Re z_1 + i \Re z_2 & \zeta_2 &= \Im z_1 + i \Im z_2 \\ \xi_1 &= \Re w_1 + i \Re w_2 & \xi_2 &= \Im w_1 + i \Im w_2 \end{aligned}$$

We can then conclude that two *real* linear operators  $A$  and  $B$  on  $\mathbb{C}^d$  coincide if and only if their complexification  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  coincide (as complex linear operators on  $\mathbb{C}^{2d}$ ).

The following Proposition now collects useful formulae on the operators  $Z, C$  and introduces the matrix

$$\mathbf{C}_Z := \mathbf{C} - i(\mathbf{Z}^* \mathbf{J} + \mathbf{J} \mathbf{Z})$$

which will have a central role in the paper.

**Proposition 6.** *Let  $Z, C$  be given by (10) and (11).*

1. *We can write*

$$C = \sqrt{C}^T \sqrt{C} \geq 0,$$

*where  $\sqrt{C}z = \bar{U}z + V\bar{z}$ , for  $z \in \mathbb{C}^d$ .*

2. *It holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Z} &= \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \Re((U - \bar{V})^*(U + \bar{V})) & \Im((U - \bar{V})^*(U - \bar{V})) \\ -\Im((U + \bar{V})^*(U + \bar{V})) & \Re((U + \bar{V})^*(U - \bar{V})) \end{bmatrix} \\ &+ \begin{bmatrix} -\Im(\Omega + \kappa) & \Re(\kappa - \Omega) \\ \Re(\Omega + \kappa) & \Im(\kappa - \Omega) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

$$\mathbf{C}_Z = \begin{bmatrix} (U + \bar{V})^*(U + \bar{V}) & -i(U + \bar{V})^*(U - \bar{V}) \\ i(U - \bar{V})^*(U + \bar{V}) & (U - \bar{V})^*(U - \bar{V}) \end{bmatrix} \geq 0. \quad (18)$$

3. *The semigroup has exactly  $2d$  (linearly independent) Kraus' operators if and only if  $\mathbf{C}_Z > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Equalities in statements 1 and 2 follow from direct computation starting from the expression (10), (11) (see Appendix A). The inequality instead follows from noticing that, setting

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} U + \bar{V} & -i(U - \bar{V}) \end{bmatrix} \in M_{m,2d}(\mathbb{C})$$



one has

$$\mathbf{C}_Z = M^* M \geq 0.$$

Eventually the inequality holds strict if and only if  $\ker M = \{0\}$  or equivalently  $\dim \operatorname{Ran} M = 2d$ . However we have

$$\dim \operatorname{Ran} M = m - \dim(\operatorname{Ran} M)^\perp = m - \dim \ker M^* = m,$$

since  $\ker M^* = \ker(U + \overline{V})^* \cap \ker(U - \overline{V})^*$  and by taking linear combinations of the two operators we get to  $\ker M^* = \ker U^T \cap \ker V^* = \{0\}$  by the conditions we imposed on the matrices  $U, V$ .  $\square$

Note that we introduced the notation  $\mathbf{C}_Z$  using bold-face characters even though the operator is not the complexification of any real linear operator. This is to emphasize the fact that the operator acts on  $\mathbb{C}^{2d}$ .

We end this section by recalling the following result on invariant densities, namely, those positive operators  $\rho$  with unit trace such that  $\mathcal{T}_{*t}(\rho) = \rho$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . This parallels known results ([13] Section 11.2.3) for classical Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes. The real linear operator  $\mathbf{Z}$  is called *stable* if all its eigenvalues have strictly negative real part. It is clear from formula (14) that  $Z$  is stable if and only if  $\mathbf{Z}$  is stable.

**Theorem 7.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a gaussian QMS and suppose  $Z$  is stable. Then there is a unique gaussian state  $\rho = \rho_{(\mu, S)}$  which is invariant for  $\mathcal{T}$  whose parameters are given by:*

$$\mu = (Z^\sharp)^{-1} \zeta, \quad S = \int_0^\infty e^{sZ^\sharp} C e^{sZ} ds. \quad (19)$$

*If also  $\mathbf{C}_Z > 0$  then  $\rho$  is faithful and it is the unique invariant state for  $\mathcal{T}$ .*

*Proof.* Let us start by showing the existence of an invariant state under the stability condition. Let  $\rho = \rho_{(\mu, S)}$  a gaussian state. For it to be an invariant state, from Proposition 4, we must have

$$\mu = e^{tZ^\sharp} \mu - \int_0^t e^{sZ^\sharp} \zeta ds, \quad S_t = e^{tZ^\sharp} S e^{tZ} + \int_0^t e^{sZ^\sharp} C e^{sZ} ds, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

The previous equations can be equivalently rewritten as

$$\int_0^t e^{sZ^\sharp} (Z^\sharp \mu - \zeta) ds = 0, \quad \int_0^t e^{sZ^\sharp} (Z^\sharp S + S Z + C) e^{sZ} ds = 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Since the equations hold for every  $t \geq 0$  their derivative must vanish at every  $t \geq 0$ . Moreover both  $e^{tZ^\sharp}$  and  $e^{tZ}$  are invertible so the equations are eventually equivalent to

$$Z^\sharp \mu = \zeta, \quad Z^\sharp S + S Z = -C. \quad (20)$$

Now it is easy to show that the pair  $\mu, S$  given by (19) solves the previous equations. Indeed the integral in the definition for  $S$  converges and

$$Z^\sharp S + S Z = \int_0^\infty e^{sZ^\sharp} (Z^\sharp C + C Z) e^{sZ} ds = \left[ e^{sZ^\sharp} C e^{sZ} \right]_0^\infty = -C.$$

where the last equality is due to the stability of  $Z$ .

Uniqueness of the invariant state among gaussian states is due to the fact that  $Z$  is stable and rewriting equation (20) as a linear system for the entries of  $S$  (see [6] Theorem 12.4 and the discussion preceding it) one obtains a system matrix which is invertible.

Suppose now that  $\mathbf{C}_Z > 0$ . It is easy to see that  $\mathbf{C}_Z$ , explicitly given in Proposition 6, is unitarily equivalent to the Kossakowski matrix of the semigroup (see [3]). Therefore, by [3] Theorem 4, the semigroup is irreducible. Recall now that a gaussian state is faithful if and only if  $\mathbf{S} - i\mathbf{J} > 0$ , or equivalently, by conjugation,  $\mathbf{S} + i\mathbf{J} > 0$  (see [29, Theorem 4]) and note that, thanks to the stability of  $Z$  we can write

$$-J = \int_0^\infty e^{sZ^\sharp} (Z^\sharp J + JZ) e^{sZ} ds.$$

Using (19) we have therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S} + i\mathbf{J} &= \int_0^\infty e^{sZ^*} \mathbf{C} e^{sZ} ds - i \int_0^\infty e^{sZ^*} (\mathbf{Z}^* \mathbf{J} + \mathbf{J} \mathbf{Z}) e^{sZ} ds \\ &= \int_0^\infty e^{sZ^*} \mathbf{C}_Z e^{sZ} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since, from Proposition 6,  $\mathbf{C}_Z \geq 0$ , we have that  $\langle w, (\mathbf{S} + i\mathbf{J}) w \rangle = 0$  for some  $w \in \mathbb{C}^{2d}$  if and only if

$$\langle e^{sZ} w, \mathbf{C}_Z e^{sZ} w \rangle = 0, \quad \forall s \geq 0.$$

which in turn is equivalent to  $e^{tZ} w \in \ker \mathbf{C}_Z$  for every  $t \geq 0$ . However  $\mathbf{C}_Z > 0$  means this cannot happen. We can now end the proof by observing that irreducibility and the existence of an invariant faithful state imply the invariant state is unique (see [22]).  $\square$

### 3 Relationship with Classical Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups

Special cases of gaussian QMSs have been considered as quantum analogues of classical Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups (see [10, 14]) for  $d = 1$ . The multidimensional case, under the further assumption of a detailed balance condition, has been extensively studied [11, 34]. The key observation is that it is possible to restrict a QMS on  $\mathcal{B}(\Gamma(\mathbb{C}^d))$  described in Theorem 3 to an abelian subalgebra generated by commuting (i.e. classical) observables. Here we show that, with this procedure, one can recover some classical Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups starting from gaussian QMSs. A preliminary clarification is now in order. Using Schrödinger representation (see Example 5.2.16 in [7]) we can represent  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h})$  onto  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  via the identifications

$$\begin{aligned} W(cf_j)\psi(x_1, \dots, x_d) &= e^{icf_j}\psi(x_1, \dots, x_d), \\ W(icf_j)\psi(x_1, \dots, x_d) &= \psi(x_1, \dots, x_j - c, \dots, x_d), \end{aligned}$$

with  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $(f_j)$  the canonical orthonormal basis of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Under this representation we have then

$$\begin{aligned} q_j \psi(x_1, \dots, x_d) &= x_j \psi(x_1, \dots, x_d), \\ p_j \psi(x_1, \dots, x_d) &= -i \partial_j \psi(x_1, \dots, x_d). \end{aligned}$$

When position operators, in the different coordinates, are the commuting observables of interest, the algebra they generate is particularly simple to describe. Indeed a (bounded) function of field operators is simply the multiplication operator for that function, i.e.

$$f(q_1, \dots, q_d) \psi(x_1, \dots, x_d) = f(x_1, \dots, x_d) \psi(x_1, \dots, x_d).$$

We restrict ourselves to the case where  $H = 0$  and  $U, V \in M_{m \times d}(\mathbb{R})$ , i.e. all the coefficients of the Kraus operators are real. This is not at all a necessary restraint but it is sufficient to show the link between classical Ornstein-Uhlenbeck and gaussian quantum Markov semigroups. Indeed we can rewrite the Kraus' operators (6) as

$$L_\ell = \sum_{j=1}^d (r_{\ell j} q_j + i s_{\ell j} p_j), \quad r_{\ell j} = \frac{\overline{v_{\ell j}} + u_{\ell j}}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad s_{\ell j} = \frac{\overline{v_{\ell j}} - u_{\ell j}}{\sqrt{2}}$$

with  $X = (s_{jk})_{jk}, R = (r_{jk})_{jk} \in M_{md}(\mathbb{R})$ , and obtain the following.

**Proposition 8.** *Let  $H = 0$  and  $U, V$  be real matrices, then the commutative algebra of bounded functions of  $q_1, \dots, q_d$  is invariant for the semigroup and the generator acts on them as*

$$\mathcal{L} f(q_1, \dots, q_d) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1}^d (X^* X)_{jk} (\partial_j \partial_k f)(q_1, \dots, q_d) - \sum_{j,k=1}^d (R^* X)_{jk} q_j (\partial_k f)(q_1, \dots, q_d),$$

where  $X^* X$  and  $R^* X$  correspond, respectively, to the bottom-right  $d \times d$  blocks of  $\mathbf{C}_Z$  and  $\mathbf{Z}$ , (17) (18) .

*Proof.* All the calculations in this proof are assumed to be performed using the quadratic form on  $D \times D$  but, in order to avoid cluttering notation, we leave it implicit. On every bounded function of  $q_1, \dots, q_d$ , again at least on the dense domain  $D$ , we can compute

$$[q_j, f(q_1, \dots, q_d)] = 0, \quad [p_j, f(q_1, \dots, q_d)] = -i (\partial_j f)(q_1, \dots, q_d).$$

Using these computations we can evaluate the generator on such functions start-

ing from (8)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}(f(q_1, \dots, q_d)) &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^m (L_\ell^* [L_\ell, f(q_1, \dots, q_d)] - [L_\ell^*, f(q_1, \dots, q_d)] L_\ell) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^m \sum_{j,k=1}^d (r_{\ell j} q_j - i s_{\ell j} p_j) [r_{\ell k} q_k + i s_{\ell k} p_k, f(q_1, \dots, q_d)] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^m \sum_{j,k=1}^d [r_{\ell j} q_j - i s_{\ell j} p_j, f(q_1, \dots, q_d)] (r_{\ell k} q_k + i s_{\ell k} p_k) \\
&= - \sum_{j,k=1}^d (R^* X)_{jk} q_j (\partial_k f)(q_1, \dots, q_d) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1}^d (X^* X)_{jk} (\partial_j \partial_k f)(q_1, \dots, q_d).
\end{aligned}$$

□

The previous result shows indeed that starting from a particular subset of gaussian QMSs one can recover a Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup. What one can also show, in the special case of a non-degenerate diffusion matrix  $X^* X$ , that a converse result also holds.

