Precision Enhancement via Symmetry Breaking in Quantum Markov Process

Yoshihiko Hasegawa*

Department of Information and Communication Engineering, Graduate School of Information Science and Technology, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan (Dated: January 19, 2021)

Symmetry breaking with respect to the time reversal characterizes entropy production. This viewpoint induces us to regard thermodynamic uncertainty relation (TUR), stating that higher precision can be achieved at the cost of higher entropy production, as a relation between precision and the extent of symmetry breaking. In this Letter, we formalize a TUR as symmetry breaking in quantum Markov processes, where the extent of symmetry breaking constitutes the thermodynamic cost. We derive a TUR for quantum continuous measurement, which holds for any conceivable continuous measurement. We demonstrate that counting- and current-type TURs can be obtained as particular cases of the obtained bound.

Introduction.—Symmetry plays fundamental roles in physics. The Noether theorem states that, when there are symmetries, corresponding conserved currents exist, leading to the momentum and energy conservation laws [1]. Symmetries impose constraints on correlation functions through the Ward-Takahashi identity [1]. The Ward-Takahashi identity has been a principal relation in quantum field theory, and it has been reported that even thermodynamic relations, such as fluctuation-dissipation relation, fluctuation theorem [2], and Jarzynski equality [3], can be derived from it [4–6].

Thermodynamic uncertainty relation (TUR) [7–22] (see [23] for a review) provides the universal relation between precision and thermodynamic cost. In the simplest form, it states $[\![j]\!]^2/\langle j \rangle^2 \leq 2/\langle \sigma \rangle$, where $\langle j \rangle$ and $[\![j]\!]$ are mean and standard deviation, respectively, of a current observable j, and $\langle \sigma \rangle$ is the mean entropy production. TUR implies that higher precision can be achieved at the cost of higher entropy production. The entropy production can be defined through the extent of symmetry breaking under time reversal. Let $\mathcal{P}_F(\Gamma)$ be path probability to observe a trajectory Γ in the forward process, and $\mathcal{P}_R(\overline{\Gamma})$ be that to observe a time-reversed trajectory $\overline{\Gamma}$. Then the entropy production is defined by

$$\sigma = \ln \frac{\mathcal{P}_F(\Gamma)}{\mathcal{P}_R(\overline{\Gamma})}.$$
 (1)

This relation provides a viewpoint that TUR is a consequence of symmetry breaking of the system, that is, the larger the extent of symmetry breaking under the transformation is, the higher the precision of thermodynamic machines becomes. Indeed, many classical TURs have been concerned with symmetry breaking of the dynamics. References [17, 24] derived TUR via a joint fluctuation theorem with respect to the entropy production and observable, which reflect their asymmetry under time reversal. TUR was derived via an isometric fluctuation theorem [25], which is related to the rotational symmetry breaking of the system. Reference [26] obtained a lower bound for the Kullback-Leibler divergence between two dynamics quantifying their asymmetry, leading to the unification of TUR and the classical speed limit [27]. Recently, a continuous time-reversal transformation was considered in TUR [28], which is a continuous extension of discrete time-reversal transformation.

Although the relation between the extent of symmetry breaking and precision has been studied in classical Markov processes, it is difficult to consider it in quantum Markov processes. One reason for the difficulty is that it is intricate to define the path integral, which quantifies the classical asymmetry between two dynamics, in quantum Markov processes. In the present Letter, we evaluate the extent of symmetry breaking of quantum Markov processes through quantum fidelity. We consider a composite system comprising the principal system and the environment, where measurement is applied to the environment. This measurement induces jumps in the principal system, which is responsible for the stochasticity of quantum Markov processes. The fidelity is calculated between two composite systems of the original dynamics and its transformed dynamics (conjugate dynamics). Using the fidelity, we obtain a quantum TUR whose lower bound comprises the extent of symmetry breaking between the two dynamics, stating that the precision of quantum continuous measurement can be enhanced when the extent of symmetry breaking increases. Notably, our relation holds for any continuous measurement, which has not been realized in the previous quantum TURs [29–38]. Considering specific transformations, we demonstrate that counting- and current-type TURs, as derived in classical Markov processes, can be obtained as particular cases of the main result.

Results.—We consider a quantum Markov process described by a Lindblad equation. Let $\rho(t)$ be a density operator at time t. In the Lindblad equation, the time evolution of $\rho(t)$ is governed by

$$\dot{\rho} = \mathcal{L}\rho \equiv -i\left[H,\rho\right] + \sum_{m=1}^{M} \mathcal{D}(\rho, L_m), \qquad (2)$$

where \mathcal{L} is a Lindblad super-operator, H is a Hamil-



FIG. 1. Input-output formalism of continuous measurement. Within $[t_k, t_{k+1}]$, the principal system S interact with the environment E through a unitary operator U_{t_k} . After the interaction, the measurement is performed on E.



