

# Multiparty Spohn's theorem for mixed local Markovian and non-Markovian quantum dynamics

Ahana Ghoshal and Ujjwal Sen

Harish-Chandra Research Institute, A CI of Homi Bhabha National Institute, Chhatnag Road, Jhansi, Prayagraj 211 019, India

We obtain the Gorini-Kossakowski-Sudarshan-Lindblad master equation for two or more quantum systems connected locally to a combination of Markovian and non-Markovian heat baths. We analyze the thermodynamic quantities for such a mixed set of local environments, and derive a modified form of the Spohn's theorem for that setup. The modification of the theorem naturally leads to a witness as well as an easily computable quantifier of non-Markovianity. Furthermore, we find that for multiparty situations, where a combination of Markovian and non-Markovian heat baths are active, the response in thermodynamic system characteristics due to non-Markovian baths is prominent at times close to the initial time of evolution, whereas the long-time behavior is predominantly controlled by the Markovian ones.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum thermodynamics is an emerging field of research and the interconnections of it with quantum information theory have been studied from myriad perspectives. The interface has been enriched with the inventions of quantum thermal devices like quantum heat engines and quantum refrigerators [1–7], quantum diodes [8], quantum thermal transistors [9–12], etc. The dynamics of quantum thermal machines are governed by the theory of open quantum systems [13–16], and the investigations, in particular, have led to a better understanding of the thermodynamic laws in the quantum regime [17–29]. A significant body of work that analyze quantum devices deals with Markovian evolution, although non-Markovian dynamics has also been considered.

Detecting and measuring non-Markovianity is possible via several measures of non-Markovianity [30], which are not all equivalent. Two widely used measures are those proposed by Breuer-Laine-Pillo (BLP) [31] and Rivas-Huelga-Plenio (RHP) [32], which respectively uses non-monotonicity in time-evolution of state distinguishability and entanglement. Later on, an equivalence of these two measures in some cases has been established [33, 34]. See e.g. [35–38] for some further works on non-Markovianity.

Heat current and entropy production rate (EPR) are two fundamental quantities that give an idea about the thermal properties of a system. The second law of thermodynamics leads to a balance equation, relating EPR ( $\sigma$ ), the von Neumann entropy ( $S$ ), and heat current ( $J$ ) for a single system immersed in a heat bath, given by

$$\sigma = \frac{dS}{dt} + J.$$

EPR is an important characteristic for understanding the thermodynamics of a system, and moreover, is a valuable physical quantity for detection of non-Markovianity of a dynamics. Spohn's theorem [39, 40] states that for a Markovian evolution, EPR of the system is always positive. It is known that for non-Markovian evolutions, the EPR may take negative values [41–48]. So, that EPR can be treated as a non-Markovianity detector. While speaking about detectors and quantifiers of non-Markovianity, we remember that many of them provide either a necessary or a sufficient criterion for non-Markovianity detection, but not both. For a deeper under-

standing of the entropy production rate, see e.g. [21, 49–88]. For experimental works, see e.g. [89–91].

Quantum evolution of a system within the Markovian approximation is a very special case and hardly occurs in realistic scenarios. The Born-Markov assumptions have strict limitations on the thermal environment. For obeying the approximations, the thermal baths must be infinitely large and should have a continuous energy spectrum [13]. Many environments cannot be categorized as Markovian baths and reside within the family of the non-Markovian ones. An example of a Markovian bath is the bosonic bath consisting of an infinite numbers of harmonic oscillators, within certain restrictions. There exist some thermal baths which can not be treated easily as a Markovian bath, like spin baths [43, 92–95]. Some non-Markovian baths have their Markovian limits, while for some others like the spin star model, such a limit can be elusive [96]. Consideration of non-Markovian evolutions is therefore often the natural choice. Indeed, non-Markovian evolutions have been widely studied in literature along with Markovian ones, especially when all the relevant environments in the physical system considered are either non-Markovian or Markovian.

Here, we consider a situation where the local parts of the physical system under study are affected by local environments, which can be a few non-Markovian and the remaining not so. We derive the quantum dynamical equation of the system for this case. We first provide the analytical derivation for a two-qubit system and then extend it to the case of  $m + n$  subsystems, locally connected to  $m$  Markovian and  $n$  non-Markovian baths respectively. Furthermore, we study thermodynamic quantities like heat current and EPR, for the composite system (of  $m + n$  subsystems) immersed in a “mixed” set of local environments, and obtain a modified form of the well-known Spohn's theorem [39, 40] in connection to the second law of thermodynamics. Here and in the rest of the paper, by a “mixed set of local environments or baths”, we will mean a situation where a few subsystems of the system are engaged with non-Markovian baths, while the remaining are so with Markovian ones. Moreover, we propose a quantity which is easily computable and can be treated as a quantifier of non-Markovianity in case of a mixed set of local environments. We explicitly consider the case of four system qubits, with each of the qubits being connected to a non-Markovian or a Markovian bath. We observe that in a mixed set of local environments, the response is dominated by the effect of non-

Markovian baths at short times. Interestingly however, with the increase of time, non-Markovianity effects reduce, and the dynamics is prone to be more and more Markovian-like.

The remainder of the paper is arranged as follows. In Sec. II we derive the Gorini-Kossakowski-Sudarshan-Lindblad master equation (GKSL equation) of the system for a mixed set of local envions, for  $m + n$  qubits. Section III provides definitions of some physical quantities like heat current and EPR, which are used to describe the second law of thermodynamics in the quantum regime. In Sec. IV, we show that the Spohn's theorem has a modified form in case of a mixed set of local environments of which some are non-Markovian while others are Markovian. This leads to an extra term in the Spohn's relation, which we treat as a quantifier of non-Markovianity. The nature of the quantifier for mixed environments is discussed in the same section. Section V contains the concluding remarks.

## II. MULTIPARTY GKSL EQUATION IMMersed IN LOCAL MARKOVIAN AND NON-MARKOVIAN BATHS

We consider  $m + n$  two-level systems (TLSs) locally coupled to  $m$  Markovian and  $n$  non-Markovian baths respectively. The situation is depicted in the left panel of Fig. 1. The composite system consisting of  $m + n$  TLSs will evolve under the combined influence of the local Markovian and non-Markovian baths. Before considering the case of arbitrary  $m$  and  $n$ , we deal with the case of two TLSs ( $S_A$  and  $S_B$ ), locally coupled respectively to two heat baths, one of which is a Markovian bath ( $B_1$ ) and which can be treated under the Born-Markov approximation, while the other is a non-Markovian one ( $B_2$ ), whose frequency spectrum is discrete and goes beyond the Markovian regime. A schematic diagram of this two-qubit two-bath setup is illustrated in the right panel of Fig. 1. The Hamiltonian of the composite setup is given by

$$H = H_s + H_B + H_I, \quad (1)$$

where  $H_s$  describes the Hamiltonian of the composite system consisting of the two TLSs,  $H_B$  stands for the combined local Hamiltonian of the two baths and  $H_I = \sum_j H_{I_j}$  for  $j = 1, 2$ . Here  $H_{I_1}$  represents the interaction between  $S_A$  and  $B_1$ , and  $H_{I_2}$  presents the interaction between  $S_B$  and  $B_2$ . In the Schrödinger picture, let the density matrix of the composite two-qubit two-bath setup at time  $t$  be represented by  $\rho(t)$ . It is useful to perform the calculation in the interaction picture [13]. The von Neumann equation in that picture will be

$$\frac{d\rho_{int}(t)}{dt} = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [H_{I_{int}}(t), \rho_{int}(t)], \quad (2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_{I_{int}}(t) &= e^{\frac{i(H_s + H_B)t}{\hbar}} H_I e^{-\frac{i(H_s + H_B)t}{\hbar}}, \\ \rho_{int}(t) &= e^{\frac{i(H_s + H_B)t}{\hbar}} \rho(t) e^{-\frac{i(H_s + H_B)t}{\hbar}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

without assuming a commutativity relation of  $H_I$  and  $\rho(t)$  with  $H_s$  and  $H_B$ . The interaction Hamiltonian in the