**Proposition 9.** *Let*

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1}^d Q_{jk} \partial_j \partial_k + \sum_{j,k=1}^d A_{jk} \partial_k,$$

*be a Ornstein-Uhlenbeck generator with  $Q > 0$ . Then the semigroup generated by  $\mathcal{L}$  can be recovered as a restriction of a suitable gaussian QMS.*

*Proof.* From Proposition 8 we just need to show that there is a suitable choice of  $R, X$  (corresponding uniquely to a choice of  $U, V$ ) such that

$$Q = X^* X, \quad A = -R^* X.$$

However, since  $Q > 0$ , it is immediate to obtain  $X = \sqrt{Q}$ . Moreover, from invertibility of  $Q$  we infer invertibility of  $X$ , therefore we can set  $R = -X^{*-1} A^*$  and conclude the proof. □

The previous Proposition shows that we can actually recover all Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups with non-degenerate diffusion matrix starting from a gaussian QMS. The case of a degenerate diffusion matrix is more complicated and is beyond the scope of this work.

## 4 The spectral gap for the GNS embedding

In this section we explicitly compute the spectral gap for the  $i_2$  embedding. Even when not explicitly stated we will assume  $Z$  stable and  $\mathbf{C}_Z > 0$ , or equivalently that the semigroup has  $2d$  Kraus' operators, thanks to Proposition 6. We will prove in section 5 that these two requirements are not really restrictive since they are necessary conditions for the semigroup to have a spectral gap  $g > 0$ .

*Remark 10.* In the following we will always assume  $\zeta = 0$  to simplify calculations even though all the results remain true without this assumption.

We will show the existence of a spectral gap by first finding a candidate  $g > 0$  and then proving it actually satisfies (1). We will work on a dense subspace of  $\mathfrak{I}_2(\mathfrak{h})$ , the space of Hilbert-Schmidt operators on  $\mathfrak{h}$ , which is the range of the immersion  $i_2$  of the space of linear combination of Weyl operators

$$\mathcal{W} = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^l \eta_j W(z_j) \mid l \geq 1, z_1, \dots, z_l \in \mathbb{C}^d, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_l \in \mathbb{C} \right\}.$$

In the following, for any  $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h})$  we will denote by  $\tilde{x}$  the projection of  $x\rho^{1/2}$  on the orthogonal of  $\rho^{1/2}$  in  $\mathfrak{I}_2(\mathfrak{h})$  given by

$$\tilde{x} := x\rho^{1/2} - \langle \rho^{1/2}, x\rho^{1/2} \rangle_2 \rho^{1/2}. \quad (21)$$

Note that for  $x \in \mathcal{W}$  we have

$$\langle \rho^{1/2}, x\rho^{1/2} \rangle_2 = \sum_{j=1}^l \eta_j \operatorname{tr}(\rho W(z_j)) = \sum_{j=1}^l \eta_j e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_j, Sz_j \rangle},$$

so that the orthogonalization  $\tilde{x}$  yields

$$\tilde{x} = \sum_{j=1}^l \eta_j \left( W(z_j) - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_j, Sz_j \rangle} \mathbb{1} \right) \rho^{1/2}. \quad (22)$$

We start with the following

**Lemma 11.** *Let  $x \in \mathcal{W}$  and set  $\xi_j = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_j, Sz_j \rangle} \eta_j$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . Then*

$$\|T_t(\tilde{x})\|_2^2 = \sum_{j,k=1}^l \bar{\xi}_j \xi_k \left( \exp \left\langle e^{tZ} \begin{bmatrix} \Re z_j \\ \Im z_j \end{bmatrix}, (\mathbf{S} + i\mathbf{J}) e^{tZ} \begin{bmatrix} \Re z_k \\ \Im z_k \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle - 1 \right) \quad (23)$$

for all  $t \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* By formula (22) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_t(\tilde{x})\|_2^2 &= \left\| \sum_{j=1}^l \eta_j \left( \mathcal{T}_t(W(z_j)) - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_j, Sz_j \rangle} \mathbb{1} \right) \rho^{1/2} \right\|_2^2 \\ &= \sum_{j,k=1}^l \bar{\eta}_j \eta_k \operatorname{tr} \left( \rho \left( \mathcal{T}_t(W(-z_j)) - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_j, Sz_j \rangle} \mathbb{1} \right) \left( \mathcal{T}_t(W(z_k)) - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_k, Sz_k \rangle} \mathbb{1} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

which is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j,k=1}^l \bar{\eta}_j \eta_k \operatorname{tr} \left( \rho \left( \mathcal{T}_t(W(-z_j)) \mathcal{T}_t(W(z_k)) - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_j, Sz_j \rangle - \frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_k, Sz_k \rangle} \mathbb{I} \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{j,k=1}^l \bar{\eta}_j \eta_k \left[ \operatorname{tr} \left( \rho e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Re \int_0^t (\langle e^{sZ} z_j, C e^{sZ} z_j \rangle + \langle e^{sZ} z_k, C e^{sZ} z_k \rangle) ds} W(-e^{tZ} z_j) W(e^{tZ} z_k) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_j, Sz_j \rangle - \frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_k, Sz_k \rangle} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Keeping into account the CCR relation for Weyl operators (3) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T_t(\tilde{x})\|_2^2 &= \sum_{j,k} \bar{\eta}_j \eta_k \left[ e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Re \int_0^t (\langle e^{sZ} z_j, C e^{sZ} z_j \rangle + \langle e^{sZ} z_k, C e^{sZ} z_k \rangle) ds} \right. \\
&\quad \cdot e^{i\Im\langle e^{tZ} z_j, e^{tZ} z_k \rangle - \frac{1}{2}\Re\langle e^{tZ}(z_k - z_j), S e^{tZ}(z_k - z_j) \rangle} \\
&\quad \left. - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_j, Sz_j \rangle - \frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_k, Sz_k \rangle} \right]. \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

Now note that using the expression (19) for  $S$  we have

$$\Re\langle e^{tZ}(z_k - z_j), S e^{tZ}(z_k - z_j) \rangle = \int_t^\infty \Re\langle e^{sZ}(z_k - z_j), C e^{sZ}(z_k - z_j) \rangle ds$$

for all  $j, k$ , which allows us to rewrite

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{2}\Re \int_0^t (\langle e^{sZ} z_j, C e^{sZ} z_j \rangle + \langle e^{sZ} z_k, C e^{sZ} z_k \rangle) ds + i\Im\langle e^{tZ} z_j, e^{tZ} z_k \rangle \\
& -\frac{1}{2}\Re\langle e^{tZ}(z_k - z_j), S e^{tZ}(z_k - z_j) \rangle \\
&= -\frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_j, Sz_j \rangle - \frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_k, Sz_k \rangle + \Re\langle e^{tZ} z_j, S e^{tZ} z_k \rangle + i\Im\langle e^{tZ} z_j, e^{tZ} z_k \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Summing up, we can write  $\|T_t(\tilde{x})\|_2^2$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j,k} \bar{\eta}_j \eta_k \left[ e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_j, Sz_j \rangle - \frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_k, Sz_k \rangle + \Re\langle e^{tZ} z_j, S e^{tZ} z_k \rangle + i\Im\langle e^{tZ} z_j, e^{tZ} z_k \rangle} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_j, Sz_j \rangle - \frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_k, Sz_k \rangle} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Letting  $\xi_j = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_j, Sz_j \rangle} \eta_j$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T_t(\tilde{x})\|_2^2 &= \sum_{j,k=1}^l \bar{\xi}_j \xi_k \left( e^{\Re\langle e^{tZ} z_j, S e^{tZ} z_k \rangle + i\Im\langle e^{tZ} z_j, e^{tZ} z_k \rangle} - 1 \right) \\
\|\tilde{x}\|_2^2 &= \sum_{j,k=1}^l \bar{\xi}_j \xi_k \left( e^{\Re\langle z_j, Sz_k \rangle + i\Im\langle z_j, z_k \rangle} - 1 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, recalling equation (15), we can write

$$\Re\langle e^{tZ} z_j, S e^{tZ} z_k \rangle + i\Im\langle e^{tZ} z_j, e^{tZ} z_k \rangle = \left\langle e^{tZ} \begin{bmatrix} \Re z_j \\ \Im z_j \end{bmatrix}, (S + iJ) e^{tZ} \begin{bmatrix} \Re z_k \\ \Im z_k \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle. \tag{25}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

The previous lemma allows us to rewrite equation (1) for  $\tilde{x}$  with  $x \in \mathcal{W}$ . In this linear space of operators the condition for the spectral gap reduces to positive definiteness of a kernel as highlighted in the following proposition.

**Proposition 12.** *For all  $t \geq 0$ , defining*

$$s_t(z, w) := \left\langle e^{t\mathbf{Z}} \begin{bmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \end{bmatrix}, (\mathbf{S} + i\mathbf{J}) e^{t\mathbf{Z}} \begin{bmatrix} \Re w \\ \Im w \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad z, w \in \mathbb{C}^d$$

for all  $x \in \mathcal{W}$ , setting  $\xi_j = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\langle z_j, S z_j \rangle} \eta_j$  as in Lemma 11, we have

$$\|T_t(\tilde{x})\|_2^2 = \sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{j, k=1}^l \frac{\bar{\xi}_j \xi_k}{n!} (s_t(z_j, z_k))^n. \quad (26)$$

In particular, if the kernel

$$K_{n,t}(z, w) = e^{-2gt} (s_0(z, w))^n - (s_t(z, w))^n, \quad z, w \in \mathbb{C}^d,$$

is positive definite for every  $n \geq 1$ , the spectral gap inequality (1) holds for any  $\tilde{x}$  with  $x \in \mathcal{W}$ .

*Proof.* The power series expansion of the exponential immediately yields (26) from (23). This formula for  $t > 0$  and for  $t = 0$  allows us to rewrite (1) as

$$0 \leq e^{-2gt} \|\tilde{x}\|_2^2 - \|T_t(\tilde{x})\|_2^2 = \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{j, k=1}^l \bar{\xi}_j \xi_k (e^{-2gt} (s_0(z_j, z_k))^n - (s_t(z_j, z_k))^n),$$

which proves the claim.  $\square$

The characterization of Proposition 12 can be exploited to find a suitable candidate for the spectral gap. We begin by the following Lemma.

**Lemma 13.** *Let  $Y \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ ,  $n \geq 1$ , and let  $\omega_0$  be the maximum eigenvalue of  $Y + Y^*$ . Then*

$$\|e^{tY} v\|^2 \leq e^{t\omega_0} \|v\|^2 \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad v \in \mathbb{C}^n. \quad (27)$$

Moreover  $\omega_0$  is the optimal choice in the inequality, i.e.

$$\omega_0 = \min\{\omega \in \mathbb{R} : \|e^{tY} v\|^2 \leq e^{t\omega} \|v\|^2 \forall t \geq 0, \quad v \in \mathbb{C}^n\}.$$

*Proof.* Differentiating the function  $f_v(t) = \|e^{tY} v\|^2$  we find

$$\frac{d}{dt} f_v(t) = \langle e^{tY} z, (Y + Y^*) e^{tY} z \rangle \leq \omega_0 f_v(t) \quad (28)$$

and Gronwall's Lemma implies (27). On the other hand, if we choose  $\omega < \omega_0$  and we consider the eigenvector  $v$  of  $Y + Y^*$  associated with the eigenvalue  $\omega_0$ , then

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} e^{-t\omega} f_v(t) \right|_{t=0} = (\omega_0 - \omega) \|v\|^2 > 0.$$

In particular we have  $e^{-t\omega} f_v(t) > \|v\|^2$  in a right neighbourhood of  $t = 0$  which means  $\omega_0$  is the optimal bound in inequality (27).  $\square$

Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}} = \mathbf{S} + i\mathbf{J}$ . Proposition 12 with  $n = 1$  and  $x = W(z)$  yields

$$K_{1,t}(z, z) = e^{-2gt} s_0(z, z) - s_t(z, z) = e^{-2gt} \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{1/2} \begin{bmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2 - \left\| e^{t\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{1/2} \mathbf{Z} \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2}} \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{1/2} \begin{bmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2 \quad (29)$$

for all  $t \geq 0$ , and we get a natural candidate for  $2g$  from Lemma 13 applied to  $Y = \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{1/2} \mathbf{Z} \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2}$  as a  $2d \times 2d$  matrix.