FIG. 2. Quantum trajectories generated by measurement bases of (a) $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ and (b) $\{|-\rangle, |+\rangle\}$, where $|\pm\rangle \equiv (|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. ρ_{ee} is the population of the excited state in a two-level atom driven by laser field.

tonian, $\mathcal{D}(\rho, L) \equiv [L\rho L^{\dagger} - \{L^{\dagger}L, \rho\}/2]$ is a dissipator, and L_m $(1 \leq m \leq M)$ is an *m*th jump operator ([\bullet, \bullet] and { \bullet, \bullet } denote the commutator and anticommutator, respectively). Here we are considering M jump operators. For sufficiently small time interval Δt , the Lindblad equation of Eq. (2) admits the Kraus representation $\rho(t + \Delta t) = \sum_{m=0}^{M} V_m \rho(t) V_m^{\dagger}$, where

$$V_0 \equiv \mathbb{I}_S - i\Delta t H - \frac{1}{2}\Delta t \sum_{m=1}^M L_m^{\dagger} L_m, \qquad (3)$$

$$V_m \equiv \sqrt{\Delta t} L_m \quad (1 \le m \le M). \tag{4}$$

 V_0 corresponds to no jump and V_m $(m \ge 1)$ to *m*th jump within the interval $[t, t+\Delta t]$, and V_m satisfies a completeness relation $\sum_{m=0}^{M} V_m^{\dagger} V_m = \mathbb{I}_S$. As discussed later, V_m defined in Eqs. (3) and (4) are not only operators that are consistent with Eq. (2). There are infinitely many operators that can induce the same time evolution.

Using the input-output formalism [39–42], we describe the time evolution generated by the Kraus operators (3) and (4) as interactions between the principal system Sand the environment E (Fig. 1). Let t = 0 and $t = \tau$ be the initial and the final time, respectively, of the time evolution. We discretize the time interval $[0, \tau]$ by dividing it into N intervals, where N is a sufficiently large number, and we define $\Delta t \equiv \tau/N$ and $t_k \equiv \Delta tk$ ($t_0 = 0$ and $t_N = \tau$). Here, the orthonormal basis of E is assumed to be $|m_{N-1}, ..., m_1, m_0\rangle$ ($m_k \in \{0, 1, ..., M-1, M\}$), where a subspace $|m_k\rangle$ interacts with S via a unitary operator U_{t_k} during an interval $[t_k, t_{k+1}]$ (Fig. 1). When the initial states of S and E are $|\psi\rangle$ and $|0_{N-1}, ..., 0_1, 0_0\rangle$, respectively, the composite state at $t = \tau$ is

$$|\Psi(\tau)\rangle = U_{t_{N-1}} \cdots U_{t_0} |\psi\rangle \otimes |0_{N-1}, \cdots, 0_0\rangle$$

=
$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}} V_{m_{N-1}} \cdots V_{m_0} |\psi\rangle \otimes |m_{N-1}, \cdots, m_0\rangle,$$
(5)

where $V_{m_k} = \langle m_k | U_{t_k} | 0_k \rangle$ is an action on S, which is associated with the transition from $|0_k\rangle$ to $|m_k\rangle$ in E. If we calculate $\operatorname{Tr}_E[|\Psi(\tau)\rangle \langle \Psi(\tau)|]$ for $\Delta t \to 0$, we recover the original Lindblad equation of Eq. (2).

Continuous measurement of the principal system via the environment at each time interval corresponds to measuring the environment at the final time (Fig. 1). When we measure the environment at $t = \tau$ with projectors $\{\Pi(\boldsymbol{m}) = |\boldsymbol{m}\rangle \langle \boldsymbol{m}|\}$ with $\boldsymbol{m} \equiv [m_{N-1}, ..., m_1, m_0]$, we observe a realization of \boldsymbol{m} and the principal system becomes $V_{m_{N-1}} \cdots V_{m_0} |\psi\rangle$ (note that this state is unnormalized). Therefore, \boldsymbol{m} constitutes a measurement record of the continuous measurement. Because the evolution of $V_{m_{N-1}} \cdots V_{m_0} |\psi\rangle$ is stochastic, it is referred to as a quantum trajectory (Fig. 2(a) shows an example of quantum trajectories). We next consider an Hermitian measurement operator \mathcal{G} on E, which admits the following eigendecomposition:

$$\mathcal{G} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{m}} g(\boldsymbol{m}) \Pi(\boldsymbol{m}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{m}} g(\boldsymbol{m}) |\boldsymbol{m}\rangle \langle \boldsymbol{m}|.$$
 (6)

In classical stochastic thermodynamics, a typical observable is a counting observable that counts the number of jumps (transitions). In a quantum Markov process, suppose that we wish to count the number of jumps in a quantum trajectory. If we define $g(\boldsymbol{m})$ so that it counts and weights jumps in \boldsymbol{m} , we can define a counting observable in quantum Markov processes. Specifically, we may use

$$g(\boldsymbol{m}) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} C_{m_k},\tag{7}$$

where $C \equiv [0, a_1, ..., a_M]$ $(a_i \in \mathbb{R})$ is a projection vector specifying the weight of each jump. For instance, if M = 1, an example of the measurement record is something like $\boldsymbol{m} = [0, 0, 1, 0, \cdots, 0, 1, 0, 0]$ where 1s denote detection of jumps. When $C = [0, 1], g(\boldsymbol{m})$ simply counts the number of jumps in \boldsymbol{m} and $\langle \Psi(\tau) | \mathcal{G} | \Psi(\tau) \rangle$ yields the average number of jumps. We can employ a different basis other than $\{|\boldsymbol{m}\rangle\}$ in Eq. (6), which will be discussed later.