Schrödinger picture can be decomposed in the form [13, 15],

$$H_{I_j} = \sum_k A_{j_k} \otimes B_{j_k}, \quad (4)$$

with  $A_{j_k}$  and  $B_{j_k}$  being the system and bath operators respectively. Here  $j = 1, 2$  and  $k$  runs from 1 to the maximum number of terms required for the decomposition for each  $j$ . Reverting to the interaction picture we get,

$$H_{I_{j,int}}(t) = \sum_k A_{j_k}(t) \otimes B_{j_k}(t), \quad (5)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{j_k}(t) &= e^{\frac{iH_s t}{\hbar}} A_{j_k} e^{-\frac{iH_s t}{\hbar}}, \\ B_{j_k}(t) &= e^{\frac{iH_B t}{\hbar}} B_{j_k} e^{-\frac{iH_B t}{\hbar}}. \end{aligned}$$

The system operators  $A_{j_k}$  can be decomposed in the eigenspace of the system Hamiltonian as

$$A_{j_k}(\omega) = \sum_{\epsilon' - \epsilon = \omega} \Pi(\epsilon) A_{j_k} \Pi(\epsilon'), \quad (6)$$

where  $\Pi(\epsilon)$ 's are the projectors onto the eigenspaces of the system Hamiltonian  $H_s$  corresponding to the eigenvalue  $\epsilon$ . Therefore, we have the properties,  $[H_s, A_{j_k}(\omega)] = -\omega A_{j_k}(\omega)$  and  $[H_s, A_{j_k}^\dagger(\omega)] = \omega A_{j_k}^\dagger(\omega)$ , indicating the fact that  $A_{j_k}(t)$  and  $A_{j_k}(\omega)$  are related by a Fourier transformation from the  $t$  space to the  $\omega$  space, as  $A_{j_k}(t) = \sum_\omega e^{-i\omega t} A_{j_k}(\omega)$  and  $A_{j_k}^\dagger(t) = \sum_\omega e^{i\omega t} A_{j_k}^\dagger(\omega)$ . Now the interaction Hamiltonian becomes

$$H_{I_{int}}(t) = \sum_j H_{I_{j,int}} = \sum_{j,k,\omega} e^{-i\omega t} A_{j_k}(\omega) \otimes B_{j_k}(t). \quad (7)$$

The state of the entire setup  $\rho_{int}(t)$ , is given by

$$\rho_{int}(t) = \rho(0) - \frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^t ds [H_{I_{int}}(s), \rho_{int}(s)]. \quad (8)$$

We assume that initially the systems are uncorrelated to the baths, and that the baths themselves are also in a product state, so that at time  $t = 0$ ,

$$\rho(0) = \rho_s(0) \otimes \rho_{B_1}(0) \otimes \rho_{B_2}(0), \quad (9)$$

where  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  are initially in their canonical equilibrium states given by  $\rho_{B_j}(0) = \frac{e^{-\beta_j H_{B_j}}}{\text{tr}(e^{-\beta_j H_{B_j}})}$  for  $j = 1, 2$ . The corresponding  $\beta_j$ 's are  $\frac{1}{k_B T_j}$ , with  $k_B$  being the Boltzmann constant. As we mentioned earlier, that the bath  $B_1$  is Markovian and therefore in the further calculations, while talking about  $B_1$ , we will impose the Born-Markov approximations which tells that the coupling between the system  $S_A$  and  $B_1$  is weak, so that the state of  $B_1$  regains its initial state after every time-step of interaction with  $S_A$ , and that any correlation created between  $B_1$  and  $S_A$  is also destroyed after the same time-step. Moreover,  $B_1$  will also be assumed to remain uncorrelated with  $B_2$  during the evolution. So, at time  $t$ , the state of the entire setup will take the form,

$$\rho(t) \approx \rho_{sB_2}(t) \otimes \rho_{B_1}, \quad (10)$$




FIG. 1. Mixed set of local environments. In the left panel, we present a schematic diagram of  $m + n$  TLSs, evolving under their system Hamiltonian as well as local environments which are some Markovian and the rest not so.  $B_{M,1} \cdots B_{M,m}$  are the baths which can be treated under the Born-Markov approximations, hence are Markovian baths, and  $B_{N,1} \cdots B_{N,n}$  are the baths residing in a non-Markovian family. A special case of the left panel is presented in the right one where only two TLSs are interacting with two baths locally among which one is Markovian and the other is non-Markovian.  $S_A$  and  $S_B$  are the two TLSs.  $B_1$  is the Markovian bath, while  $B_2$  is non-Markovian one.

where  $\rho_{sB_2}(t)$  is the density matrix of the systems  $S_A$  and  $S_B$  combined along the bath  $B_2$  at time  $t$ , and  $\rho_{B_1} = \rho_{B_1}(0)$ . Now we make a further assumption for the Markovian bath  $B_1$  [13], viz.

$$\text{tr}_B[H_{I_1,int}(t), \rho_{int}(0)] = 0. \quad (11)$$

As a consequence of this assumption, the Markovian bath  $B_1$  possesses the property,

$$\text{tr}_{B_1}(B_{1k} \rho_{B_1}) = 0, \quad (12)$$

which is a very important one for the succeeding calculations of our paper. Now, using the integral form of  $\rho_{int}(t)$ , given in Eq. (8), and then using Eq. (11) in the von Neumann equation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\rho_{int}(t)}{dt} = & \sum_j -\frac{1}{\hbar^2} \int_0^t ds [H_{I_j,int}(t), [H_{I_j,int}(s), \rho_{sB_2,int}(s) \otimes \rho_{B_1}]] \\ & - \frac{i}{\hbar} [H_{I_2,int}(t), \rho_{sB_2,int}(t) \otimes \rho_{B_1}], \quad (13) \end{aligned}$$

for  $j = 1, 2$ . The first term for  $j = 2$  vanishes by using the relation given in Eq. (12). Thus the reduced system dynamics comes out to be

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\tilde{\rho}_{s,int}(t)}{dt} = & -\frac{1}{\hbar^2} \int_0^t ds \text{tr}_{B_1} [H_{I_1,int}(t), [H_{I_1,int}(s), \tilde{\rho}_{s,int}(s) \otimes \rho_{B_1}]] \\ & - \frac{i}{\hbar} \text{tr}_B [H_{I_2,int}(t), \rho_{sB_2,int}(t) \otimes \rho_{B_1}]. \quad (14) \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\tilde{\rho}_{s,int}(t) = \text{tr}_{B_2}\{\rho_{sB_2,int}(t)\}$ . Next we use the Markov approximation, i.e., replace the integrand  $\tilde{\rho}_{s,int}(s)$  in the first term by  $\tilde{\rho}_{s,int}(t)$ , so that the development of the reduced state of the system at time  $t$  only depends on the present state  $\tilde{\rho}_{s,int}(t)$ . Furthermore, we substitute  $s$  by  $t - s$  and let the upper limit of the integral go to infinity so that we can avoid the dependency of the reduced density matrix on the explicit choice of the initial preparation at time  $t = 0$ . See [13] for more details about the Markovian approximations. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\tilde{\rho}_{s,int}(t)}{dt} = & -\frac{1}{\hbar^2} \int_0^\infty ds \text{tr}_{B_1} [H_{I_1,int}(t), [H_{I_1,int}(t-s), \tilde{\rho}_{s,int}(t) \otimes \rho_{B_1}]] \\ & - \frac{i}{\hbar} \text{tr}_B [H_{I_2,int}(t), \rho_{sB_2,int}(t) \otimes \rho_{B_1}]. \quad (15) \end{aligned}$$