**Proposition 14.** *Suppose that  $Z$  is stable and  $\mathbf{C}_Z > 0$ . Let  $\omega_0$  be the greatest eigenvalue of the  $2d \times 2d$  matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{1/2} \mathbf{Z} \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} + \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Z}^* \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{1/2}$ , then  $-\omega_0$  is the smallest eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{C}_Z \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}$  and  $\omega_0 < 0$ .*

*Proof.* The condition on the covariance operator  $\mathbf{S}$  of an invariant state  $\mathbf{Z}^* \mathbf{S} + \mathbf{S} \mathbf{Z} = -\mathbf{C}$  immediately yields

$$\mathbf{Z}^* \tilde{\mathbf{S}} + \tilde{\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{Z} = -\mathbf{C} + i(\mathbf{Z}^* \mathbf{J} + \mathbf{J} \mathbf{Z}) = -\mathbf{C}_Z.$$

Left and right multiplying by  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2}$  we get

$$\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{1/2} \mathbf{Z} \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} + \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Z}^* \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{1/2} = -\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{C}_Z \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2}. \quad (30)$$

Since  $\mathbf{C}_Z > 0$  by our assumptions, we get  $\omega_0 < 0$ . On the other hand,  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{C}_Z \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2}$  is similar to  $\mathbf{C}_Z \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}$  and then  $-\omega_0$  is the smallest eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{C}_Z \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}$ .  $\square$

Our goal now is to prove that  $g = -\omega_0/2$  is actually the spectral gap. We begin by showing that equation (1) holds for  $\tilde{x}$  with  $x \in \mathcal{W}$ , i.e. that  $K_{n,t}$  is a definite positive kernel. As a preliminary result we prove the following

**Lemma 15.** *Let  $n \geq 1$  and  $t \geq 0$ . The kernel*

$$K'_{n,t}(z, w) = e^{t\omega_0/n} s_0(z, w) - s_t(z, w), \quad z, w \in \mathbb{C}^d \quad (31)$$

*is positive definite.*

*Proof.* Note that we just need to prove the proposition for  $n = 1$  because we have

$$\sum_{j,k} \bar{c}_j c_k K'_{n,t}(z_j, z_k) = \sum_{j,k} \bar{c}_j c_k \left( K'_{1,t}(z_j, z_k) + (e^{-2tg/n} - e^{-2tg}) s_0(z_j, z_k) \right),$$

( $c_j \in \mathbb{C}, z_j \in \mathbb{C}^d$ ) which is positive if  $K'_{1,t}$  is positive definite, since  $s_0$  is positive definite and  $e^{-2tg/n} - e^{-2tg} > 0$ . Therefore, fix  $n = 1$  and let us prove positive definiteness of (31). By sesquilinearity of  $s_t$  we have

$$\sum_{j,k} \bar{c}_j c_k K'_{1,t}(z_j, z_k) = e^{-2tg} s_0(\xi, \xi) - s_t(\xi, \xi),$$

where  $\xi = \sum_j c_j z_j$ . Since this quantity is positive by our choice of  $2g$  and Lemma 13,  $K'_{1,t}$  is positive definite and the proof is complete.  $\square$

We are now in a position to prove the key inequality



**Proposition 16.** *For all  $x \in \mathcal{W}$  and  $t \geq 0$  we have*

$$\|T_t(\tilde{x})\|_2^2 \leq e^{-2gt} \|\tilde{x}\|_2^2.$$

*Proof.* Thanks to Proposition 12 it suffices to show that the kernel

$$K_{n,t}(z, w) = e^{t\omega_0} (s_0(z, w))^n - (s_t(z, w))^n, \quad z, w \in \mathbb{C}^d,$$

is positive definite. Recalling the kernel defined in (31), we have

$$K_{n,t}(z, w) = K'_{n,t}(z, w) \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} e^{\frac{n-1-m}{n} t\omega_0} (s_0(z, w))^{n-1-m} (s_t(z, w))^m.$$

Since both  $s_t$  and  $s_0$  are positive definite kernels, their powers and their linear combinations with positive coefficients are still positive definite by [27] Corollary 15.2, and so is  $K_{n,t}$ .  $\square$

Finally we prove that the bound for the spectral gap given by Proposition 16 is actually optimal, even if we just consider Hilbert-Schmidt operators  $\tilde{x}$  with  $x \in \mathcal{W}$ .

**Proposition 17.** *Let  $\omega < \omega_0$ . There exist  $\delta > 0$  and  $x \in \mathcal{W}$  such that*

$$\|T_t(\tilde{x})\|_2^2 > e^{t\omega} \|\tilde{x}\|_2^2 \quad \forall t \in (0, \delta).$$

*Proof.* Let  $z \in \mathbb{C}^{2d}$  such that  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{\frac{1}{2}} z$  is an eigenvector of  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{Z} \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{Z}^* \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  associated with the eigenvalue  $\omega_0$ . Write  $z = [z_p, z_q]^T$  with  $z_p, z_q \in \mathbb{C}^d$  and consider  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}^d$  defined by  $z_1 = \Re z_p + i \Re z_q$ ,  $z_2 = \Im z_p + i \Im z_q$ , so that  $[\Re z_1, \Im z_1]^T = \Re z$  and  $[\Re z_2, \Im z_2]^T = \Im z$ . For all  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ , considering  $x_r = W(rz_1) + iW(rz_2) = \sum_{j=1}^2 c_j W(rz_j)$ , with  $c_1 = 1, c_2 = i$ , we have

$$\tilde{x}_r = \sum_{j=1}^2 c_j \left( W(rz_j) - e^{-\frac{r^2}{2} s_0(z_j, z_j)} \mathbb{1} \right) \rho^{1/2}$$

by equation (22). Setting again  $\xi_{j,r} = e^{-\frac{r^2}{2} s_0(z_j, z_j)} c_j$ , using equation (23) and recalling the definition of  $s_t(z, w)$  in Proposition 12 we then have

$$\|T_t(\tilde{x})\|_2^2 = \sum_{j,k=1}^l \bar{\xi}_{j,r} \xi_{k,r} \left( e^{r^2 s_t(z_j, z_k)} - 1 \right)$$

Taking the derivative at  $t = 0$  we find

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} s_t(z_j, z_k) \right|_{t=0} = \left\langle \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \Re z_j \\ \Im z_j \end{bmatrix}, \left( \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{1/2} \mathbf{Z} \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} + \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Z}^* \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{1/2} \right) \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \Re z_k \\ \Im z_k \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle$$

Consider now

$$\begin{aligned} f(r) &:= \left. \frac{d}{dt} \|T_t(\tilde{x}_r)\|_2^2 - e^{t\omega} \|\tilde{x}_r\|_2^2 \right|_{t=0} \\ &= \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \bar{\xi}_{j,r} \xi_{k,r} \left( \left( r^2 \left. \frac{d}{dt} s_t(z_j, z_k) \right|_{t=0} - \omega \right) e^{r^2 s_0(z_j, z_k)} + \omega \right) \end{aligned}$$

It holds  $f(0) = f'(0) = 0$  while

$$f''(0) = 2 \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \overline{c_j} c_k \left( \left. \frac{d}{dt} s_t(z_j, z_k) \right|_{t=0} - \omega s_0(z_j, z_k) \right) = 2(\omega_0 - \omega) s_0(z, z)$$

where the last equality follows from sesquilinearity of the derivative of  $s_t$  and  $s_0$  as well as the fact that  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{\frac{1}{2}} z$  is an eigenvector. In particular, recalling that  $\omega < \omega_0 < 0$ , we find  $f''(0) > 0$  because the invariant state is faithful and  $z \neq 0$ . This implies that there exists  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that  $f(r) > 0$  for every  $r \in (0, \delta_0)$ . This implies in turn that for every  $r \in (0, \delta_0)$  there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\|T_t(\tilde{x}_r)\|_2^2 > e^{t\omega} \|\tilde{x}_r\|_2^2, \quad \forall t \in (0, \delta).$$

□

Proposition 16 proves the inequality (1) for the spectral gap for elements  $\tilde{x}$  with  $x \in \mathcal{W}$ . The following Theorem shows that it holds for all the remaining elements.

**Theorem 18.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a gaussian QMS with  $Z$  stable,  $\mathbf{C}_Z > 0$  and  $\zeta = 0$ . Then  $\mathcal{T}$  has a spectral gap  $g = -\omega_0/2 > 0$ .*

*Proof.* By Proposition 16 we have  $\|T_t(\tilde{x})\|_2^2 \leq e^{-2gt} \|\tilde{x}\|_2^2$  for all  $t \geq 0$  and all  $\tilde{x} \in \mathfrak{I}_2(\mathbf{h})$  written in the form (22). To show that it also holds for any element of  $\mathfrak{I}_2(\mathbf{h})$  orthogonal to  $\rho^{1/2}$  we show that the set of those  $\tilde{x}$  is dense in the orthogonal subspace of  $\rho^{1/2}$ . To this end, consider  $y \in \mathfrak{I}_2(\mathbf{h})$  orthogonal to  $\rho^{1/2}$  such that  $\text{tr}(y^* \tilde{x}) = 0$  for all  $\tilde{x} = x\rho^{1/2} - \langle \rho^{1/2}, x\rho^{1/2} \rangle_2 \rho^{1/2}$  with  $x \in \mathcal{W}$ . In particular, taking  $x = W(z)$  we have

$$0 = \text{tr}(y^* \tilde{x}) = \text{tr}(y^* (W(z) - \text{tr}(\rho W(z)) \mathbb{1}) \rho^{1/2}) = \text{tr}(\rho^{1/2} y^* W(z))$$

for all  $z \in \mathbb{C}^d$ . Since  $\rho^{1/2} y^*$  is a trace class operator, the weak\* density of Weyl operators in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{h})$  implies  $\rho^{1/2} y^* = 0$ , namely  $y = 0$  because  $\rho$  is faithful.

Proposition 17 now concludes the proof, showing that  $g$  is the optimal choice. □

## 5 Conditions on the invariant state

In this section we want to discuss the assumptions we made on  $Z$  and  $\mathbf{C}_Z$  to show that they are not restrictive when looking for a positive spectral gap. We have indeed the following result.

**Theorem 19.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a gaussian QMS and suppose it has a spectral gap  $g$ . Then  $Z$  is stable and  $\mathbf{C}_Z > 0$ .*

We will split the proof in two steps. We start by showing the stability of  $Z$ , which is due to the requirement of the existence of an invariant state and the asymptotic stability-like requirement in (1).