We next consider a conjugate dynamics, which is a transformation of the original dynamics. When we consider a time-reversal transformation, the conjugate dynamics corresponds to the time-reversed dynamics, as often considered in classical Markov processes [43]. Let H_{\star} and $L_{\star,m}$ be the Hamiltonian and the jump operator of the conjugate dynamics. Note that, throughout this

Letter, we use \star for quantities in the conjugate dynamics. Then $V_{\star,m}$, the Kraus operators of the conjugate dynamics, can be defined through Eqs. (3) and (4), where H and L_m should be replaced with H_{\star} and $L_{\star,m}$, respectively. Similar to Eq. (5), the composite state of the conjugate dynamics at $t = \tau$ is

$$|\Psi_{\star}(\tau)\rangle = \sum_{\boldsymbol{m}} V_{\star,m_{N-1}} \cdots V_{\star,m_0} |\psi\rangle \otimes |m_{N-1}, \cdots, m_0\rangle.$$
(8)

In order to quantify the extent of symmetry breaking of the conjugate dynamics [Eq. (8)] with respect to the original dynamics [Eq. (5)], we consider the fidelity $\langle \Psi_{\star}(\tau)|\Psi(\tau)\rangle$. We define the symmetry breaking measure χ as follows:

$$\chi \equiv 1 - \left| \left\langle \Psi_{\star}(\tau) | \Psi(\tau) \right\rangle \right|^2. \tag{9}$$

Here, $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ and $\chi = 0$ ($\chi = 1$) means that two dynamics are symmetric (asymmetric). Calculation of the fidelity $\langle \Psi_{\star}(\tau) | \Psi(\tau) \rangle$ appears to be a formidable task because the composite state $[|\Psi(\tau)\rangle$ or $|\Psi_{\star}(\tau)\rangle]$, comprising the principal system and the environment, is not accessible in general. However, for continuous measurement, the fidelity can be computed explicitly after Refs. [40, 44]. Notice that $\langle \Psi_{\star} | \Psi \rangle = \text{Tr}_{SE} [|\Psi\rangle \langle \Psi_{\star}|] = \text{Tr}_{S} [\phi]$ where $\phi(t) \equiv \text{Tr}_{E}[|\Psi(t)\rangle \langle \Psi_{\star}(t)|]$. Therefore, by using Eqs. (5) and (8), ϕ satisfies a two-sided Lindblad equation [40, 44]:

$$\dot{\phi} = \mathcal{K}\phi \equiv -iH\phi + i\phi H_{\star} + \sum_{m} L_{m}\phi L_{\star,m}^{\dagger}$$
$$-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{m} [L_{m}^{\dagger}L_{m}\phi + \phi L_{\star,m}^{\dagger}L_{\star,m}], \qquad (10)$$

where \mathcal{K} is a super-operator. Note that ϕ does not preserve the trace, that is, $\operatorname{Tr}_S[\phi(t)] \neq 1$ in general. By solving Eq. (10), the solution is $\phi(\tau) = e^{\mathcal{K}\tau}\rho(0)$ where $\rho(0) = |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|$ is the initial density operator of the Lindblad dynamics. Since \mathcal{K} is a super-operator, evaluation of $e^{\mathcal{K}\tau}$ may require calculation in the Liouville space. Using \mathcal{K}, χ is expressed by

$$\chi = 1 - \left| \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left[e^{\mathcal{K}\tau} \rho(0) \right] \right|^{2}.$$
(11)

Importantly, χ of Eq. (11) can be specified by quantities of the principal system alone (i.e., H, L_m , H_{\star} , and $L_{\star,m}$). We do not require information about the environment, which is not accessible in general. Calculations above assumed an initially pure state; however, generalization to an initially mixed state case is straightforward [45].

We next relate the precision of continuous measurement with the symmetry breaking measure χ . Let \mathcal{F} be a general Hermitian measurement operator on E. \mathcal{F} admits the eigendecomposition $\mathcal{F} = \sum_k f(k)\Lambda(k)$, where f(k) and $\Lambda(k)$ are an eigenvalue and its corresponding projector, respectively. Note that \mathcal{F} includes \mathcal{G} of Eq. (6) as a particular case and thus $\Lambda(k)$ is not necessarily identical to $\Pi(\mathbf{m})$ in Eq. (6). By using the projector $\Lambda(k)$ in Eq. (6), the fidelity is known to be bounded from above by

$$\begin{split} |\langle \Psi_{\star} | \Psi \rangle| &\leq \sum_{k} |\langle \Psi_{\star} | \Lambda(k) | \Psi \rangle| \\ &\leq \sum_{k} \sqrt{\langle \Psi_{\star} | \Lambda(k) | \Psi_{\star} \rangle} \sqrt{\langle \Psi | \Lambda(k) | \Psi \rangle} \\ &= 1 - \mathcal{H}^{2}(P, P_{\star}). \end{split}$$
(12)

where $P(k) \equiv \langle \Psi | \Lambda(k) | \Psi \rangle$, $P_{\star}(k) \equiv \langle \Psi_{\star} | \Lambda(k) | \Psi_{\star} \rangle$, and $\mathcal{H}^2(\bullet, \bullet)$ is the Hellinger distance. P(k) denotes the probability of measuring k when we measure $|\Psi\rangle$ with the projector $\Lambda(k)$ ($P_{\star}(k)$ is defined in a similar way). Given two distributions P(k) and Q(k), the Hellinger distance is defined by

$$\mathcal{H}^2(P,Q) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \left(\sqrt{P(k)} - \sqrt{Q(k)}\right)^2, \quad (13)$$