Applying the rotating wave approximation, the right-hand side comes out to be

$$\begin{aligned} = & \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \sum_\omega \sum_{k,l} \gamma_{k,l}(\omega) [A_{1l}(\omega) \tilde{\rho}_{s,int}(t) A_{1k}^\dagger(\omega) \\ & - A_{1k}^\dagger(\omega) A_{1l}(\omega) \tilde{\rho}_{s,int}(t)] + \text{h.c.} \\ & - \frac{i}{\hbar} \text{tr}_{B_2} [H_{I_2,int}(t), \rho_{sB_2,int}(t)]. \quad (16) \end{aligned}$$

$\gamma_{k,l}(\omega)$  is given by

$$\gamma_{k,l}(\omega) = \int_0^\infty ds e^{i\omega s} \text{tr}_{B_1} \{B_k^\dagger(t) B_l(t-s) \rho_{B_1}\}. \quad (17)$$

Now we go to the Schrödinger picture.  $\rho_{B_1}$  will be the same in both the pictures as  $\rho_{B_1}$  commutes with  $H_{B_1}$ . So,

$$\tilde{\rho}_{s,int}(t) = \text{tr}_{B_2} \left[ e^{\frac{i(H_s + H_{B_2})t}{\hbar}} \rho_{sB_2}(t) e^{-\frac{i(H_s + H_{B_2})t}{\hbar}} \right]. \quad (18)$$

The reduced system dynamics in the Schrödinger picture turns out to be

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\tilde{\rho}_s(t)}{dt} = \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) \equiv & \\ -\frac{i}{\hbar} [H_s, \tilde{\rho}_s(t)] + \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \sum_{\omega} \sum_{k,l} \gamma_{k,l}(\omega) & (A_{1_l}(\omega) \tilde{\rho}_s(t) A_{1_k}^\dagger(\omega) \\ -\frac{1}{2} \{A_{1_k}^\dagger(\omega) A_{1_l}(\omega), \tilde{\rho}_s(t)\}) & - \frac{i}{\hbar} \text{tr}_{B_2} [H_{I_2}(t), \rho_{sB_2}(t)]. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Here we have used that  $\tilde{\rho}_s(t) = \text{tr}_{B_2} \{ e^{\frac{iH_{B_2}t}{\hbar}} \rho_{sB_2}(t) e^{-\frac{iH_{B_2}t}{\hbar}} \} = \text{tr}_{B_2}(\rho_{sB_2})$ . Thus, we can write

$$\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [H_s, \tilde{\rho}_s(t)] + \mathcal{D}_M(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) + \mathcal{D}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t)), \quad (20)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_M(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \sum_{\omega} \sum_{k,l} \gamma_{k,l}(\omega) & (A_{1_l}(\omega) \tilde{\rho}_s(t) A_{1_k}^\dagger(\omega) \\ -\frac{1}{2} \{A_{1_k}^\dagger(\omega) A_{1_l}(\omega), \tilde{\rho}_s(t)\}) & , \\ \mathcal{D}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t)) = -\frac{i}{\hbar} \text{tr}_{B_2} & [H_{I_2}(t), \rho_{sB_2}(t)]. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Here we have neglected the possible effects of the Lamb-shift Hamiltonian in the dynamics [48, 97]. Effectively,  $\mathcal{D}_M(\tilde{\rho}_s(t))$  contains the dissipative part of the GKSL equation due to the influence of the Markovian bath and  $\mathcal{D}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t))$  contains the non-Markovian contribution. As the bath  $B_1$  is Markovian, we can expect that the effect coming from the bath in the evolution of the system should be completely Markovian. However, we see from Eq. (21) that the term capturing the contribution of the Markovian bath contains  $\tilde{\rho}_s(t)$ , the system's state correlated with the non-Markovian bath, instead of the system's state, uncorrelated with any environment, as it occurs in the Markovian approach. This is a major difference between the Markovian case [13, 15] and the situation which we have referred to as mixed set of local environments. Although we have considered  $B_1$  as a Markovian bath, the non-Markovian effect of  $B_2$  remains in the contribution of  $B_1$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{D}_M(\tilde{\rho}_s(t))$  can be named as a Markovian-like dissipator, whereas  $\mathcal{D}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t))$  can be called as a non-Markovian dissipator.

We now move over to the case of an arbitrary number of subsystems, as schematically depicted in the left panel of Fig. 1. The two-qubit dynamical equation given in Eq. (20) can be extended to the situation where  $m+n$  qubits are connected to  $m$  Markovian and  $n$  non-Markovian baths locally. For that general case, the dynamical equation of the system takes the form,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [H_s, \tilde{\rho}_s(t)] + \sum_{j=1}^m \mathcal{D}_{M_j}(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) \\ + \sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{D}_{NM_j}(\rho_{sB_{NM,1\dots n}}(t)). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Here  $\tilde{\rho}_s(t) = \text{tr}_{B_{NM,1\dots n}}(\tilde{\rho}_{sB_{NM,1\dots n}}(t))$ . All the  $\mathcal{D}_{M_j}(\tilde{\rho}_s(t))$ 's have the same form as  $\mathcal{D}_M(\tilde{\rho}_s(t))$ , presenting the contribution of the  $j^{\text{th}}$  Markovian bath. Similarly,  $\mathcal{D}_{NM_j}(\rho_{sB_{NM,1\dots n}}(t))$  represents the contribution of the  $j^{\text{th}}$  non-Markovian bath. With the increase in the number of non-Markovian baths, the system in general will tend to become more and more correlated with the non-Markovian baths, but the effect of the Markovian baths will also in general become significantly altered in comparison to the situation where non-Markovian environments are absent. This in turn may affect the general properties and inter-relations between thermodynamic quantities that are typically considered in non-mixed sets of local environs. Below, we study the response of the heat current and EPR, and their inter-relation via the Spohn's theorem, to the incorporation of mixed sets of local baths.

### III. THERMODYNAMIC QUANTITIES AND THEIR PROPERTIES IN MIXED ENVIRONS

Heat current and EPR are two fundamental thermodynamic properties of a system which provide information about heat flow from the system to its environment or vice versa, and further aspects of equilibrium and non-equilibrium physics of the system. If the system resides in its equilibrium steady state after an evolution in presence of a Markovian environment, EPR takes the value 0 and for the situation where the system reaches a non-equilibrium steady state, EPR is always  $> 0$ . It is known that for a non-Markovian evolution, EPR can take a negative value [41–48] and as a consequence, it can be treated as a witness of non-Markovianity. The definitions of the thermodynamic quantities can strongly depend on the character of the environments under which the system is being evolved. For example, under local non-Markovian evolutions, the general definitions of heat current and EPR differ from that in the ideal Markovian situation [48].