**Lemma 20.** *If  $Z$  is not stable then there exists  $z \in \mathbb{C}^d$  that satisfies one of the following:*

1.  $e^{tZ}z \in \ker C$  for every  $t \geq 0$ ;
2.  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \Re \langle e^{sZ}z, Ce^{sZ}z \rangle ds = +\infty$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $\lambda$  is an eigenvalue for  $\mathbf{Z}$  with  $\Re \lambda \geq 0$  and let  $w \in \mathbb{C}^{2d}$  be its associated eigenvector. This implies that  $\bar{w}$  is an eigenvector for  $\bar{\lambda}$ . Consider  $x = w + \bar{w}$  and  $y = i(w - \bar{w})$ , both belonging to  $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$  and satisfying

$$\mathbf{Z}x = \Re \lambda x + \Im \lambda y, \quad \mathbf{Z}y = -\Im \lambda x + \Re \lambda y.$$

If  $\Im \lambda = 0$  we can set  $z \in \mathbb{C}^d$  as the element corresponding to  $w$  and have  $e^{tZ}z = e^{t\Re \lambda}z$ , in particular

$$\int_0^t \Re \langle e^{sZ}z, Ce^{sZ}z \rangle ds = \Re \langle z, Cz \rangle \int_0^t e^{2s\Re \lambda} ds.$$

This implies either  $z \in \ker C$  or it converges to infinity, proving the result in the case  $\Im \lambda = 0$ . Suppose then  $\Im \lambda \neq 0$ . On the space generated by  $x, y$  we have

$$Z = \begin{bmatrix} \Re \lambda & \Im \lambda \\ -\Im \lambda & \Re \lambda \end{bmatrix}, \quad e^{tZ} = e^{t\Re \lambda} \begin{bmatrix} \cos(t\Im \lambda) & \sin(t\Im \lambda) \\ -\sin(t\Im \lambda) & \cos(t\Im \lambda) \end{bmatrix}.$$

For any  $z \in \mathbb{C}^d$  corresponding to a real linear combination of  $x, y$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t \Re \langle e^{sZ}z, Ce^{sZ}z \rangle ds \\ &= \int_0^t \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} \cos(s\Im \lambda) & \sin(s\Im \lambda) \\ -\sin(s\Im \lambda) & \cos(s\Im \lambda) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{C} \begin{bmatrix} \cos(s\Im \lambda) & \sin(s\Im \lambda) \\ -\sin(s\Im \lambda) & \cos(s\Im \lambda) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle e^{2s\Re \lambda} ds \\ &\geq \int_0^t \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} \cos(s\Im \lambda) & \sin(s\Im \lambda) \\ -\sin(s\Im \lambda) & \cos(s\Im \lambda) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{C} \begin{bmatrix} \cos(s\Im \lambda) & \sin(s\Im \lambda) \\ -\sin(s\Im \lambda) & \cos(s\Im \lambda) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle ds \end{aligned}$$

The scalar product inside the integral is non-negative and periodic as a function of  $s$ , therefore either it is identically zero or the integral diverges. Eventually, the scalar product being identically zero is equivalent to  $e^{tZ}z \in \ker C$  for every  $t \geq 0$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 21.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a gaussian QMS with an invariant state  $\rho$  and a positive spectral gap  $g$ . Then  $Z$  is stable.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\mathbf{Z}$  has an eigenvalue  $\lambda$  with  $\Re \lambda \geq 0$ . From Lemma 20 we can find  $z \in \mathbb{C}^d$  such that either  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \Re \langle e^{sZ}z, Ce^{sZ}z \rangle ds = +\infty$  or  $e^{tZ}z \in \ker C$  for every  $t \geq 0$ . In the former case, the constant  $c_t(z)$  multiplying the Weyl operator in (9) satisfies

$$c_t(z) = \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \Re \langle e^{sZ}z, Ce^{sZ}z \rangle ds \right) \longrightarrow 0. \quad (32)$$

We can explicitly compute

$$|\hat{\rho}(z)| = |\text{tr}(\rho W(z))| = |\text{tr}(\rho \mathcal{T}_t(W(z)))| = |c_t(z) \hat{\rho}(e^{tZ} z)| = c_t(z) |\hat{\rho}(e^{\lambda t} z)| \leq c_t(z), \quad (33)$$

and, for every  $r > 0$ , equation (33) reads  $|\hat{\rho}(rz)| = 0$ . This is a contradiction since the characteristic function is continuous and  $\hat{\rho}(0) = 1$ . On the other hand, if  $z \in \ker C$ , from explicit computations

$$\mathbb{1} = \mathcal{T}_t(W(z)) \mathcal{T}_t(W(z))^*.$$

Therefore

$$\|T_t(W(z)\rho^{1/2})\|_2^2 = \text{tr}(\rho \mathcal{T}_t(W(z))^* \mathcal{T}_t(W(z))) = 1$$

and

$$\|T_t(W(z)\rho^{1/2}) - \langle \rho^{1/2}, W(z)\rho^{1/2} \rangle_2 \rho^{1/2}\|_2^2 \geq 1 - |\hat{\rho}(z)|^2.$$

For the semigroup to have a spectral gap and inequality (1) to hold we must have  $|\hat{\rho}(z)| = 1$  which is a contradiction since then

$$\|W(z)\rho^{1/2} - \langle \rho^{1/2}, W(z)\rho^{1/2} \rangle_2 \rho^{1/2}\|_2^2 = 1 - |\hat{\rho}(z)|^2 = 0.$$

□

To prove the necessity of  $\mathbf{C}_Z > 0$ , by contradiction, one can show that if  $\ker \mathbf{C}_Z \neq \{0\}$  then (1) does not hold for some  $x \in \mathfrak{I}_2(\mathbf{h})$  and  $t > 0$  and so there is no strictly positive spectral gap. The intuition behind the proof is that if  $(z_p, z_q) \in \ker \mathbf{C}_Z$  with  $z_p, z_q \in \mathbb{C}^d$  then (1) fails when considering  $x = \sum_{j=1}^d (z_{p,j} p_j - z_{q,j} q_j) \rho^{1/2}$ . This choice for  $x$  however is not rigorous since  $\sum_{j=1}^d (z_{p,j} p_j - z_{q,j} q_j) \notin \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{h})$  and we have to work out computations through a limiting procedure. However, we can prove the following proposition whose technical details are deferred to Appendix B.

**Proposition 22.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a gaussian QMS with a faithful invariant state  $\rho$ . If  $\ker \mathbf{C}_Z \neq \{0\}$ . Then the semigroup has no spectral gap.*

*Proof of Theorem 19.* From Proposition 21 we have stability of  $Z$ , while Proposition 22 gives  $\mathbf{C}_Z > 0$ . □

## 6 A one-dimensional case

The detailed analysis of a one-dimensional case with the explicit computation of  $g$  in terms of a few parameters clarifies why the condition  $\mathbf{C}_Z > 0$  is necessary for  $g > 0$ . Moreover, it shows that one can find a quantum Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process with  $g = 0$  with a classical subprocess, obtained by restriction to an abelian subalgebra, with strictly positive spectral gap.

Fix  $d = 1$ . In order to further simplify the notation we consider

$$L_1 = \mu a, \quad L_2 = \lambda a^\dagger, \quad H = \Omega a^\dagger a + \kappa(a^{\dagger 2} + a^2)/2$$

with  $0 < \lambda < \mu$ ,  $\Omega, \kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ . Define  $\gamma = (\mu^2 - \lambda^2)/2$ . In this framework a faithful invariant state exists if and only if  $\gamma^2 + \Omega^2 - \kappa^2 > 0$  (see [1] Theorem 9 and Proposition 5). Moreover

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} \mu^2 + \lambda^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \mu^2 + \lambda^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{Z} = \begin{bmatrix} -\gamma & \kappa - \Omega \\ \kappa + \Omega & -\gamma \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{C}_Z = \begin{bmatrix} \mu^2 + \lambda^2 & 2i\gamma \\ -2i\gamma & \mu^2 + \lambda^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Solving  $\mathbf{Z}^* \mathbf{S} + \mathbf{S} \mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{C} = 0$  we find the covariance matrix of the unique invariant state

$$\mathbf{S} = \frac{\mu^2 + \lambda^2}{2\gamma(\gamma^2 + \Omega^2 - \kappa^2)} \begin{bmatrix} \gamma^2 + \Omega(\Omega + \kappa) & \kappa\gamma \\ \kappa\gamma & \gamma^2 + \Omega(\Omega - \kappa) \end{bmatrix} \quad (34)$$

Since  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{Z} \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{Z}^* \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{\frac{1}{2}} = -\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{C}_Z \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ , we have  $\mathbf{C}_Z \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1} = -\mathbf{Z}^* - \tilde{\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{Z} \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}$ , therefore

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_Z \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}) = 4\gamma.$$

In addition

$$\det(\mathbf{C}_Z \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}) = \frac{\det(\mathbf{C}_Z)}{\det(\tilde{\mathbf{S}})} = \frac{4\mu^2 \lambda^2}{\det(\mathbf{S}) - 1},$$

yielding eventually

$$\det(\mathbf{C}_Z \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}) = \frac{4\mu^2 \lambda^2}{\frac{(\gamma^2 + \Omega^2)(\mu^2 + \lambda^2)^2}{4\gamma^2(\gamma^2 + \Omega^2 - \kappa^2)} - 1} = \frac{4\mu^2 \lambda^2 \gamma^2 (\gamma^2 + \Omega^2 - \kappa^2)}{\mu^2 \lambda^2 (\gamma^2 + \Omega^2) + \gamma^2 \kappa^2}$$

Eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{C}_Z \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}$  are the roots of  $r^2 - \text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_Z \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-1})r + \det(\mathbf{C}_Z)/\det(\tilde{\mathbf{S}}) = 0$  and the spectral gap is one-half of

$$\gamma - \sqrt{\gamma^2 - \frac{\mu^2 \lambda^2 \gamma^2 (\gamma^2 + \Omega^2 - \kappa^2)}{\mu^2 \lambda^2 (\gamma^2 + \Omega^2) + \gamma^2 \kappa^2}} = \gamma \left( 1 - \frac{|\kappa|(\mu^2 + \lambda^2)}{2\sqrt{(\mu^2 \lambda^2 (\gamma^2 + \Omega^2) + \gamma^2 \kappa^2)}} \right)$$

Note that, for  $\lambda = 0$  and  $\kappa \neq 0$ , even the invariant state is faithful by

$$\det(\tilde{\mathbf{S}}) = \det(\mathbf{S}) - 1 = \frac{\kappa^2}{4\gamma^2(\mu^4 + \Omega^2)} > 0,$$

but the spectral gap is zero because  $\det(\mathbf{C}_Z) = 0$ . If, in addition  $\kappa = 2\Omega$  so that  $H = \Omega(q^2 + \mathbb{1})/2$

$$\mathcal{L}(f(q)) = \frac{\mu^2 + \lambda^2}{4} f''(q) - \frac{\mu^2 - \lambda^2}{2} q f'(q)$$

which is the generator of a classical Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process which is also symmetric. The density of the invariant measure (up to the normalization constant) is  $e^{-(\mu^2 - \lambda^2)q^2/(\mu^2 + \lambda^2)}$  and the spectral gap is  $(\mu^2 - \lambda^2)/2 > 0$ .

## 7 The spectral gap for the KMS embedding

As we already recalled in the introduction, the invariant density can induce different semigroups  $T$  on the space of Hilbert-Schmidt operators due to non-commutativity. The  $i_{1/2,2}$  embedding has the advantage of producing a semigroup  $T$  of self-adjoint operators in more cases (see [20]), but at the cost of longer calculations because of the computations for quantities of the kind of  $\text{tr}(\rho^{1/2}W(w)\rho^{1/2}W(z))$ . These can be simplified by symplectic diagonalization of  $S$  but their explicit derivation is deferred to Appendix C.

In this section we present the computation of the spectral gap when we consider the KMS embedding, highlighting the differences with the GNS case and the changes to be made for the calculations to go through. The spectral gap is again defined through condition (1), however the semigroup  $T_t$  is no more defined by  $T_t(x\rho^{1/2}) = \mathcal{T}_t(x)\rho^{1/2}$  but instead by an adjusted version for the KMS-embedding

$$T_t(\rho^{\frac{1}{4}}x\rho^{\frac{1}{4}}) = \rho^{\frac{1}{4}}\mathcal{T}_t(x)\rho^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{h}).$$

We will show that many results obtained in Section 4 follow similarly with this new embedding, apart for some adjustments and many more calculations. The overall result can be briefly summarized by saying that the spectral gap is no longer  $-1/2$  times the greatest eigenvalue of  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{Z}\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{Z}^*\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  but  $-1/2$  times the greatest eigenvalue of an alike matrix obtained by replacing  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}$  by another operator  $\check{S}$ , still linked with  $S$ . Remarkably, there will be no need to consider complexifications of matrices since, in this case, real linear operators will be sufficient to describe the behaviour of the semigroup.