where $0 \leq \mathcal{H}^2(P,Q) \leq 1$. The Hellinger distance quantifies the similarity of two distributions. The Hellinger distance has a lower bound given mean and variance [46, 47]. In particular, we use a tighter lower bound recently derived in Ref. [48]:

$$\mathcal{H}^2(P,Q) \ge 1 - \left(\frac{\left(\langle f \rangle_P - \langle f \rangle_Q\right)^2}{\left(\llbracket f \rrbracket_P + \llbracket f \rrbracket_Q\right)^2} + 1\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \qquad (14)$$

where $\langle f \rangle_P \equiv \sum_k f(k)P(k)$ and $\llbracket f \rrbracket_Q \equiv \sqrt{\langle f^2 \rangle_Q - \langle f \rangle_Q^2}$ stand for mean standard deviation, respectively. Substituting Eq. (14) to Eq. (12), we obtain

$$\left(\frac{\llbracket \mathcal{F} \rrbracket + \llbracket \mathcal{F} \rrbracket_{\star}}{\langle \mathcal{F} \rangle - \langle \mathcal{F} \rangle_{\star}}\right)^2 \ge \frac{1}{\chi} - 1, \tag{15}$$

which is the main result of this Letter. Because \mathcal{G} in Eq. (6) is a subset of \mathcal{F} , \mathcal{G} should satisfy Eq. (15) as well. Equation (15) shows that the precision is bounded from below by the symmetry breaking measure χ . When the system becomes more asymmetric with respect to the transformation, the precision can be improved. Because $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$, the right-hand side of Eq. (15) is always non-negative. If we employ a lower bound of the Hellinger distance in Refs. [46, 47], we obtain a different bound $\frac{2\sqrt{1-\chi}-1}{4(1-\sqrt{1-\chi})} \leq \frac{\|\mathcal{F}\|^2 + \|\mathcal{F}\|_*^2}{(\langle \mathcal{F} \rangle - \langle \mathcal{F} \rangle_*)^2}.$

It is known that the Kraus operator V_m in Eqs. (3) and (4) are not unique. Let \mathcal{B} be a unitary matrix. Any Kraus operator Y_m defined by

$$Y_n = \sum_m \mathcal{B}_{nm} V_m, \tag{16}$$

yields the same time evolution as V_m , that is, $\sum_m V_m \rho V_m^{\dagger} = \sum_m Y_m \rho Y_m^{\dagger}$. A different Kraus operator corresponds to a different measurement on the environment *E*. The Kraus operator of Eqs. (3) and (4) corresponds to the measurement with basis $|m\rangle$ for each subspace of the environment. Let us consider a different basis $|\alpha\rangle$ representing a basis different from $|m\rangle$. $|\alpha\rangle$ is related to $|m\rangle$ via

$$\left|\alpha\right\rangle = \sum_{m} \mathcal{A}_{m\alpha} \left|m\right\rangle, \qquad (17)$$

where \mathcal{A} is a unitary operator. A direct calculation shows that the unitary operator \mathcal{A} satisfies $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}^{\dagger}$, indicating that the unitary freedom in the Kraus operator corresponds to that in the measurement basis. Figure 2shows trajectories generated by measurement bases of (a) $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ and (b) $\{|-\rangle, |+\rangle\}$, where $|\pm\rangle \equiv (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. Although trajectories of (a) and (b) are very different, both cases reduce to the same dynamics on average. Because the two-sided Lindblad equation is invariant under the unitary transformation on the environmental basis [40], the symmetry breaking measure χ given by Eq. (11) is invariant as well. Therefore, Eq. (15) should hold for any measurement on the environment, that is, any continuous measurement. This measurement independence is a notable advantage of Eq. (15) because most of the previous quantum TURs depend on the type of continuous measurement. Reference [35] obtained a unified TUR valid for any continuous measurement, but it still requires a scaling condition which cannot be satisfied generally in continuous measurement.

Empty dynamics.—There are several conjugate dynamics leading Eq. (15) to meaningful thermodynamic bounds. We first consider a simple case that the conjugate dynamics is an empty dynamics, that is, $H_{\star} = 0$ and $L_{\star,m} = 0$. In this case, the composite state of the conjugate dynamics at $t = \tau$ is $|\Psi_{\star}(\tau)\rangle = |\psi\rangle \otimes |0_{N-1}, \cdots, 0_0\rangle$, which is unchanged from the initial state. We consider an observable \mathcal{G}_{cnt} , which is a subset of \mathcal{G} defined in Eq. (6). Specifically, \mathcal{G}_{cnt} assumes

$$g(0_{N-1}, ..., 0_1, 0_0) = 0.$$
(18)