In general, entropy flux or heat current can be defined as the amount of entropy exchanged per unit time between the open system and its environment [13]. For positive values of the heat current, heat flows from the system to the environment, and for negative values of the same, the direction of heat flow will be the opposite. Entropy flux for the composite two-qubit system depicted in the right panel of Fig. 1 can be defined as

$$J_{12} = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{diss} E, \quad (23)$$

which indicates the change in internal energy resulting from the dissipative effects. Here  $E = \text{tr}(H_s \tilde{\rho}_s(t))$ . So,

$$\begin{aligned} J_{12} = \text{tr} \left( H_s (\mathcal{D}_M(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) + \mathcal{D}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t))) \right) \\ = \text{tr} (H_s \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\rho}_s(t))). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Now we define the local heat currents of each subsystem as

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 = \text{tr} (H_s \mathcal{D}_M(\tilde{\rho}_s(t))), \\ J_2 = \text{tr} (H_s \mathcal{D}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t))). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

The definition of  $J_1$  is quite similar to that in the Markovian approach, but the effect of non-Markovianity resides in the

state  $\tilde{\rho}_s(t)$ , as the system's state is correlated with the non-Markovian bath. The formulation of  $J_2$  is inherently non-Markovian.

EPR is a thermodynamic quantity of a system which is defined as a source term in the balance equation involving the rate of change of entropy with time and heat current [39, 40, 98]. For a two-qubit two-bath composite setup, this balance equation can be considered as

$$\sigma_{12} = \frac{dS(\tilde{\rho}_s(t))}{dt} - \frac{1}{T_1} J_1 - \frac{1}{T_2} J_2, \quad (26)$$

where  $S(\cdot)$  is the von Neumann entropy of its argument and defined as  $S(\rho) = -k_B \text{tr}(\rho \ln(\rho)) = -k_B \sum_i \lambda_i \ln(\lambda_i)$ , with  $\lambda_i$ 's being the eigenvalues of the density matrix  $\rho$ .  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are the temperatures of the Markovian and non-Markovian baths respectively. In this formulation, the balance equation is the definition of the EPR, denoted  $\sigma_{12}$ , with the suffixes indicating the systems involved. In Markovian dynamics of a single system, EPR turns out to be the negative derivative of the relative entropy distance from the canonical equilibrium state of the system [39, 40], but for non-Markovian cases, this interpretation may not apply [48].

We now move over to the case of  $m+n$  qubits (see the left panel of Fig. 1). For  $m+n$  qubits, the global heat current and the global EPR take the following forms:

$$\begin{aligned} J_{1\dots(m+n)} &= \sum_{j=1}^m \text{tr} \left( H_s (\mathcal{D}_{M_j}(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{D}_{NM_j}(\rho_{sB_{NM,1\dots n}}(t))) \right), \\ \sigma_{1\dots(m+n)} &= \frac{dS(\tilde{\rho}_s(t))}{dt} - \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{T_{M,j}} J_{M,j} \\ &\quad - \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{T_{NM,j}} J_{NM,j}. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Here the local heat currents,  $J_{M_j}$ , flowing to or from the  $j^{\text{th}}$  Markovian bath is presented by the  $j^{\text{th}}$  contribution of the first term in  $J_{1\dots(m+n)}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ , and the same of the second term signifies the local heat currents,  $J_{NM_j}$ , flowing towards or outwards from the  $j^{\text{th}}$  non-Markovian bath for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ .

#### IV. MODIFICATION TO SPOHN'S THEOREM

Spohn's theorem assures the positivity of EPR for a Markovian process. For non-Markovian evolutions the positivity of the same quantity may be valid, but not guaranteed. So, there may exist a modified form of Spohn's theorem for non-Markovian evolutions which can describe the thermodynamics of non-Markovian scenarios. Our aim is to obtain a thermodynamic condition similar to that in the Spohn's theorem, which can describe a multiparty situation with a mixed set of local environs.

For the ease of notation and calculations, we take the simple two-qubit, two-bath situation depicted in the right panel of Fig. 1. The dynamical equation of the system for this setup is given in Eq. (20). We separate the Markovian-like part and the non-Markovian one from the GKSL equation (Eq. (20)) and define the partial superoperators [99],

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_M(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) &= -\frac{ip}{\hbar} [H_s, \tilde{\rho}_s(t)] + D_M(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)), \\ \mathcal{L}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t)) &= -\frac{i(1-p)}{\hbar} [H_s, \tilde{\rho}_s(t)] + D_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where the total Lindblad operator is  $\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) = \mathcal{L}_M(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) + \mathcal{L}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t))$  and  $p$  is a weight factor. The two parts  $\mathcal{L}_M(\tilde{\rho}_s(t))$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t))$  act as GKSL equation operators individually, with  $\text{tr}(\mathcal{L}_M(\tilde{\rho}_s(t))) = \text{tr}(\mathcal{L}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t))) = 0$ . Hence, the local heat currents can be described in terms of the local superoperators as

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= \text{tr}(H_s \mathcal{L}_M(\tilde{\rho}_s(t))), \\ J_2 &= \text{tr}(H_s \mathcal{L}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t))). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Now we introduce two "local" canonical equilibrium states of the composite system at temperatures  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  [99] having the form,

$$\tilde{\rho}_{th_j} = \frac{e^{-\beta_j H_s}}{Z_j}, \quad (30)$$

for  $j = 1$  and  $2$ . Note that  $H_s$  is a Hamiltonian of two parties.  $Z_j$ 's stand for the corresponding partition functions and defined as  $Z_j = \text{tr}(e^{-\beta_j H_s})$ . Here  $\beta_j = \frac{1}{k_B T_j}$ , with  $k_B$  being the Boltzmann's constant. Thus, using Eq. (30) and the partial superoperators, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{12} &= -k_B \left[ \text{tr}(\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) \ln(\tilde{\rho}_s(t))) - \text{tr}(\mathcal{L}_M(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) \ln(\tilde{\rho}_{th_1})) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \text{tr}(\mathcal{L}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t)) \ln(\tilde{\rho}_{th_2})) \right] \\ &= -\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_M S(\tilde{\rho}_s(t) || \tilde{\rho}_{th_1}) \\ &\quad - k_B \text{tr}(\mathcal{L}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t)) (\ln(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) - \ln(\tilde{\rho}_{th_2}))), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where the relative entropy distance,  $S(\rho || \sigma) = k_B \text{tr}(\rho \ln \rho - \rho \ln \sigma)$ , is used to quantify the "distance" between the evolved state and the local canonical equilibrium state at temperature  $T_1$ , which is a stationary state for the local superoperator  $\mathcal{L}_M(\cdot)$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{L}_M(\tilde{\rho}_{th_1}) = 0$ . As we can see, the first term in (31) is a contribution of the Markovian bath, so that  $\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_M$  denotes a Markovian-like contribution,  $\mathcal{L}_M(\cdot)$ , to the total GKSL equation. In the Markovian limit of the setup under consideration, i.e., when both the baths are Markovian, the first term of Eq. (31) will be duplicated for the other bath, and the second term will be non-existent. Hence, Eq. (31) can be presented as a general expression of EPR for a two-qubit system evolving under a mixed set of environments. This is to be contrasted with the modified EPR obtained in [48] for

the local non-Markovian evolution of a globally Markovian dynamics.