We start by considering  $x \in \mathcal{W}$ , this time we denote with  $\check{x}$  the projection of  $\rho^{\frac{1}{4}}x\rho^{\frac{1}{4}}$  onto the orthogonal of  $\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , namely

$$\check{x} = \rho^{\frac{1}{4}} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^l \eta_j \left( W(z_j) - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_j, Sz_j \rangle} \mathbb{1} \right) \right] \rho^{\frac{1}{4}}. \quad (35)$$

An analogous result to Lemma 11 and Proposition 12 holds, with some slight adjustments. First of all we recall that every covariance matrix of a gaussian state can be symplectically diagonalized [29]. Explicitly, there exists a symplectic transformation  $M$  on  $\mathbb{C}^d$ , i.e. a real linear operator satisfying  $\Im \langle Mz, Mw \rangle = \Im \langle z, w \rangle$  for every  $z, w \in \mathbb{C}^d$ , such that  $S = M^T D_\sigma M$  with  $D_\sigma$  the diagonal matrix with entries  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d \in (1, +\infty)$ . We can now state the following result.

**Lemma 23.** *Let  $x \in \mathcal{W}$  and set  $\xi_j = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z_j, Sz_j \rangle} \eta_j$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . Then*

$$\|T_t(\check{x})\|_2^2 = \sum_{j,k=1}^l \bar{\xi}_j \xi_k \left( \exp \left( \Re \left\langle e^{tZ} z_j, \check{S} e^{tZ} z_k \right\rangle \right) - 1 \right) \quad (36)$$

$$= \sum_{j,k=1}^l \bar{\xi}_j \xi_k \left( e^{\check{s}t(z_j, z_k)} - 1 \right) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{j,k=1}^l \frac{\bar{\xi}_j \xi_k}{n!} (\check{s}_t(z_j, z_k))^n \quad (37)$$

for all  $t \geq 0$ , where  $\check{S} = M^T D_\nu M$ ,  $M$  is the above symplectic transformation,  $\nu_j = \text{csch} \coth^{-1}(\sigma_j)$  and

$$\check{s}_t(z, w) := \Re \left\langle e^{tZ} z, \check{S} e^{tZ} w \right\rangle \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad z, w \in \mathbb{C}^d.$$

In particular we have

$$\check{s}_t(z, z) = \left\| e^{t\check{S}^{1/2} Z \check{S}^{-1/2}} \check{S}^{1/2} z \right\|^2 \quad (38)$$

for all  $t \geq 0$  and  $z \in \mathbb{C}^d$ .

*Proof.* We defer the proof to Appendix C.  $\square$

The previous Lemma joins in a single statement results similar to those of Lemma 11 and Proposition 12, simply replacing all instances of  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}$  with  $\check{S}$ . The matrices  $\check{S}$  and  $S$  are diagonalized by the same symplectic transformation  $M$  and we know the explicit relation between their symplectic eigenvalues  $\sigma_j, \nu_j$ . Furthermore, from the condition  $\sigma_j > 1$ , we infer  $\nu_j > 0$  showing that  $\check{S}$  is still a positive and invertible matrix, which were the relevant properties that also  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}$  enjoyed. Letting  $\check{\omega}_0$  the greatest eigenvalue of  $\check{S}^{\frac{1}{2}} Z \check{S}^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \check{S}^{-\frac{1}{2}} Z^\sharp \check{S}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\check{g} = -\check{\omega}_0/2$ , we can now proceed to compute the spectral gap, in total analogy to what we did for the GNS embedding.

With these new definition a new version for Proposition 16 holds, yielding a lower bound for the spectral gap with the KMS embedding, namely  $2\check{g}$ .

**Proposition 24.** *Let  $x \in \mathcal{W}$ . It holds*

$$\|T_t(\check{x})\|_2^2 \leq e^{-2\check{g}t} \|\check{x}\|_2^2, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

The proof follows precisely the lines of the one in Section 4 except that Lemma 15 and all the computations have to be performed with the  $\check{\cdot}$  counterparts of the quantities involved.

In the same way we can prove optimality of the spectral gap by following the proof of Proposition 17 and using the  $\check{\cdot}$  counterparts of the quantities. We get the following result.

**Proposition 25.** *Let  $g > \check{g}$ . There exists  $\delta > 0$  and  $x \in \mathcal{W}$  such that*

$$\|T_t(\check{x})\|_2^2 > e^{-2tg} \|\check{x}\|_2^2, \quad \forall t \in (0, \delta).$$

Eventually, following again Theorem 18, we arrive to the following result.

**Theorem 26.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a gaussian QMS with a unique invariant faithful gaussian state and  $\zeta = 0$ . If  $\ker Z^\sharp \check{S} + \check{S} Z \neq \{0\}$  then  $\mathcal{T}$  has the spectral gap  $\check{g}$ .*

As foreshadowed in the introduction to this section, the only difference between Theorems 18 and 26 is the need to replace  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}$  with  $\check{S}$ . Even the condition on  $\ker Z^\sharp \check{S} + \check{S} Z$  is the translation of the condition  $\mathbf{C}_Z > 0$  for the GNS embedding since  $-\mathbf{C}_Z = \mathbf{Z}^* \tilde{\mathbf{S}} + \tilde{\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{Z}$ . However the explicit conditions we had in Theorem 18 are now replaced by the implicit requirement of a unique invariant faithful gaussian state. This is due to the fact that the sufficient conditions we had in the GNS case, namely  $\mathbf{C}_Z > 0$  and  $Z$  stable, are no more necessary for the existence of a spectral gap (see the last comment of subsection 7.1 below).

Another difference of note, is the lack of a counterpart of Proposition 14 in the KMS embedding. Indeed we lack a simple formula to connect the matrix  $\check{S}$  to the operators  $Z$  and  $C$ , that describe the QMS. For this very reason it is also difficult to compare the spectral gaps that we obtain with respect to the two different embeddings. We believe that  $\check{g}$  is bigger than  $g$ , however we do not have a definite proof. The next example support this claim as the prototypical example of a gaussian QMS.

## 7.1 one dimensional case: KMS embedding

In Section 6, we computed the spectral gap for the GNS embedding for a typical model with  $d = 1$ . Here, we consider the same gaussian QMS and we analyse the situation for the KMS embedding. Starting from the expression for  $\mathbf{S}$  in (34) we may symplectically diagonalize it writing  $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{D}_\sigma \mathbf{M}$  with

$$\mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\gamma^2 + \Omega^2} & 0 \\ \frac{\kappa\gamma}{(\gamma^2 + \Omega^2 - \kappa^2)\sqrt{\gamma^2 + \Omega^2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma^2 + \Omega^2}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{D}_\sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma \end{bmatrix}, \quad \sigma = \frac{\mu^2 + \lambda^2}{2\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{\gamma^2 + \Omega^2}{\gamma^2 + \Omega^2 - \kappa^2}}.$$

Since  $d = 1$ , both the matrix  $\mathbf{D}_\sigma$  in the previous equation and  $\mathbf{D}_\nu$  coming from Lemma 23 are actually multiple of the identity therefore we can write

$$\check{\mathbf{S}} = \frac{\text{csch coth}^{-1}(\sigma)}{\sigma} \mathbf{S} = \frac{\text{csch coth}^{-1}(\sigma)}{\sigma} \mathbf{M}^* (\sigma \mathbb{1}) \mathbf{M}. \quad (39)$$

In particular, contrary to what happens in the GNS embedding with  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}$ , the operator  $\check{\mathbf{S}}$  does not involve any operations that require the complexification for its definition. Therefore equation (39) can simply be formulated using real linear operators, i.e.

$$\check{S} = \frac{\text{csch coth}^{-1}(\sigma)}{\sigma} S.$$

This allows us to also avoid consider complexification of the operators  $Z, C$  so that the computations for the spectral gap can proceed, using just real linear operators, as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \check{S}^{\frac{1}{2}} Z \check{S}^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \check{S}^{-\frac{1}{2}} Z^\# \check{S}^{\frac{1}{2}} &= S^{\frac{1}{2}} Z S^{-\frac{1}{2}} + S^{-\frac{1}{2}} Z^\# S^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= -S^{-\frac{1}{2}} C S^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which is similar to  $-CS^{-1}$ . Notice that in the calculations we used once again the algebraic characterization of the covariance matrix  $S$ , namely  $SZ + Z^\# S = -C$ . The eigenvalues of  $CS^{-1}$  satisfy now the equation  $r^2 - \text{tr}(CS^{-1})r + \frac{\det C}{\det S} = 0$ . Borrowing some of the calculations from Section 6 we have

$$\text{tr}(CS^{-1}) = 4\gamma, \quad \det(CS^{-1}) = \frac{4\gamma^2(\gamma^2 + \Omega^2 - \kappa^2)}{\Omega^2 + \gamma^2}$$

In particular  $2\check{g}$  is the smallest eigenvalue of  $CS^{-1}$  and so

$$\check{g} = \gamma \left( 1 - \frac{|\kappa|}{\sqrt{\Omega^2 + \gamma^2}} \right).$$



Comparing this quantity with  $g$  obtained in Section 6 we have  $\check{g} > g$  if and only if

$$\frac{|\kappa|}{\sqrt{\Omega^2 + \gamma^2}} < \frac{|\kappa|(\mu^2 + \lambda^2)}{2\sqrt{\mu^2\lambda^2(\Omega^2 + \gamma^2) + \gamma^2\kappa^2}}$$

which simplifies down to (recalling that  $\gamma = (\mu^2 - \lambda^2)/2$ )

$$\gamma^2(\gamma^2 + \Omega^2 - \kappa^2) > 0.$$

The inequality is now always satisfied since  $\gamma > 0$  and  $\Omega^2 + \gamma^2 - \kappa^2 > 0$  are necessary and sufficient conditions for the semigroup to have a gaussian invariant state (see [1]).

In particular we can set  $\lambda = 0$ , resulting in the non-invertibility of  $\mathbf{C}_Z$ , and still have  $\check{g} > 0$ . This shows that the conditions for the existence of a unique faithful invariant gaussian state of Theorem 18, namely  $Z$  stable and  $\mathbf{C}_Z > 0$ , are only sufficient for the existence of a spectral gap in the KMS embedding, unlike in the GNS one.

**Acknowledgements** The authors are members of GNAMPA-INdAM. FF acknowledges the support of the MUR grant “Dipartimento di Eccellenza 2023–2027” of Dipartimento di Matematica, Politecnico di Milano and “Centro Nazionale di ricerca in HPC, Big Data and Quantum Computing”. DP, ES and VU have been supported by the MUR grant “Dipartimento di Eccellenza 2023–2027” of Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Genova.