Because the initial state of the environment is assumed to be $|0_{N-1}, ..., 0_0\rangle$, the condition of Eq. (18) means that \mathcal{G}_{cnt} vanishes at the initial state. For instance, when we consider an observable which counts the number of jumps during [0, T], such a counting observable vanishes at the initial state because there is no jump at t = 0 ("cnt" in the subscript of \mathcal{G}_{cnt} is short for "counting"). Because Eq. (18) guarantees $\langle \mathcal{G}_{cnt} \rangle_{\star} = 0$ and $[\![\mathcal{G}_{cnt}]\!]_{\star} = 0$, Eq. (15) becomes

$$\frac{\llbracket \mathcal{G}_{\rm cnt} \rrbracket^2}{\langle \mathcal{G}_{\rm cnt} \rangle^2} \ge \frac{1}{\chi_{\rm emp}} - 1, \tag{19}$$

where χ_{emp} is the symmetry breaking measure χ specific to the empty conjugate dynamics. Here, ϕ in Eq. (10) becomes $\dot{\phi} = -iH\phi - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{m}L_{m}^{\dagger}L_{m}\phi$, yielding $\langle \Psi_{\star}|\Psi \rangle = \text{Tr}_{S}\left[e^{\left(-iH - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{m}L_{m}^{\dagger}L_{m}\right)\tau}\rho(0)\right]$. The bound of

Eq. (19) is similar to that obtained in Ref. [37]. Note that there is no definitive magnitude relation between Eq. (19) and Ref. [37]. For short time limit $\tau \to 0$, we obtain $[[\mathcal{G}_{cnt}]]^2 / \langle \mathcal{G}_{cnt} \rangle^2 \geq 1 / [\text{Tr}_S[L^{\dagger}L\rho(0)]\tau]$, where the denominator corresponds to the dynamical activity [49] in classical Markov process.

Although Eq. (15) is invariant under a different measurement basis on E, Eq. (19) is *not* invariant. Suppose a counting observable \mathcal{G}'_{cnt} that has a different basis:

$$\mathcal{G}_{\rm cnt}' = \sum_{\alpha} g(\alpha) |\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha|, \qquad (20)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \equiv [\alpha_{N-1}, ..., \alpha_1, \alpha_0]$ and $|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\rangle$ is different from $|\boldsymbol{m}\rangle$. Even if we assume the condition of Eq. (18), $\langle \Psi_{\star}(\tau) | \mathcal{G}'_{\text{cnt}} | \Psi_{\star}(\tau) \rangle \neq 0$, indicating that $\langle \mathcal{G}'_{\text{cnt}} \rangle_{\star}$ and $[[\mathcal{G}'_{\text{cnt}}]]_{\star}$ do not vanish. This shows that Eq. (19) does not hold for $\mathcal{G}'_{\text{cnt}}$.

Reversed dynamics.—We next consider a case that the conjugate dynamics is time reversal of the original one. To consider the time reversal, we consider a case that each Kraus operator V_m ($m \ge 1$) has its conjugate Kraus operator (then M is assumed to be an even number). Without loss of generality, suppose that V_{m-1} and V_m , where $m = \{2, 4, 6, \dots, M\}$, are conjugate pair of the operator, that is,

$$V = \left[V_0, \underbrace{V_1, V_2}_{M_1, \dots, M_2}, \underbrace{V_3, V_4}_{M_2, \dots, M_2}, \underbrace{V_{M-1}, V_M}_{M_2}\right], \quad (21)$$

where the underbraces denote conjugate pairs. We define the following time reversal operators:

$$V_{\star} = [V_{\star,0}, V_{\star,1}, V_{\star,2}, V_{\star,3}, V_{\star,4}, \cdots, V_{\star,M-1}V_{\star,M}],$$

= $[V_0, V_2, V_1, V_4, V_3, \cdots, V_M, V_{M-1}],$ (22)

which simply swaps two pairing Kraus operators.

In classical stochastic thermodynamics, we are often interested in a current observable. We can consider a current observable in quantum Markov processes by properly defining the projection vector in Eq. (7). In particular, for V and V_{\star} defined in Eqs. (21) and (22), we employ the following projection vector:

$$C_{\rm cur} = \left[0, \underbrace{b_1, -b_1}_{, \underline{b_2}, -\underline{b_2}}, \dots, \underbrace{b_{M/2}, -b_{M/2}}_{, \underline{b_{M/2}}}\right], \qquad (23)$$

where $b_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and the underbraces denote conjugate pairs, and the subscript "cur" is short for "current". Let \mathcal{G}_{cur} be a subset of \mathcal{G} in Eq. (6) where C is replaced by C_{cur} . When we carry out the reversed dynamics specified by Eq. (22), the dynamics is exactly the same except for the indexing, that is, if we swap indices of conjugate pairs, the dynamics becomes the same. This property along with Eq. (23) yields

$$\left\langle \mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cur}} \right\rangle_{\star} = -\left\langle \mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cur}} \right\rangle,$$
 (24)

$$\llbracket \mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cur}} \rrbracket_{\star} = \llbracket \mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{cur}} \rrbracket.$$
⁽²⁵⁾

Therefore using Eqs. (24) and (25), Eq. (15) yields

$$\frac{\left[\!\left[\mathcal{G}_{\rm cur}\right]\!\right]^2}{\left<\mathcal{G}_{\rm cur}\right>^2} \ge \frac{1}{\chi_{\rm rev}} - 1.$$
(26)

Here $\chi_{\rm rev}$ quantifies the extent of irreversibility defined through Eq. (11). $\chi_{\rm rev}$ plays a similar role to the entropy production in classical Markov processes. Note that $\chi_{\rm rev}$ can be calculated through the quantity of the principal system only, indicating that $\chi_{\rm rev}$ is a measurable quantity.