We now try to establish the Spohn's theorem with the altered definition of EPR. From Eq. (31), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{12} + k_B \text{tr} \{ \mathcal{L}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t)) (\ln(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) - \ln(\tilde{\rho}_{th_2})) \} \\ = -k_B \text{tr} \{ \mathcal{L}_M(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) (\ln(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) - \ln(\tilde{\rho}_{th_1})) \}. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Spohn's inequality [39] tells us that for any superoperator of Lindblad form, say  $\mathcal{L}_M(\cdot)$ , with a stationary state, say  $\tilde{\rho}_{th_1}$ , the R.H.S of Eq. (32) is always  $\geq 0$ . Thus, for the case of a two-qubit system with the qubits being attached separately to two baths, one of which is Markovian and the other not, we get the altered form of Spohn's theorem as

$$\sigma_{12} + k_B \text{tr} \{ \mathcal{L}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t)) (\ln(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) - \ln(\tilde{\rho}_{th_2})) \} \geq 0. \quad (33)$$

The second term in the L.H.S. of the inequality is an extra term that has appended due to the presence of the non-Markovian bath, in the mixed set of local environments. The existence of a steady state for a Markovian evolution of Lindblad form is guaranteed. The canonical equilibrium state of the system is a steady state for the dynamics of the system under a Markovian environment. When one must go beyond the Markovian approximations while considering the dynamics of a system, the existence of a steady state is not guaranteed. Moreover, in the second term of the L.H.S. of (33),  $\tilde{\rho}_{th_2}$  will in general not be the steady state corresponding to  $\mathcal{L}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t))$ . So, we cannot infer the sign of that term and hence a modified version of Spohn's theorem arises which states that not the EPR, but the conjunction of EPR and  $M_{NM}^1 = k_B \text{tr} \{ \mathcal{D}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t)) (\ln(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) - \ln(\tilde{\rho}_{th_2})) \}$  is assured to be positive for a mixed set of local environments. The  $\mathcal{L}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t))$  in (33) can be replaced by  $\mathcal{D}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t))$ , as the first term of the local superoperator  $\mathcal{L}_{NM}(\rho_{sB_2}(t))$  has no contribution in  $M_{NM}^1$ . The presence of  $M_{NM}^1$  in the inequality (33), therefore, indicates a deviation from the Markovian regime and can be regarded as a witness of non-Markovianity. A nonzero value of  $M_{NM}^1$  signals non-Markovianity in the dynamics.

The altered form of Spohn's theorem illustrated in (33) is obtained for a two-qubit two-bath setup. For a general  $(m+n)$ -qubit system, schematically depicted in the left panel of Fig. 1, the total GKSL equation takes the form,  $\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\rho}_s(t) = \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) \equiv \sum_{j=1}^m \mathcal{L}_{M_j}(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{L}_{NM_j}(\rho_{sB_2}(t))$ . The witness of non-Markovianity in this general case of  $m+n$  qubits turns out to be

$$\begin{aligned} M_{NM}^n \\ = k_B \sum_{j=1}^n \text{tr} \{ \mathcal{D}_{NM_j}(\rho_{sB_{NM,1\dots n}}(t)) \\ (\ln(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) - \ln(\tilde{\rho}_{th_{NM_j}})) \} \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

and the modified Spohn's theorem has the form,

$$\sigma_{1\dots n} + M_{NM}^n \geq 0. \quad (35)$$

We can therefore define a quantifier of non-Markovianity as

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{M}_{NM}^n \\ = k_B \sum_{j=1}^n \left| \text{tr} \{ \mathcal{D}_{NM_j}(\rho_{sB_{NM,1\dots n}}(t)) \right. \\ \left. (\ln(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) - \ln(\tilde{\rho}_{th_{NM_j}})) \} \right| \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

for the dynamics of  $m+n$  qubits,  $m$  of which are connected to Markovian baths, while  $n$  are to non-Markovian ones. For a Markovian dynamics, the local superoperators as well as the total GKSL equation guarantees the existence of steady states, and therefore the quantifier appears with  $\overline{M}_{NM}^0 = 0$ . In case there is at least one non-markovian bath, the quantifier  $\overline{M}_{NM}^n$  gives a positive (non-zero) value. It is an important point to be noted that the quantifiers of non-Markovianity described in the literature are typically not easily computable. The quantifier  $\overline{M}_{NM}^n$  is, however, easily computable, and therein lies its potential utility, viz. in providing a computable strength of non-markovianity in the dynamics of a system. Now, we study in the next subsection, how the non-Markovianity of the dynamics increases by adding a non-Markovian bath, or by replacing a Markovian bath with a non-Markovian one.

#### A. Four qubits coupled to a combination of four Markovian and non-Markovian heat baths locally

Consider four non-interacting single-qubit systems, each locally immersed in a Markovian bosonic heat bath, so that the local canonical equilibrium states are the steady states of the partial superoperators. So, as we discussed in the previous section, the quantifier,  $\overline{M}_{NM}^0 = 0$  in this case. We now replace the Markovian baths one by one with non-Markovian ones, and study its response in the non-Markovian quantifier  $\overline{M}_{NM}^n$  with time.

The Hamiltonian of the composite four-qubit four-bath setup is

$$H_{tot} = \sum_{j=1}^4 (H_{s_j} + H_{B_{j,X}} + H_{I_{j,X}}), \quad (37)$$

with  $X$  in the suffixes of the second and the third terms indicating whether the contribution is coming from a Markovian ( $M$ ) or a non-Markovian ( $NM$ ) bath. The local Hamiltonian of each TLS is given by

$$H_{s_j} = \frac{\hbar\omega_j}{2} \sigma_j^z, \quad (38)$$

having the ground state eigenvalue  $-\frac{\hbar\omega_j}{2}$  corresponding to the state  $|1\rangle$  and the excited state eigenvalue  $\frac{\hbar\omega_j}{2}$  corresponding to the state  $|0\rangle$ . For the Markovian harmonic oscillator baths, the local Hamiltonian of each bath can be expressed as

$$H_{B_{j,M}} = \int_0^{\eta_{max_j}} \hbar \tilde{\eta} d\eta_j a_{\eta_j}^\dagger a_{\eta_j}, \quad (39)$$




FIG. 2. Time dynamics of the non-Markovianity quantifier. Here we plot the behavior of the quantifier of non-Markovianity,  $\overline{M}_{NM}^n$ , with time for (a)  $n = 1$ , where only the fourth bath is non-Markovian and the other three are Markovian, (b)  $n = 2$ , where the third and fourth baths are non-Markovian and the other two are Markovian and (c)  $n = 3$ , where only the first bath is Markovian and the other three are non-Markovian, for the initial state of the system taken as  $|\psi_s(0)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0000\rangle + |1111\rangle)$ . For the demonstration, we have chosen  $\omega_1 = 50.0$ ,  $\omega_2 = 55.0$ ,  $\omega_3 = 60.0$ ,  $\omega_4 = 65.0$  and  $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \nu_3 = \nu_4 = 1.0$  and the temperatures of the heat baths are set to be  $T_1 = 127.33$ ,  $T_2 = 105.57$ ,  $T_3 = 95.8$  and  $T_4 = 68.6$ . The coupling constants are taken to be  $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = \kappa_3 = 10^{-3}$  and  $\alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha_4 = 5 \times 10^{-3}$ . The quantities plotted along the horizontal axes are dimensionless and the same along the vertical axes have the unit of  $k_B \tilde{\eta}$ .