## A Calculations on $\mathbf{C}_Z$

**Lemma 27.** *Matrices  $\mathbf{Z}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_Z$  are given by (17) and (18).*

*Proof.* Using the formula of the complexification of a real linear operator we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Z} &= \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \Re(U^T \bar{U} - V^T \bar{V} + U^T V - V^T U) & \Im(-U^T \bar{U} + V^T \bar{V} + U^T V - V^T U) \\ \Im(U^T \bar{U} - V^T \bar{V} + U^T V - V^T U) & \Re(U^T \bar{U} - V^T \bar{V} - U^T V + V^T U) \end{bmatrix} \\ &\quad + \begin{bmatrix} -\Im(\Omega + \kappa) & \Re(\kappa - \Omega) \\ \Re(\Omega + \kappa) & \Im(\kappa - \Omega) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \Re((U - \bar{V})^* (U + \bar{V})) & \Im((U - \bar{V})^* (U - \bar{V})) \\ -\Im((U + \bar{V})^* (U + \bar{V})) & \Re((U + \bar{V})^* (U - \bar{V})) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} -\Im(\Omega + \kappa) & \Re(\kappa - \Omega) \\ \Re(\Omega + \kappa) & \Im(\kappa - \Omega) \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C} &= \begin{bmatrix} \Re(\overline{U^* U + V^* V} + U^T V + V^T U) & -\Im(\overline{U^* U + V^* V} - U^T V - V^T U) \\ \Im(\overline{U^* U + V^* V} + U^T V + V^T U) & \Re(\overline{U^* U + V^* V} - U^T V - V^T U) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \Re((U + \bar{V})^* (U + \bar{V})) & \Im((U + \bar{V})^* (U - \bar{V})) \\ -\Im((U - \bar{V})^* (U + \bar{V})) & \Re((U - \bar{V})^* (U - \bar{V})) \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover

$$\mathbf{Z}^* \mathbf{J} + \mathbf{J} \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{J} \mathbf{Z} - (\mathbf{J} \mathbf{Z})^*$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{J}\mathbf{Z} = & \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} -\Im \left( (U + \bar{V})^* (U + \bar{V}) \right) & \Re \left( (U + \bar{V})^* (U - \bar{V}) \right) \\ -\Re \left( (U - \bar{V})^* (U + \bar{V}) \right) & -\Im \left( (U - \bar{V})^* (U - \bar{V}) \right) \end{bmatrix} \\ & + \begin{bmatrix} \Re(\Omega + \kappa) & \Im(\kappa - \Omega) \\ \Im(\kappa + \Omega) & \Re(\Omega - \kappa) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Now note that the first matrix in the expression for  $\mathbf{J}\mathbf{Z}$  is anti-selfadjoint while the second one is selfadjoint. In particular then

$$\mathbf{Z}^*\mathbf{J} + \mathbf{J}\mathbf{Z} = \begin{bmatrix} -\Im \left( (U + \bar{V})^* (U + \bar{V}) \right) & \Re \left( (U + \bar{V})^* (U - \bar{V}) \right) \\ -\Re \left( (U - \bar{V})^* (U + \bar{V}) \right) & -\Im \left( (U - \bar{V})^* (U - \bar{V}) \right) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using the definition of  $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{Z}} = \mathbf{C} - \mathbf{i}(\mathbf{Z}^*\mathbf{J} + \mathbf{J}\mathbf{Z})$  we get the desired result.  $\square$

## B Proof of Proposition 22

This appendix is devoted to the proof of Proposition 22. Let  $(z_p, z_q) \in \ker \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{Z}}$  with  $z_p, z_q \in \mathbb{C}^d$  and consider  $x = \sum_{j=1}^d (z_{p,j}p_j - z_{q,j}q_j)\rho^{1/2}$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^d (z_{p,j}p_j - z_{q,j}q_j) &= \sum_{j=1}^d (\Re z_{p,j}p_j - \Re z_{q,j}q_j) + \mathbf{i} \sum_{j=1}^d (\Im z_{p,j}p_j - \Im z_{q,j}q_j) \\ &= \sqrt{2}(p(z_1) + \mathbf{i}p(z_2)) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\sqrt{2}z_1 = \Re z_p + \mathbf{i}\Re z_q$ ,  $\sqrt{2}z_2 = \Im z_p + \mathbf{i}\Im z_q$ . Which motivates the introduction of the following notation

$$\tilde{W}(z_p, z_q) = W(z_1) + \mathbf{i}W(z_2)$$

and the ratios of increments

$$R_z(r) = \frac{W(rz) - \mathbb{1}}{-\mathbf{i}r}, \quad \tilde{R}_{z_p, z_q}(r) = \frac{\tilde{W}(rz_p, rz_q) - (1 + \mathbf{i})\mathbb{1}}{-\mathbf{i}r} = R_{z_1}(r) + \mathbf{i}R_{z_2}(r). \quad (40)$$

In particular it holds

$$\sum_{j=1}^d (z_{p,j}p_j - z_{q,j}q_j) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{W(rz_1) + \mathbf{i}W(rz_2) - (1 + \mathbf{i})\mathbb{1}}{-\mathbf{i}r} = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{R}_{z_p, z_q}(r)$$

where the limits holds in the strong operator topology and on a suitable dense domain. We can now prove that the existence of a spectral gap implies  $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{Z}} > 0$ , starting from a lemma.

**Lemma 28.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a gaussian QMS with an invariant state  $\rho$ . For every  $z, w \in \mathbb{C}^d$  we have*

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \text{tr}(\rho \mathcal{T}_t(R_z(r))^* \mathcal{T}_t(R_w(r))) \right|_{t=0} = - \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{Z}} \begin{pmatrix} \Re w \\ \Im w \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \text{tr}(\rho W(-rz)W(rw))$$

*Proof.* Note at first that, from (9),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}_t(W(z))\mathcal{T}_t(W(w)) &= \alpha_t(z)\alpha_t(w)W(e^{tZ}z)W(e^{tZ}w) \\ &= \alpha_t(z)\alpha_t(w)e^{-i\Im\langle e^{tZ}z, e^{tZ}w \rangle}W(e^{tZ}(z+w)) \\ &= \exp\left\{\int_0^t \Re\langle e^{sZ}z, Ce^{sZ}w \rangle ds - i\Im\langle e^{tZ}z, e^{tZ}w \rangle\right\}\mathcal{T}_t(W(z+w)),\end{aligned}$$

where we set

$$\alpha_t(z) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \Re\langle e^{sZ}z, Ce^{sZ}z \rangle ds\right).$$

Tracing both sides of the previous equation against  $\rho$  and taking the derivative at  $t = 0$  one gets

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\text{tr}(\rho\mathcal{T}_t(W(z))\mathcal{T}_t(W(w)))\Big|_{t=0} &= (\Re\langle z, Cw \rangle - i\Im\langle Zz, w \rangle - i\Im\langle z, Zw \rangle) \\ &\quad \cdot e^{-i\Im\langle z, w \rangle}\text{tr}(\rho W(z+w)) \\ &= \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{C}_Z \begin{pmatrix} \Re w \\ \Im w \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \text{tr}(\rho W(z)W(w)).\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is due to explicit computations and the invariant property for  $\rho$ , while the second one is due to (3) and (15). Eventually

$$\begin{aligned}\text{tr}(\rho\mathcal{T}_t(R_z(r))^*\mathcal{T}_t(R_w(r))) &= \frac{1}{r^2}\text{tr}(\rho\mathcal{T}_t(W(-rz) - \mathbb{1})\mathcal{T}_t(W(rw) - \mathbb{1})) \\ &= \frac{1}{r^2}\text{tr}(\rho\mathcal{T}_t(W(-rz))\mathcal{T}_t(W(rw))) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{r^2}(-\text{tr}(\rho W(-rz)) - \text{tr}(\rho W(rw)) + \text{tr}(\rho))\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, when taking the derivative at  $t = 0$  only the first summand does not vanish and the result is proven.  $\square$

**Lemma 29.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a gaussian QMS with a faithful gaussian invariant state  $\rho$ . Then for every  $z, w \in \mathbb{C}^d$  it holds*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \left\| \tilde{R}_{z_p, z_q}(r)\rho^{1/2} \right\|_2^2 > 0$$

*Proof.* Note at first that, for  $z, w \in \mathbb{C}^d$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{tr}(\rho R_z(r)^* R_w(r)) &= \frac{1}{r^2}\text{tr}(\rho(W(-rz) - \mathbb{1})(W(rw) - \mathbb{1})) \\ &= \frac{e^{ir^2\Im\langle z, w \rangle}\hat{\rho}(-r(z-w)) - 1}{r^2} - \frac{\hat{\rho}(-rz) - 1}{r^2} - \frac{\hat{\rho}(rw) - 1}{r^2}\end{aligned}$$

and the limit as  $r \rightarrow 0^+$  exists and is finite since the characteristic function of  $\rho$  is differentiable. In particular it holds

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \text{tr}(\rho R_z(r)^* R_w(r)) &= \left( i\Im\langle z, w \rangle - \frac{1}{2}\Re\langle (z-w), S(z-w) \rangle \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\Re\langle z, Sz \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\Re\langle w, Sw \rangle \\ &= \Re\langle z, Sw \rangle + i\Im\langle z, w \rangle = \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \end{bmatrix}, (\mathbf{S} + i\mathbf{J}) \begin{bmatrix} \Re w \\ \Im w \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle\end{aligned}$$

thanks to (15). To conclude that the desired limit exists and is finite it sufficient to note that, using definition (40),

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\tilde{R}_{z_p, z_q}(r)\rho^{1/2}\right\|_2^2 &= \text{tr}\left(\rho\left(\tilde{R}_{z_p, z_q}(r)\right)^*\tilde{R}_{z_p, z_q}(r)\right) \\ &= \text{tr}(\rho R_{z_1}(r)^* R_{z_1}(r)) + \text{tr}(\rho R_{z_2}(r)^* R_{z_2}(r)) \\ &\quad + i \text{tr}(\rho R_{z_1}(r)^* R_{z_2}(r)) - i \text{tr}(\rho R_{z_2}(r)^* R_{z_1}(r))\end{aligned}$$

and taking the limit as  $r \rightarrow 0^+$

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \left\|\tilde{R}_{z_p, z_q}(r)\rho^{1/2}\right\|_2^2 &= \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} \Re z_1 + i \Re z_2 \\ \Im z_1 + i \Im z_2 \end{bmatrix}, (\mathbf{S} + i\mathbf{J}) \begin{bmatrix} \Re z_1 + i \Re z_2 \\ \Im z_1 + i \Im z_2 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} z_p \\ z_q \end{bmatrix}, (\mathbf{S} + i\mathbf{J}) \begin{bmatrix} z_p \\ z_q \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle > 0\end{aligned}$$

Where positivity of the last quantity follows from the fact that  $\mathbf{S} + i\mathbf{J} = \overline{\mathbf{S} - i\mathbf{J}} > 0$ .  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Proposition 22.