We also consider a different measurement basis on E. Through a unitary transformation on the measurement basis, we obtain a new Kraus operator $\mathbf{Y} = [Y_0, Y_1, Y_2, \cdots, Y_M]$, where Y_n is obtained via Eq. (16). Again, in this new Kraus operator, the reversal condition identical to Eq. (22) should be met:

$$\mathbf{Y}_{\star} = [Y_{\star,0}, Y_{\star,1}, Y_{\star,2}, Y_{\star,3}, Y_{\star,4}, \dots, Y_{\star,M-1}, Y_{\star,M}], = [Y_0, Y_2, Y_1, Y_4, Y_3, \dots, Y_M, Y_{M-1}],$$
(27)

As mentioned above, Eq. (15) holds for arbitrary measurement on the environment, that is, arbitrary unitary transformation on the Kraus operator. However, the condition of Eq. (27) imposes a constraint on the unitary transformation \mathcal{A} in Eq. (17). Therefore, Eq. (26) holds for different measurement basis on E but the unitary operator connecting with $|\mathbf{m}\rangle$ is a subset of the whole unitary operators.

Conclusion.—In this letter, we have found a relation between the extent of symmetry breaking and the precision in quantum Markov processes, which is a quantum generalization of TUR. Notably, our relation holds for any continuous measurement of the Lindblad equation. Moreover, our bound can be applied to any conjugate dynamics in quantum Markov processes. In classical stochastic thermodynamics, there exist many conjugate dynamics leading to different thermodynamics relations [43]. Therefore, it is expected that we can obtain other thermodynamic relations through the main result.

This work was supported by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) KAKENHI Grant No. JP19K12153.

- * hasegawa@biom.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp
- P. Di Francesco, P. Mathieu, and D. Sénéchal, Conformal field theory (Springer, New York, NY, 1997).
- [2] R. Spinney and I. Ford, Fluctuation relations: A pedagogical overview, in *Nonequilibrium Statistical Physics of Small Systems* (John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2013) Chap. 1, pp. 3–56.
- [3] C. Jarzynski, Nonequilibrium equality for free energy differences, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2690 (1997).
- [4] C. Aron, G. Biroli, and L. F. Cugliandolo, Symmetries of generating functionals of Langevin

processes with colored multiplicative noise, J. Stat. Mech: Theory Exp. **2010**, P11018 (2010).

- [5] K. Mallick, M. Moshe, and H. Orland, A fieldtheoretic approach to non-equilibrium work identities, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 44, 095002 (2011).
- [6] C. Aron, G. Biroli, and L. F. Cugliandolo, (Non) equilibrium dynamics: a (broken) symmetry of the Keldysh generating functional, SciPost Phys. 4, 008 (2018).
- [7] A. C. Barato and U. Seifert, Thermodynamic uncertainty relation for biomolecular processes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 158101 (2015).
- [8] T. R. Gingrich, J. M. Horowitz, N. Perunov, and J. L. England, Dissipation bounds all steady-state current fluctuations, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 120601 (2016).
- [9] P. Pietzonka, A. C. Barato, and U. Seifert, Universal bounds on current fluctuations, Phys. Rev. E 93, 052145 (2016).
- [10] J. M. Horowitz and T. R. Gingrich, Proof of the finitetime thermodynamic uncertainty relation for steadystate currents, Phys. Rev. E 96, 020103 (2017).
- [11] S. Pigolotti, I. Neri, E. Roldán, and F. Jülicher, Generic properties of stochastic entropy production, Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 140604 (2017).
- [12] J. P. Garrahan, Simple bounds on fluctuations and uncertainty relations for first-passage times of counting observables, Phys. Rev. E 95, 032134 (2017).
- [13] A. Dechant and S.-i. Sasa, Current fluctuations and transport efficiency for general Langevin systems, J. Stat. Mech: Theory Exp. **2018**, 063209 (2018).
- [14] A. C. Barato, R. Chetrite, A. Faggionato, and D. Gabrielli, Bounds on current fluctuations in periodically driven systems, New J. Phys. 20 (2018).
- [15] I. D. Terlizzi and M. Baiesi, Kinetic uncertainty relation, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 52, 02LT03 (2019).
- [16] Y. Hasegawa and T. Van Vu, Uncertainty relations in stochastic processes: An information inequality approach, Phys. Rev. E 99, 062126 (2019).
- [17] Y. Hasegawa and T. Van Vu, Fluctuation theorem uncertainty relation, Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 110602 (2019).
- [18] T. Van Vu and Y. Hasegawa, Uncertainty relations for underdamped Langevin dynamics, Phys. Rev. E 100, 032130 (2019).
- [19] T. Van Vu and Y. Hasegawa, Thermodynamic uncertainty relations under arbitrary control protocols, Phys. Rev. Research 2, 013060 (2020).
- [20] A. Dechant and S.-i. Sasa, Fluctuationresponse inequality out of equilibrium, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 117, 6430 (2020).
- [21] V. T. Vo, T. V. Vu, and Y. Hasegawa, Unified approach to classical speed limit and thermodynamic uncertainty relation, arXiv:2007.03495 (2020).
- [22] T. Koyuk and U. Seifert, Thermodynamic uncertainty relation for time-dependent driving, Phys. Rev. Lett. 125, 260604 (2020).
- [23] J. M. Horowitz and T. R. Gingrich, Thermodynamic uncertainty relations constrain non-equilibrium fluctuations, Nat. Phys. (2019).
- [24] A. M. Timpanaro, G. Guarnieri, J. Goold, and G. T. Landi, Thermodynamic uncertainty relations from exchange fluctuation theorems, Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 090604 (2019).
- [25] H. Vroylandt, K. Proesmans, and T. R. Gingrich, Isometric uncertainty relations, J. Stat. Phys. 178, 1039 (2020).