and the same for each non-Markovian bath is taken as

$$H_{B_{j,NM}} = \hbar \nu_j J_j^+ J_j^-. \quad (40)$$

For the harmonic oscillator baths,  $\tilde{\eta}$  is a constant, being in the unit of frequency,  $a_{\eta_j}^\dagger$  ( $a_{\eta_j}$ ) represents the bosonic creation (annihilation) operator of the harmonic oscillator of the  $j^{\text{th}}$  mode of the bath, having the unit of  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta_j}}$  and connected by the commutation relation  $[a_{\eta_i}, a_{\eta'_i}^\dagger] = \delta(\eta_i - \eta'_i)$ ,  $\eta_{max_j}$  is the cutoff frequency of the  $j^{\text{th}}$  Markovian bath. On the contrary, each of the non-Markovian baths, with frequency  $\nu_j$  for each  $j$ , is taken as one described by the spin-star model [96, 100] consisting of  $N$  localized quantum spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  particles centering the single qubit system at equal distances on a sphere, with  $J_j^\pm = \sum_{l=1}^N \sigma_{j,(l)}^\pm$ . Here  $\sigma_{j,(l)}^\pm = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{j,(l)}^x \pm i\sigma_{j,(l)}^y)$ , with  $\vec{\sigma}(\sigma^x, \sigma^y, \sigma^z)$  representing the Pauli matrices. The interaction between the systems and the local bosonic baths is considered

as

$$H_{I_{j,M}} = \int_0^{\eta_{max_j}} \hbar \sqrt{\tilde{\eta}} d\eta_j h(\eta_j) (a_{\eta_j}^\dagger \sigma_j^- + a_{\eta_j} \sigma_j^+), \quad (41)$$

where  $h(\eta_j)$  is a dimensionless function of  $\eta_j$ , and represents the system-bath coupling strength. For a harmonic oscillator bath,  $\tilde{\eta} h^2(\eta_j) = \mathcal{J}(\eta_j)$ , where  $\mathcal{J}(\eta_j)$  is the ohmic spectral density function. As we consider the spectral density function as ohmic,  $\mathcal{J}(\eta_j) \propto \eta_j$ . Thus  $\mathcal{J}(\eta_j) = \kappa_j \eta_j$ , where  $\kappa_j$  are unitless constants. For the qubits connected to non-Markovian spin baths, the interaction is through a Heisenberg  $XY$  coupling [101], given by

$$H_{I_{j,NM}} = \hbar \alpha_j (\sigma_j^+ J_j^- + \sigma_j^- J_j^+). \quad (42)$$

Here  $\alpha_j$  quantifies the coupling strength between the  $j^{\text{th}}$  system and the  $j^{\text{th}}$  non-Markovian bath, having the unit of frequency. The dynamical equation for the  $(m+n) = 4$ -qubit system, locally connected to a combination of Markovian and

non-Markovian heat baths, directly follows from Eq. (22), and is given by

$$\frac{d\rho}{d(\tilde{\eta}t)} = \frac{1}{\tilde{\eta}} \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) = -\frac{i}{\hbar\tilde{\eta}} [H_s, \tilde{\rho}_s(t)] + \frac{1}{\tilde{\eta}} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathcal{D}_{M_j}(\tilde{\rho}_s(t)) + \frac{1}{\tilde{\eta}} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{D}_{NM_j}(\rho_{sB_{NM,1\dots n}}(t)). \quad (43)$$

Both sides of the equation are made dimensionless. For the purpose of our demonstration, we will take the variable  $\tilde{t} = \tilde{\eta}t$  as the dimensionless time.

In Fig. 2, we have depicted the time dynamics of the quantifier  $\overline{M}_{NM}^n$  for  $n = 1, 2$ , and 3. In all the three panels, the quantifier exhibits oscillating profiles. The envelope of  $\overline{M}_{NM}^n$  increases for a short time near zero, reaches a peak and then decreases monotonically, tending to zero for large time. This implies that while the non-Markovian baths have a significant contribution for times near the initial time, for larger time, the effect of Markovian baths dominate, suppressing the amplitude of oscillations of the non-Markovianity quantifier to approximately zero. More the number of Markovian baths, the quicker is the suppression. (Compare the panels (a), (b) and (c) of Fig. 2). For a complete non-Markovian situation, where all the baths are from the non-Markovian family, the periodic oscillatory pattern of the quantifier gets disrupted. The amplitude of oscillation does not diminish with time, as there is no Markovian bath to suppress the oscillation as in case of the combination of local Markovian and non-Markovian dynam-

ics.

## V. CONCLUSION

To summarize, we have derived the GKSL equation for a situation containing more than one system, each interacting locally with a separate heat bath, some of which are Markovian, while others are non-Markovian. This leads to a modification of the Spohn's theorem, taken to the multiparty case with a mixed set of local environments. As a consequence of the modification, we obtained a computable quantifier of non-Markovianity which can detect the deviation from a Markovian situation. Analysis of the time dynamics of the quantifier showed that for an evolution affected by a combination of local Markovian and non-Markovian baths, non-Markovian effects are prominent for times close to initial time, but with the increase of time, non-Markovianity of the dynamics decreases and the evolution tends to be more and more Markovian-like.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge computations performed using Armadillo [102, 103] and QIClib [104] on the cluster computing facility of the Harish-Chandra Research Institute, India. This research was supported in part by the 'INFOSYS scholarship for senior students'. We also acknowledge partial support from the Department of Science and Technology, Government of India, through QuEST with Grant No. DST/ICPS/QUST/Theme-3/2019/120.

- 
- [1] J. P. Palao, R. Kosloff, and J. M. Gordon, Quantum thermodynamic cooling cycle, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 056130 (2001).
  - [2] T. Feldmann and R. Kosloff, Quantum four-stroke heat engine: Thermodynamic observables in a model with intrinsic friction, *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 016101 (2003).
  - [3] A. Levy and R. Kosloff, Quantum Absorption Refrigerator, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 070604 (2012).
  - [4] R. Kosloff and A. Levy, Quantum Heat Engines and Refrigerators: Continuous Devices, *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry* **65**, 365 (2014).
  - [5] R. Uzdin, A. Levy, and R. Kosloff, Equivalence of Quantum Heat Machines, and Quantum-Thermodynamic Signatures, *Phys. Rev. X* **5**, 031044 (2015).
  - [6] F. Clivaz, R. Silva, G. Haack, J. B. Brask, N. Brunner, and M. Huber, Unifying Paradigms of Quantum Refrigeration: A Universal and Attainable Bound on Cooling, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 170605 (2019).
  - [7] M. T. Mitchison, Quantum thermal absorption machines: refrigerators, engines and clocks, *Contemporary Physics* **60**, 164 (2019).
  - [8] Q. Yuan, T. Wang, P. Yu, H. Zhang, H. Zhang, and W. Ji, A review on the electroluminescence properties of quantum-dot light-emitting diodes, *Organic Electronics* **90**, 106086 (2021).
  - [9] K. Joulain, J. Drevillon, Y. Ezzahri, and J. Ordonez-Miranda, Quantum Thermal Transistor, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 200601 (2016).
  - [10] Y. Zhang, Z. Yang, X. Zhang, B. Lin, G. Lin, and J. Chen, Coulomb-coupled quantum-dot thermal transistors, *Europhysics Letters* **122** 17002 (2018).
  - [11] S. Su, Y. Zhang, B. Andresen, and J. Chen, Quantum coherence thermal transistors, arXiv:1811.02400.
  - [12] A. Mandarino, K. Joulain, M. D. Gómez, and B. Bellomo, Thermal transistor effect in quantum systems, *Phys. Rev. Applied* **16**, 034026 (2021).
  - [13] H. P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002).
  - [14] R. Alicki and K. Lendi, *Quantum Dynamical Semigroups and Applications* (Springer, Berlin Heidelberg 2007).
  - [15] A. Rivas and S. F. Huelga, *Open Quantum Systems: An Introduction* (Springer Briefs in Physics, Springer, Spain, 2012).
  - [16] D. A. Lidar, Lecture Notes on the Theory of Open Quantum Systems, arXiv:1902.00967.
  - [17] A. E. Allahverdyan and T. M. Nieuwenhuizen, Extraction of Work from a Single Thermal Bath in the Quantum Regime, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 1799 (2000).
  - [18] G. Gemmer, M. Michel, and G. Mahler, *Quantum Thermodynamics* (Springer, New York, 2004).
  - [19] R. Kosloff, Quantum Thermodynamics: A Dynamical Viewpoint, *Entropy* **15**, 2100 (2013).