*Proof of Proposition 22.* Let  $[z_p, z_q]^T$  be an eigenvector for  $\mathbf{C}_Z$  associated with the eigenvalue 0. For every  $g, r > 0$  consider the function

$$f_{g,r}(t) = \left\|\mathcal{T}_t\left(\tilde{R}_{z_p, z_q}(r)\right)\rho^{1/2}\right\|_2^2 - e^{-2gt} \left\|\tilde{R}_{z_p, z_q}(r)\rho^{1/2}\right\|_2^2$$

Clearly  $f_{g,r}(0) = 0$  and we will show that for every  $g > 0$  there exists  $r_g > 0$  such that  $f'_{g,r_g}(0) > 0$ . In this way, at least for  $t > 0$  small enough,  $f_{g,r_g}(t) > 0$  contradicting the existence of a spectral gap. The derivative at  $t = 0$  of  $f_{g,r}(t)$  is

$$f'_{g,r}(0) = \frac{d}{dt} \left\|\mathcal{T}_t\left(\tilde{R}_{z_p, z_q}(r)\right)\rho^{1/2}\right\|_2^2 \Big|_{t=0} + 2g \left\|\tilde{R}_{z_p, z_q}(r)\rho^{1/2}\right\|_2^2.$$

The first summand can be further expanded using

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\mathcal{T}_t\left(\tilde{R}_{z_p, z_q}(r)\right)\rho^{1/2}\right\|_2^2 &= \text{tr}\left(\rho\mathcal{T}_t(\tilde{R}_{z_p, z_q}(r))^*\mathcal{T}_t(\tilde{R}_{z_p, z_q}(r))\right) \\ &= \text{tr}[\rho\mathcal{T}_t(R_{z_1}(r))^*\mathcal{T}_t(R_{z_1}(r))] + \text{tr}[\rho\mathcal{T}_t(R_{z_2}(r))^*\mathcal{T}_t(R_{z_2}(r))] \\ &\quad + i\text{tr}[\rho\mathcal{T}_t(R_{z_1}(r))^*\mathcal{T}_t(R_{z_2}(r))] - i\text{tr}[\rho\mathcal{T}_t(R_{z_2}(r))^*\mathcal{T}_t(R_{z_1}(r))]\end{aligned}$$

and then taking the derivative at  $t = 0$ , using Lemma 28

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt} \left\|\mathcal{T}_t\left(\tilde{R}_{z_p, z_q}(r)\right)\rho^{1/2}\right\|_2^2 \Big|_{t=0} &= - \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \Re z_1 \\ \Im z_1 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{C}_Z \begin{pmatrix} \Re z_1 \\ \Im z_1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \text{tr}(\rho W(-rz_1)W(rz_1)) \\ &\quad - \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \Re z_2 \\ \Im z_2 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{C}_Z \begin{pmatrix} \Re z_2 \\ \Im z_2 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \text{tr}(\rho W(-rz_2)W(rz_2)) \\ &\quad + i \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \Re z_2 \\ \Im z_2 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{C}_Z \begin{pmatrix} \Re z_1 \\ \Im z_1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \text{tr}(\rho W(-rz_2)W(rz_1)) \\ &\quad - i \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \Re z_1 \\ \Im z_1 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{C}_Z \begin{pmatrix} \Re z_2 \\ \Im z_2 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \text{tr}(\rho W(-rz_1)W(rz_2)).\end{aligned}$$

Letting  $r \rightarrow 0^+$  we get

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{d}{dt} \left\| \mathcal{T}_t \left( \tilde{R}_{z_p, z_q}(r) \right) \rho^{1/2} \right\|_2^2 \Big|_{t=0} = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} z_p \\ z_q \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{C}_Z \begin{pmatrix} z_p \\ z_q \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle = 0.$$

Eventually, using Lemma 29, we get

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} f'_{g,r}(0) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \left\| \tilde{R}_{z_p, z_q}(r) \rho^{1/2} \right\|_2^2 > 0.$$

□

## C Proof of Lemma 23

This appendix contains the proof of Lemma 23. The first part revolves around the computation of the quantity

$$\text{tr}(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} W(z) \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} W(w)),$$

where  $z, w \in \mathbb{C}^d$  and  $\rho = \rho_{(0,S)}$  is a faithful gaussian state. The starting point is to simplify the expression for  $\rho$  as one does for gaussian vectors in classical probability. Let us start by introducing some notation. For  $c \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we denote with  $D_c$  the real linear operator defined by

$$D_c z = \text{diag}(c_1, \dots, c_d) z, \quad \mathbf{D}_c \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} = \text{diag}(c_1, \dots, c_d, c_1, \dots, c_d) \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix}$$

From [29] every faithful gaussian state  $\rho = \rho_{(0,S)}$  has the form

$$\rho = \Gamma(M)^{-1} \prod_j (1 - e^{-s_j}) e^{-\sum_j s_j a_j^\dagger a_j} \Gamma(M),$$

where  $M$  is a symplectic, or Bogoliubov, transformation (i.e.  $M^T J M = J$ ) such that  $M^T D_\sigma M = S$ , having set  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\sigma_j = \coth(s_j/2)$ . Eventually  $\Gamma(M)$  is a unitary operator satisfying

$$\Gamma(M) W(z) \Gamma(M)^{-1} = W(Mz).$$

The previous discussion allows us to have an expression for  $\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}$  that one can work with, explicitly

$$\rho^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \Gamma(M)^{-1} \prod_j (1 - e^{-s_j})^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\sum_j s_j / 2 a_j^\dagger a_j} \Gamma(M). \quad (41)$$

Before moving to the actual calculations let us recall first *exponential vectors* in  $\mathfrak{h}$ . For any  $f \in \mathbb{C}^d$  we have

$$e(f) = e^{\frac{|z|^2}{2}} W(f) e(0, \dots, 0) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d, |\alpha|=n} \frac{f_1^{\alpha_1} \dots f_d^{\alpha_d}}{\alpha_1! \dots \alpha_d!} e(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d).$$

In particular for any  $z \in \mathbb{C}^d$  it holds

$$W(z)e(f) = \exp \left\{ -\frac{|z|^2}{2} - \langle z, f \rangle \right\} e(z + f).$$

Exponential vectors are a total set in  $\mathfrak{h}$  and provide an alternative way to computing traces, as highlighted in the following Lemma, whose proof can be found in [28].

**Lemma 30.** *For  $z = x + iy$*

$$\mathbb{1} = \frac{1}{\pi^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} e^{-|z|^2} |e(z)\rangle \langle e(z)| \, dx dy,$$

also

$$\text{tr}(\rho) = \frac{1}{\pi^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} e^{-|z|^2} \langle e(z), \rho e(z) \rangle \, dx dy$$

We can now start the computations with the following two Lemmas.

**Lemma 31.** *For any  $f, g \in \mathbb{C}^d$  and  $c_1, \dots, c_d \in (0, \infty)$  it holds*

$$\langle e(f), e^{-\sum_j c_j a_j^\dagger a_j} e(g) \rangle = \exp \{ \langle f, e^{-D_c} g \rangle \}.$$

*Proof.* Note at first that, for some fixed index  $j$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-c_j a_j^\dagger a_j} e(f) &= \sum_{m \geq 0} \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{|\alpha|=n} \frac{f_1^{\alpha_1} \dots f_d^{\alpha_d}}{\alpha_1! \dots \alpha_d!} \frac{1}{m!} (-c_j a_j^\dagger a_j)^m e(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \\ &= \sum_{m \geq 0} \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{|\alpha|=n} \frac{f_1^{\alpha_1} \dots f_d^{\alpha_d}}{\alpha_1! \dots \alpha_d!} \frac{1}{m!} (-c_j \alpha_j)^m e(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \\ &= \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{|\alpha|=n} \frac{f_1^{\alpha_1} \dots f_d^{\alpha_d}}{\alpha_1! \dots \alpha_d!} e^{-c_j \alpha_j} e(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \\ &= \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{|\alpha|=n} \frac{f_1^{\alpha_1} \dots (e^{-c_j} f_j)^{\alpha_j} \dots f_d^{\alpha_d}}{\alpha_1! \dots \alpha_d!} e(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \\ &= e(\text{diag}(1, \dots, 1, e^{-c_j}, 1, \dots, 1) f). \end{aligned}$$

In this way

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e(f), e^{\sum_j -c_j a_j^\dagger a_j} e(g) \rangle &= \left\langle e(f), \prod_j \left( e^{-c_j a_j^\dagger a_j} \right) e(g) \right\rangle \\ &= \langle e(f), e(e^{-D_c} g) \rangle = \exp \{ \langle f, e^{-D_c} g \rangle \}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 32.** *Let  $f, g, z, w \in \mathbb{C}^d$  and  $c_1, \dots, c_d \in (0, +\infty)$  it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e(f), W(z) e^{-\sum_j c_j a_j^\dagger a_j} W(w) e(g) \rangle &= \exp \left\{ -\frac{|z|^2 + |w|^2}{2} - \langle z, e^{-D_c} w \rangle + \langle f, e^{-D_c} g \rangle \right\} \\ &\quad \exp \{ \langle f, z + e^{-D_c} w \rangle - \langle w + e^{-D_c} z, g \rangle \} \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle e(f), W(z)e^{-\sum_j c_j a_j^\dagger a_j} W(w)e(g) \right\rangle &= \left\langle W(-z)e(f), e^{-\sum_j c_j a_j^\dagger a_j} W(w)e(g) \right\rangle \\ &= e^{-\frac{|z|^2}{2} + \langle f, z \rangle} e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{2} - \langle w, g \rangle} \\ &\quad \cdot \left\langle e(f-z), e^{-\sum_j c_j a_j^\dagger a_j} e(g+w) \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Now using Lemma 31 and rearranging the terms we get the desired result.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove the formula

**Proposition 33.** *For  $z, w \in \mathbb{C}^d$  it holds*

$$\text{tr}(\rho^{1/2} W(z) \rho^{1/2} W(w)) = \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \Re \langle z, Sz \rangle + \Re \langle w, Sw \rangle + 2\Re \langle z, \check{S}w \rangle \right) \right\}$$

with  $\check{S} = M^T D_\xi M$ ,  $\xi_j = \text{csch}(s_j/2)$  and  $M$  coming from (41).

*Proof.* We start by noticing that using expression (41), the commutation rule for Weyl operators, the cyclic property of the trace and Lemma 30 we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} W(z) \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} W(w)) &= \prod_j (1 - e^{-s_j}) \text{tr} \left( e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_j s_j a_j^\dagger a_j} W(Mz) e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_j s_j a_j^\dagger a_j} W(Mw) \right) \\ &= \frac{\prod_j (1 - e^{-s_j})}{\pi^{2d}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4d}} e^{-(|f|^2 + |g|^2)} \left\langle e(f), W\left(\frac{Mw}{2}\right) e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_j s_j a_j^\dagger a_j} W\left(\frac{Mz}{2}\right) e(g) \right\rangle \\ &\quad \cdot \left\langle e(g), W\left(\frac{Mz}{2}\right) e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_j s_j a_j^\dagger a_j} W\left(\frac{Mw}{2}\right) e(f) \right\rangle df dg \end{aligned}$$

Eventually, using Lemma 32, we obtain that

$$\text{tr}(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} W(z) \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} W(w)) = \frac{\prod_j (1 - e^{-s_j})}{\pi^{2d}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4d}} e^{\alpha_{(Mz, Mw)}(f, g)} df dg,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{(z, w)}(f, g) &= \exp \left\{ -\frac{|z|^2 + |w|^2}{4} - \frac{1}{2} \Re \langle z, e^{-\frac{1}{2} D_s} w \rangle \right\} \\ &\quad \exp \left\{ -|f|^2 - |g|^2 + 2\Re \langle f, e^{-\frac{1}{2} D_s} g \rangle \right\} \\ &\quad \cdot \exp \left\{ i\Im \langle f, w + e^{-\frac{1}{2} D_s} z \rangle + i\Im \langle g, z + e^{-\frac{1}{2} D_s} w \rangle \right\} \end{aligned}$$

We can rewrite the previous expression in matrix form in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{(z,w)}(f,g) = & \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{4} \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \\ \Re w \\ \Im w \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} & e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s} \\ e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s} & \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \\ \Re w \\ \Im w \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \right\} \\ & \exp \left\{ -\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \Re f \\ \Im f \\ \Re g \\ \Im g \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} & -e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s} \\ -e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s} & \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Re f \\ \Im f \\ \Re g \\ \Im g \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \right\} \\ & \cdot \exp \left\{ i \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s}\mathbf{J} & \mathbf{J} \\ \mathbf{J} & e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s}\mathbf{J} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \\ \Re w \\ \Im w \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \Re f \\ \Im f \\ \Re g \\ \Im g \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Recall now for  $x, b \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$  we have the formula for the gaussian integral

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\langle x, Ax \rangle + i\langle b, x \rangle} dx = \sqrt{\frac{(2\pi)^n}{\det A}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \langle b, A^{-1}b \rangle \right\}.$$

We want to use it with

$$A = 2 \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} & -e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s} \\ -e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s} & \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad b = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s}\mathbf{J} & \mathbf{J} \\ \mathbf{J} & e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s}\mathbf{J} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \\ \Re w \\ \Im w \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that, by rearranging rows and columns of  $A$  we get

$$\frac{1}{2}A = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & & & \\ & A_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & A_d \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_j = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & -e^{-\frac{s_j}{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -e^{-\frac{s_j}{2}} \\ -e^{-\frac{s_j}{2}} & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -e^{-\frac{s_j}{2}} & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and for each block we can easily compute  $\det A_j = (1 - e^{-s_j})^2$  while

$$A_j^{-1} = \frac{1}{1 - e^{-s_j}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & e^{-\frac{s_j}{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & e^{-\frac{s_j}{2}} \\ e^{-\frac{s_j}{2}} & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-\frac{s_j}{2}} & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In particular  $\det A = 2^{4d} \prod_j (1 - e^{-s_j})^2$  and rearranging rows and columns to the initial configuration we obtain

$$A^{-1} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} & e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s} \\ e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s} & \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} - e^{-\mathbf{D}_s} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{1} - e^{-\mathbf{D}_s} \end{pmatrix}^{-1}.$$