- [26] V. T. Vo, T. Van Vu, and Y. Hasegawa, Unified approach to classical speed limit and thermodynamic uncertainty relation, Phys. Rev. E 102, 062132 (2020).
- [27] N. Shiraishi, K. Funo, and K. Saito, Speed limit for classical stochastic processes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 070601 (2018).
- [28] A. Dechant and S. ichi Sasa, Continuous time-reversal and equality in the thermodynamic uncertainty relation, arXiv:2010.14769 (2020).
- [29] P. Erker, M. T. Mitchison, R. Silva, M. P. Woods, N. Brunner, and M. Huber, Autonomous quantum clocks: Does thermodynamics limit our ability to measure time?, Phys. Rev. X 7, 031022 (2017).
- [30] K. Brandner, T. Hanazato, and K. Saito, Thermodynamic bounds on precision in ballistic multiterminal transport, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 090601 (2018).
- [31] F. Carollo, R. L. Jack, and J. P. Garrahan, Unraveling the large deviation statistics of Markovian open quantum systems, Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 130605 (2019).
- [32] J. Liu and D. Segal, Thermodynamic uncertainty relation in quantum thermoelectric junctions, Phys. Rev. E 99, 062141 (2019).
- [33] G. Guarnieri, G. T. Landi, S. R. Clark, Goold, Thermodynamics and J. of preciin quantum nonequilibrium steady sion states. Phys. Rev. Research 1, 033021 (2019).
- [34] S. Saryal, H. M. Friedman, D. Segal, and B. K. Agarwalla, Thermodynamic uncertainty relation in thermal transport, Phys. Rev. E 100, 042101 (2019).
- [35] Y. Hasegawa, Quantum thermodynamic uncertainty relation for continuous measurement, Phys. Rev. Lett. 125, 050601 (2020).
- [36] H. M. Friedman, B. K. Agarwalla, O. Shein-Lumbroso, O. Tal, and D. Segal, Thermodynamic uncertainty relation in atomic-scale quantum conductors, Phys. Rev. B 101, 195423 (2020).
- [37] Y. Hasegawa, Thermodynamic uncertainty relation for general open quantum systems,

Phys. Rev. Lett. **126**, 010602 (2021).

- [38] M. F. Sacchi, Thermodynamic uncertainty relations for bosonic Otto engines, Phys. Rev. E 103, 012111 (2021).
- [39] M. Guţă, Fisher information and asymptotic normality in system identification for quantum Markov chains, Phys. Rev. A 83, 062324 (2011).
- [40] S. Gammelmark and K. Mølmer, Fisher information and the quantum Cramér-Rao sensitivity limit of continuous measurements, Phys. Rev. Lett. 112, 170401 (2014).
- [41] K. Macieszczak, M. Guţă, I. Lesanovsky, and J. P. Garrahan, Dynamical phase transitions as a resource for quantum enhanced metrology, Phys. Rev. A 93, 022103 (2016).
- [42] J. A. Gross, C. M. Caves, G. J. Milburn, and J. Combes, Qubit models of weak continuous measurements: Markovian conditional and open-system dynamics, Quantum Sci. Technol. 3, 024005 (2018).
- [43] U. Seifert, Stochastic thermodynamics, fluctuation theorems and molecular machines, Rep. Prog. Phys. 75, 126001 (2012).
- [44] K. Mølmer, Hypothesis testing with open quantum systems, Phys. Rev. Lett. 114, 040401 (2015).
- [45] See Supplemental Material.
- [46] M. The Dashti and Α. М. Stuart, Bayesian approach to inverse problems, in Handbook of Uncertainty Quantification, edited by R. Ghanem, D. Higdon, and H. Owhadi (2017) pp. 311 - 428.
- [47] M. A. Katsoulakis, L. Rey-Bellet, and J. Wang, Scalable information inequalities for uncertainty quantification, J. Comput. Phys. **336**, 513 (2017).
- [48] T. Nishiyama, A tight lower bound for the Hellinger distance with given means and variances, arXiv:2010.13548 (2020).
- [49] C. Maes, Frenesy: Time-symmetric dynamical activity in nonequilibria, Phys. Rep. 850, 1 (2020).

Supplementary Material for "Precision Enhancement via Symmetry Breaking in Quantum Markov Process"

Yoshihiko Hasegawa*

Department of Information and Communication Engineering, Graduate School of Information Science and Technology, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan

This supplementary material describes the calculations introduced in the main text. Equation and figure numbers are prefixed with S (e.g., Eq. (S1) or Fig. S1). Numbers without this prefix (e.g., Eq. (1) or Fig. 1) refer to items in the main text.