- [20] F. Brandão, M. Horodecki, N. Ng, J. Oppenheim, and S. Wehner, The second laws of quantum thermodynamics, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112**, 3275 (2015).
- [21] B. Gardas and S. Deffner, Thermodynamic universality of quantum Carnot engines, *Phys. Rev. E* **92**, 042126 (2015).
- [22] D. Gelbwaser-Klimovsky, W. Niedenzu, and G. Kurizki, Thermodynamics of quantum systems under dynamical control, *Adv. At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **64**, 329 (2015).
- [23] A. Misra, U. Singh, M. N. Bera, and A. K. Rajagopal, Quantum Rényi relative entropies affirm universality of thermodynamics, *Phys. Rev. E* **92**, 042161 (2015).
- [24] J. Millen and A. Xuereb, Perspective on quantum thermodynamics, *New Journal of Physics* **18**, 011002 (2016).
- [25] S. Vinjanampathy and J. Anders, Quantum thermodynamics, *Contemporary Physics* **57**, 545 (2016).
- [26] J. Goold, M. Huber, A. Riera, L. del Rio, and P. Skrzypczyk, The role of quantum information in thermodynamics—a topical review, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **49**, 143001 (2016).
- [27] G. Benenti, G. Casati, K. Saito, and R. S. Whitney, Fundamental aspects of steady-state conversion of heat to work at the nanoscale, *Phys. Rep.* **694**, 1 (2017).
- [28] F. Binder, L. A. Correa, C. Gogolin, J. Anders, and G. Adesso, *Thermodynamics in the Quantum Regime: Fundamental Aspects and New Directions* (Springer, 2018).
- [29] S. Deffner and S. Campbell, *Quantum Thermodynamics* (Morgan and Claypool Publishers, 2019).
- [30] Á Rivas, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Quantum Non-Markovianity: Characterization, Quantification and Detection, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **77**, 094001 (2014).
- [31] H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, and J. Piilo, Measure for the Degree of Non-Markovian Behavior of Quantum Processes in Open Systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 210401 (2009).
- [32] Á. Rivas, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Entanglement and Non-Markovianity of Quantum Evolutions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 050403 (2010).
- [33] D. Chruściński, A. Kossakowski, Á. Rivas, On measures of non-Markovianity: divisibility vs. backflow of information, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 052128 (2011).
- [34] H.-S. Zeng, N. Tang, Y.-P. Zheng, and G.-Y. Wang, Equivalence of the measures of non-Markovianity for open two-level systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 032118 (2011).
- [35] T. Debarba and F. F. Fanchini, Non-Markovianity quantifier of an arbitrary quantum process, *Phys. Rev. A* **96**, 062118 (2017).
- [36] P. Strasberg and M. Esposito, Response Functions as Quantifiers of Non-Markovianity, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 040601 (2018).
- [37] S. Das, S. S. Roy, S. Bhattacharya, and U. Sen, Nearly Markovian maps and entanglement-based bound on corresponding non-Markovianity, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **54**, 395301 (2021).
- [38] Z. Huang and X.-K. Guo, Quantifying non-Markovianity via conditional mutual information, *Phys. Rev. A* **104**, 032212 (2021).
- [39] H. Spohn, Entropy production for quantum dynamical semigroups, *J. Math. Phys.* **19**, 1227 (1978).
- [40] H. Spohn and J. Lebowitz, Irreversible Thermodynamics for Quantum Systems Weakly Coupled to Thermal Reservoirs, *Adv. Chem. Phys.* **38**, 109 (1978).
- [41] B. Bylicka, M. Tukiainen, D. Chruściński, J. Piilo, and S. Maniscalco, Thermodynamic power of non-Markovianity, *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 27989 (2016).
- [42] S. Marcantoni, S. Alipour, F. Benatti, R. Floreanini, and A. T. Rezakhani, Entropy production and non-Markovian dynamical maps, *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 12447 (2017).
- [43] S. Bhattacharya, A. Misra, C. Mukhopadhyay, and A. K. Pati, Exact master equation for a spin interacting with a spin bath: Non-Markovianity and negative entropy production rate, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 012122 (2017).
- [44] M. Popovic, B. Vacchini, and S. Campbell, Entropy production and correlations in a controlled non-Markovian setting, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 012130 (2018).
- [45] P. Strasberg and M. Esposito, Non-Markovianity and negative entropy production rates, *Phys. Rev. E* **99**, 012120 (2019).
- [46] P. Nazé and M. V. S. Bonança, Compatibility of linear-response theory with the second law of thermodynamics and the emergence of negative entropy production rates, *J. Stat. Mech.* 013206, (2020).
- [47] M. V. S. Bonança, P. Nazé, and S. Deffner, Negative entropy production rates in Drude-Sommerfeld metals, *Phys. Rev. E* **103**, 012109 (2021).
- [48] A. Ghoshal and U. Sen, Heat current and entropy production rate in local non-Markovian quantum dynamics of global Markovian evolution, *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 022424 (2022).
- [49] R. Alicki, The quantum open system as a model of the heat engine, *J. Phys. A* **12**, L103 (1979).
- [50] J. Vollmer, L. Matyas, and T. Tel, Escape-rate formalism, decay to steady states, and divergences in the entropy-production rate, *J. Stat. Phys.* **109**, 875 (2001).
- [51] H.-P. Breuer, Quantum jumps and entropy production, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 032105 (2003).
- [52] S. Abe and Y. Nakada, Temporal extensivity of Tsallis' entropy and the bound on entropy production rate, *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 021120 (2006).
- [53] M. M. Bandi, W. I. Goldburg, and J. R. Cressman Jr, Measurement of entropy production rate in compressible turbulence, *EPL* **76**, 595 (2006).
- [54] M. Salis, arXiv:physics/0609040.
- [55] K. Turitsyn, M. Chertkov, V. Y. Chernyak, and A. Puliafito, Statistics of Entropy Production in Linearized Stochastic Systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 180603 (2007).
- [56] B. Andrae, J. Cremer, T. Reichenbach, and E. Frey, Entropy Production of Cyclic Population Dynamics, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 218102 (2010).
- [57] M. Esposito, K. Lindenberg, and C. Van den Broeck, Entropy production as correlation between system and reservoir, *New J. Phys.* **12**, 013013 (2010).
- [58] S. Deffner and E. Lutz, Nonequilibrium Entropy Production for Open Quantum Systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 140404 (2011).
- [59] E. Carlen and A. Soffer, Propagation of Localization Optimal Entropy Production and Convergence rates for the Central Limit Theorem, arXiv:1106.2256.
- [60] B. Xu and Z. Wang, Measurement and Application of Entropy Production Rate in Human Subject Social Interaction Systems, arXiv:1107.6043.
- [61] Y. Kawazura and Z. Yoshida, Comparison of entropy production rates in two different types of self-organized flows: Bénard convection and zonal flow, *Physics of Plasmas* **19**, 012305 (2012).
- [62] M. O. Hase and M. J. de Oliveira, Irreversible spherical model and its stationary entropy production rate, *J. Phys. A* **45**, 165003 (2012).
- [63] J. M. Horowitz and J. M. R. Parrondo, Entropy production along nonequilibrium quantum jump trajectories, *New J. Phys.* **15**, 085028 (2013).