Therefore we have proved

$$\mathrm{tr}(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}W(z)\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}W(w)) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(Mz,Mw)}$$



with

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta(z, w) &= \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s}\mathbf{J} & \mathbf{J} \\ \mathbf{J} & e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s}\mathbf{J} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \\ \Re w \\ \Im w \end{pmatrix}, A^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s}\mathbf{J} & \mathbf{J} \\ \mathbf{J} & e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s}\mathbf{J} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \\ \Re w \\ \Im w \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \\ \Re w \\ \Im w \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} & e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s} \\ e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s} & \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \\ \Re w \\ \Im w \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \\ \Re w \\ \Im w \end{pmatrix}, B \begin{pmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \\ \Re w \\ \Im w \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \\ \Re w \\ \Im w \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} & e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s} \\ e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s} & \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \\ \Re w \\ \Im w \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

where we set

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s}\mathbf{J} & \mathbf{J} \\ \mathbf{J} & e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s}\mathbf{J} \end{pmatrix}^* A^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s}\mathbf{J} & \mathbf{J} \\ \mathbf{J} & e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s}\mathbf{J} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now note that every matrix that appears as a block in the previous expression commutes with the others (e.g.  $\mathbf{J}$  with  $e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s}$  or  $e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s}$  with  $(\mathbb{1} - e^{-\mathbf{D}_s})^{-1}$ ). This observation, alongside the explicit expression we obtained for  $A^{-1}$  leads to

$$B = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} + 3e^{-\mathbf{D}_s} & e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s}(3\mathbb{1} + e^{-\mathbf{D}_s}) \\ e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s}(3\mathbb{1} + e^{-\mathbf{D}_s}) & \mathbb{1} + 3e^{-\mathbf{D}_s} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} - e^{-\mathbf{D}_s} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{1} - e^{-\mathbf{D}_s} \end{pmatrix}^{-1}.$$

Putting it all back together we obtain

$$\beta(z, w) = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \\ \Re w \\ \Im w \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} + e^{-\mathbf{D}_s} & 2e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s} \\ 2e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}_s} & \mathbb{1} + e^{-\mathbf{D}_s} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} - e^{-\mathbf{D}_s} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{1} - e^{-\mathbf{D}_s} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \\ \Re w \\ \Im w \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle.$$

Performing the final calculation we obtain

$$\beta(z, w) = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \\ \Re w \\ \Im w \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{D}_\sigma & \mathbf{D}_\xi \\ \mathbf{D}_\xi & \mathbf{D}_\sigma \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Re z \\ \Im z \\ \Re w \\ \Im w \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle = \Re \langle z, D_\sigma z \rangle + \Re \langle w, D_\sigma w \rangle + 2\Re \langle z, D_\xi w \rangle$$

where  $\xi_j = \text{csch}(s_j/2)$ , ending the proof.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Lemma 23 following the same lines of Lemma 11 but using the new formula for the trace.

*Proof of Lemma 23.* Using (35) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T_t(\check{x})\|^2 &= \sum_{j,k} \bar{\eta}_j \eta_k \left[ \text{tr}(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{T}_t(W(-z_j)) \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{T}_t(W(z_k))) - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Re \langle z_j, Sz_j \rangle - \frac{1}{2}\Re \langle z_k, Sz_k \rangle} \right] \\
&= \sum_{j,k} \bar{\eta}_j \eta_k \left[ c_t(z_j) c_t(z_k) \text{tr}(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} W(-e^{tZ} z_j) \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} W(e^{tZ} z_k)) - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Re \langle z_j, Sz_j \rangle - \frac{1}{2}\Re \langle z_k, Sz_k \rangle} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

where  $c_t(z_j), c_t(z_k)$  are defined as in (32). Recalling that

$$\Re \langle e^{tZ} z, S e^{tZ} z \rangle = \int_t^\infty \Re \langle e^{sZ} z, C e^{sZ} z \rangle ds$$

we obtain

$$c_t(z_j) c_t(z_k) \operatorname{tr}(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} W(-e^{tZ} z_j) \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} W(e^{tZ} z_k)) = e^{-\frac{1}{2} \Re \langle z_j, S z_j \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \Re \langle z_k, S z_k \rangle} e^{\Re \langle e^{tZ} z_j, \check{S} e^{tZ} z_k \rangle}.$$

Therefore we get

$$\|T_t(\check{x})\|^2 = \sum_{j,k} \bar{\xi}_j \xi_k \left[ e^{\Re \langle e^{tZ} z_j, \check{S} e^{tZ} z_k \rangle} - 1 \right].$$

The remaining part of the Lemma follows immediately.  $\square$

## References

- [1] J. Agredo, F. Fagnola and D. Poletti, Gaussian QMSs on a One-Mode Fock Space: Irreducibility and Normal Invariant States. *Open Sys. Information Dyn.* **28** no. 01, 2150001 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1142/S1230161221500013>
- [2] J. Agredo, F. Fagnola and D. Poletti, The decoherence-free subalgebra of Gaussian QMSs. *Milan J. Math.* **90** 257–289 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00032-022-00355-0>  
<https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.13781>
- [3] J. Agredo, F. Fagnola and D. Poletti, The Kossakowski Matrix and Strict Positivity of Markovian Quantum Dynamics. *Open Sys. Information Dyn.* **29** 2250005 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1142/S1230161222500056>
- [4] A. Arnold, E. Carlen and Q. Ju, Large-time Behavior of Non-symmetric Fokker-Planck Type Equations *Communications on Stochastic Analysis* **2**, No. 1 (2008) 153–175. <https://repository.lsu.edu/cosa/vol2/iss1/11>
- [5] A. Arnold and B. Signorello, Optimal non-symmetric Fokker-Planck equation for the convergence to a given equilibrium. *Kinet. Relat. Models*, **15** (5), 753–773 (2022). <https://www.aims sciences.org/article/doi/10.3934/krm.2022009>
- [6] R. Bellman, *Introduction to Matrix Analysis*, McGraw-Hill, New York 1960.
- [7] O. Bratteli and D. W. Robinson, *Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics II*, Springer Berlin 1981.
- [8] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems*. Oxford University Press. (2007).
- [9] R. Carbone and F. Fagnola, Exponential  $L_2$ -convergence of quantum Markov semigroups on  $B(h)$ , *Math. Notes* **68** (2000), 452–463. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02676724>
- [10] R. Carbone and E. Sasso, Hypercontractivity for a quantum Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup, *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **140** 505–522 (2008) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-007-0073-2>
- [11] E. A. Carlen and J. Maas, Gradient flow and entropy inequalities for quantum Markov semigroups with detailed balance, *J. Funct. Anal.* **273** 5 (2017), 1810–1869. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2017.05.003>
- [12] A. Chojnowska-Michalik, B. Goldys, Symmetric Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups and their generators. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **124**, 459–486 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s004400200222>

- [13] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk, *Ergodicity for Infinite Dimensional Systems*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- [14] F. Cipriani, F. Fagnola and J. Lindsay, Spectral Analysis and Feller Property for Quantum Ornstein Uhlenbeck Semigroups. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **210**, 85–105 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002200050773>
- [15] B. Demoen, P. Vanheuverzwijn and A. Verbeure, Completely positive maps on the CCR-algebra, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **2** (2) (1977) 161–166, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00398582>
- [16] F. Fagnola, F. Boson Quadratic GKLS Generators. In: Correggi, M., Falconi, M. (eds) *Quantum Mathematics II*. INdAM 2022. Springer INdAM Series, vol. 58 (2023). Springer, Singapore. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-5884-9\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-5884-9_6)
- [17] F. Fagnola and D. Poletti, On irreducibility of Gaussian quantum Markov semigroups, *Infin. Dim. Anal. Quantum Prob. Rel. Topics* **25** No. 04, 2240001 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1142/S021902572240001X>
- [18] F. Fagnola and D. Poletti, A note on invariant states of Gaussian quantum Markov semigroups. *Infin. Dim. Anal. Quantum Prob. Rel. Topics* **27** (2024). To appear.
- [19] F. Fagnola and R. Quezada, A characterization of quantum Markov semigroups of weak coupling limit type. *Infin. Dim. Anal. Quantum Prob. Rel. Topics* **22**, No. 02, 1950008 (2019) <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219025719500085>
- [20] F. Fagnola and V. Umanità, Generators of KMS Symmetric Markov Semigroups on  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h})$  Symmetry and Quantum Detailed Balance. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **298**, 523–547 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-010-1011-1>
- [21] V.P. Flynn, E. Cobanera and L. Viola, Topological zero modes and edge symmetries of metastable Markovian bosonic systems. *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 214312 (2023) <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.108.214312>
- [22] A. Frigerio, Quantum dynamical semigroups and approach to equilibrium, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **2** (1977) 79–87. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00398571>
- [23] F. Girotti, M. Van Horssen, R. Carbone and M. Guta, Large deviations, central limit, and dynamical phase transitions in the atom maser *J. Math. Phys.* **63** (6), 062202 (2022)
- [24] T. Linowski, A.E. Teretenkov and L. Rudnicki, Dissipative evolution of quantum Gaussian states, *Phys Rev A* **106** (5) 052206 (2022) <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.106.052206>
- [25] A. Lunardi, G. Metafune, D. Pallara, The Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup in finite dimension. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A* **378** 20200217 (2020). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2020.0217>
- [26] M. Ottobre, G.A. Pavliotis, K. Pravda-Starov, Some remarks on degenerate hypoelliptic Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operators. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **429** (2015) 676–712. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmaa.2015.04.019>
- [27] K. R. Parthasarathy, *An introduction to quantum stochastic calculus*, *Monographs in Mathematics* 85, Birkhäuser-Verlag, Basel 1992.
- [28] K.R. Parthasarathy, What is a gaussian state, *Commun. Stoch. Anal.* **4**, No. 02, (2010) 143–160. <https://repository.lsu.edu/cosa/vol4/iss2/2>
- [29] K.R. Parthasarathy, The symmetry group of gaussian states in  $l^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , in Prokhorov and Contemporary Probability Theory, A. N. Shiryaev, S. R. S. Varadhan, and E. L. Presman, eds., Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 349–369.
- [30] D. Poletti, Characterization of Gaussian quantum Markov semigroups. *Infin. Dim. Anal. Quantum Prob. Rel. Topics* **25**, No. 03, 2250014 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1142/S021902572250014X>

- [31] M. Reed, B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics*, II Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness, Academic Press 1975.
- [32] A.E. Teretenkov, Irreversible quantum evolution with quadratic generator. *Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top.* **22** (4), 1930001 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219025719300019>.
- [33] P. Vanheuverzwijn, Generators for quasi-free completely positive semi-groups. *Annales de l'I.H.P. Physique théorique*, **29** (1) (1978) 123–138.
- [34] M. Vernooij and M. Wirth, Derivations and KMS-Symmetric Quantum Markov Semigroups. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **403** 381–416 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-023-04795-6>
- [35] M. Wirth and H. Zhang, Curvature-Dimension Conditions for Symmetric Quantum Markov Semigroups. *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **24**, 717–750 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00023-022-01220-x>

Authors' addresses:

- <sup>(1)</sup> Mathematics Department, Politecnico di Milano, Piazza Leonardo da Vinci 32, I - 20133 Milano, Italy [franco.fagnola@polimi.it](mailto:franco.fagnola@polimi.it)
- <sup>(2)</sup> Mathematics Department, University of Genova, Via Dodecaneso, I - 16146 Genova, Italy