S1. MIXED STATE CASE

We consider a two-sided Lindblad equation for initially mixed state case. Let ρ be the initial mixed state of S. We consider an ancilla A which purifies ρ . Let $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle$ be a purification of ρ :

$$\rho = \operatorname{Tr}_{A}\left[\left|\tilde{\psi}\right\rangle\left\langle\tilde{\psi}\right|\right].\tag{S1}$$

We want to define the time evolution on a pure state in S + A. We introduce the following Kraus operators that act on S + A:

$$V_m \equiv V_m \otimes \mathbb{I}_A \quad (0 \le m \le M), \tag{S2}$$

where V_m is defined in the main text as follows [Eqs. (3) and (4)]:

$$V_0 \equiv \mathbb{I}_S - i\Delta t H - \frac{1}{2}\Delta t \sum_{m=1}^M L_m^{\dagger} L_m,$$
(S3)

$$V_m \equiv \sqrt{\Delta t} L_m \quad (1 \le m \le M). \tag{S4}$$

When we apply \tilde{V}_m to the purified state $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle$ and tracing out the ancilla, we obtain

$$\operatorname{Tr}_{A}\left[\sum_{m=0}^{M} \tilde{V}_{m} \left|\tilde{\psi}\right\rangle \left\langle\tilde{\psi}\right| \tilde{V}_{m}^{\dagger}\right]$$

$$= \operatorname{Tr}_{A}\left[\sum_{m=0}^{M} \left(V_{m} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{A}\right) \left|\tilde{\psi}\right\rangle \left\langle\tilde{\psi}\right| \left(V_{m}^{\dagger} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{A}\right)\right]$$

$$= \sum_{m=0}^{M} V_{m} \operatorname{Tr}_{A}\left[\left|\tilde{\psi}\right\rangle \left\langle\tilde{\psi}\right|\right] V_{m}^{\dagger}$$

$$= \sum_{m=0}^{M} V_{m} \rho V_{m}^{\dagger}, \qquad (S5)$$

which shows that \tilde{V}_m induces the consistent time evolution. A pure state in S + A + E at $t = \tau$ is represented by

$$|\tilde{\Psi}(\tau)\rangle = \sum_{\boldsymbol{m}} \tilde{V}_{m_{N-1}} \cdots \tilde{V}_{m_0} |\tilde{\psi}\rangle \otimes |m_{N-1}, \cdots, m_0\rangle, \qquad (S6)$$

^{*} hasegawa@biom.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp

As mentioned in the main text, $\mathbf{m} = [m_{N-1}, ..., m_1, m_0]$ is a measurement record. We calculate the probability of measuring \mathbf{m} :

$$P(m_{N-1},...,m_0) = \langle \tilde{\Psi}(\tau) | m_{N-1},...,m_0 \rangle \langle m_{N-1},...,m_0 | \tilde{\Psi}(\tau) \rangle$$

$$= \langle \tilde{\Psi}(\tau) | \tilde{V}_{m_0}^{\dagger} ... \tilde{V}_{m_{N-1}}^{\dagger} \tilde{V}_{m_{N-1}} ... \tilde{V}_{m_0} | \tilde{\Psi}(\tau) \rangle$$

$$= \operatorname{Tr}_{SA} \left[\tilde{V}_{m_{N-1}} ... \tilde{V}_{m_0} | \tilde{\Psi}(\tau) \rangle \langle \tilde{\Psi}(\tau) | \tilde{V}_{m_0}^{\dagger} ... \tilde{V}_{m_{N-1}}^{\dagger} \right]$$

$$= \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left[V_{m_{N-1}} ... V_{m_0} \operatorname{Tr}_{A} \left[| \tilde{\Psi}(\tau) \rangle \langle \tilde{\Psi}(\tau) | \right] V_{m_0}^{\dagger} ... V_{m_{N-1}}^{\dagger} \right]$$

$$= \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left[V_{m_{N-1}} ... V_{m_0} \rho V_{m_0}^{\dagger} ... V_{m_{N-1}}^{\dagger} \right].$$
(S7)

Therefore, statistics of \boldsymbol{m} obtained by quantum trajectories induced by V_m with an initially mixed state ρ is identical to the environmental measurement on $|\tilde{\psi}(\tau)\rangle$.

In a similar manner, we introduce the conjugate Kraus operators $\tilde{V}_{\star,m}$:

$$\tilde{V}_{\star,m} \equiv V_{\star,m} \otimes \mathbb{I}_A \quad (0 \le m \le M), \tag{S8}$$

where $V_{\star,m}$ is defined in the main text. The pure state of the conjugate dynamics in S + A + E at $t = \tau$ is

$$|\tilde{\Psi}_{\star}(\tau)\rangle = \sum_{\boldsymbol{m}} \tilde{V}_{\star,m_{N-1}} \cdots \tilde{V}_{\star,m_0} |\tilde{\psi}\rangle \otimes |m_{N-1}, \cdots, m_0\rangle.$$
(S9)

As in the main text, we can compute the fidelity

$$\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{\star}(\tau) | \tilde{\Psi}(\tau) \rangle = \operatorname{Tr}_{SAE} \left[\left| \tilde{\Psi}(\tau) \right\rangle \langle \tilde{\Psi}_{\star}(\tau) | \right]$$
$$= \operatorname{Tr}_{SA} \left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}} \tilde{V}_{m_{N-1}} \cdots \tilde{V}_{m_0} | \tilde{\psi} \rangle \langle \tilde{\psi} | \tilde{V}_{\star,m_0} \cdots \tilde{V}_{\star,m_{N-1}} \right]$$
$$= \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}} V_{m_{N-1}} \cdots V_{m_0} \rho V_{\star,m_0} \cdots V_{\star,m_{N-1}} \right].$$
(S10)

The last line of Eq. (S10) yields a two-sided Lindblad equation of Eq. (10) with initial state ρ .