- [64] Y. E. Kuzovlev, On energy exchange rate and entropy production operators in quantum fluctuation-dissipation relations, arXiv:1305.3533.
- [65] K. Banerjee and K. Bhattacharyya, Entropy production as a universal functional of reaction rate: chemical networks close to steady states, *J. Math. Chem.* **52**, 820 (2014).
- [66] Y. Haitao and D. Jiulin, Entropy Production Rate of Non-equilibrium Systems from the Fokker-Planck Equation, *Braz. J. Phys.* **44**, 410 (2014).
- [67] R. Wang and L. Xu, Asymptotics of the Entropy Production Rate for d-Dimensional Ornstein–Uhlenbeck Processes, *J. Stat. Phys.* **160**, 1336 (2015).
- [68] F.-Y. Wang, J. Xiong, and L. Xu, Asymptotics of Sample Entropy Production Rate for Stochastic Differential Equations, *J. Stat. Phys.* **163**, 1211 (2016).
- [69] Y. Chen, H. Ge, J. Xiong, and L. Xu, The large deviation principle and steady-state fluctuation theorem for the entropy production rate of a stochastic process in magnetic fields, *J. Math. Phys.* **57**, 073302 (2016).
- [70] M. A. Taye, Free energy and entropy production rate for a Brownian particle that walks on overdamped medium, *Phys. Rev. E* **94**, 032111 (2016).
- [71] Y. Zhang and A. C. Barato, Critical behavior of entropy production and learning rate: Ising model with an oscillating field, *J. Stat. Mech.* 113207 (2016).
- [72] M. Ploskon and M. Veselsky, On the upper bound of entropy production rate from particle multiplicity in heavy ion collisions, arXiv:1702.01103.
- [73] J. D. V. Jaramillo and J. Fransson, Charge Transport and Entropy Production Rate in Magnetically Active Molecular Dimer, *J. Phys. Chem. C* **121**, 27357 (2017).
- [74] J. P. Santos, G. T. Landi, and M. Paternostro, Wigner Entropy Production Rate, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 220601 (2017)
- [75] Q. Zeng and J. Wang, Information Landscape and Flux, Mutual Information Rate Decomposition and Connections to Entropy Production, *Entropy* **19**, 678 (2017).
- [76] D. M. Busiello, J. Hidalgo, and A. Maritan, Entropy production in systems with random transition rates close to equilibrium, *Phys. Rev. E* **96**, 062110 (2017).
- [77] P. D. Dixit, Entropy production rate as a criterion for inconsistency in decision theory, *J. Stat. Mech.* 053408 (2018).
- [78] T. Kanda, A model of Josephson junctions on Boson systems—Currents and entropy production rate, *J. Math. Phys.* **59**, 102107 (2018).
- [79] D. S. Seara, V. Yadav, I. Linsmeier, A. P. Tabatabai, P. W. Oakes, S. M. A. Tabei, S. Banerjee, and M. P. Murrell, Entropy production rate is maximized in non-contractile actomyosin, *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 4948 (2018).
- [80] J. S. Lee, S. H. Lee, J. Um, and H. Park, Carnot Efficiency and Zero-Entropy Production Rate Do Not Guarantee Reversibility of a Process, *J. Korean Phys. Soc.* **75**, 948 (2019).
- [81] D. H. Wolpert, Minimal entropy production due to constraints on rate matrix dependencies in multipartite processes, arXiv:2001.02205.
- [82] B. O. Goes, G. T. Landi, E. Solano, M. Sanz, and L. C. Céleri, Wehrl entropy production rate across a dynamical quantum phase transition, *Phys. Rev. Research* **2**, 033419 (2020).
- [83] J. K.-Przymus and M. Lemańczyk, Entropy rate of product of independent processes, arXiv:2004.07648.
- [84] A. Budhiraja, Y. Chen, and L. Xu, Large Deviations of the Entropy Production Rate for a Class of Gaussian Processes, arXiv:2004.08754.
- [85] G. Zicari, M. Brunelli, and M. Paternostro, Assessing the role of initial correlations in the entropy production rate for nonequilibrium harmonic dynamics, *Phys. Rev. Research* **2**, 043006 (2020).
- [86] J. Kappler and R. Adhikari, Measurement of irreversibility and entropy production via the tubular ensemble, arXiv:2007.11639.
- [87] G. Gibbins and J. D. Haigh, Entropy Production Rates of the Climate, *J. Atmos. Sci.* **77**, 3551 (2020).
- [88] Y. I. Li and M. E. Cates, Steady state entropy production rate for scalar Langevin field theories, *J. Stat. Mech.* 013211 (2021).
- [89] C. Tietz, S. Schuler, T. Speck, U. Seifert, and J. Wrachtrup, Measurement of Stochastic Entropy Production, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 050602 (2006).
- [90] D. C.-Jiang and L. L.-Fu, Chinese Experimental Study of Entropy Production in Cells under Alternating Electric Field, *Phys. Lett.* **29**, 088701 (2012).
- [91] M. Rossi, L. Mancino, G. T. Landi, M. Paternostro, A. Schliesser, and A. Belenchia, Experimental Assessment of Entropy Production in a Continuously Measured Mechanical Resonator, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 080601 (2020).
- [92] N. Prokof'ev, P. Stamp, Theory of the spin bath, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **63**, 669 (2000).
- [93] J. Fischer and H.-P. Breuer, Correlated projection operator approach to non-Markovian dynamics in spin baths, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 052119 (2007).
- [94] S. Camalet and R. Chitra, Effect of random interactions in spin baths on decoherence, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 094434 (2007).
- [95] S. Bhattacharya, B. Bhattacharya, and A. S. Majumdar, Thermodynamic utility of Non-Markovianity from the perspective of resource interconversion, arXiv:1902.05864.
- [96] H.-P. Breuer, D. Burgarth, and F. Petruccione, Non-Markovian dynamics in a spin star system: Exact solution and approximation techniques, *Phys. Rev. B* **70**, 045323 (2004).
- [97] L. A. Correa, J. P. Palao, G. Adesso, and D. Alonso, Performance bound for quantum absorption refrigerators, *Phys. Rev. E* **87**, 042131 (2013).
- [98] S. R. de Groot and P. Mazur, *Non-Equilibrium Thermodynamics* (Dover, New York, 2013).
- [99] A. Hewgill, G. D. Chiara, and A. Imparato, Quantum thermodynamically consistent local master equations, *Phys. Rev. Research* **3**, 013165 (2021).
- [100] A. Hutton and S. Bose, Mediated entanglement and correlations in a star network of interacting spins, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 042312 (2004).
- [101] E. Lieb, T. Schultz, and D. Mattis, Two soluble models of an antiferromagnetic chain, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **16**, 407 (1961).
- [102] C. Sanderson and R. Curtin, *Armadillo: a template-based C++ library for linear algebra*, *Journal of Open Source Software* **1**, 26 (2016).
- [103] C. Sanderson and R. Curtin, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (LNCS)* 10931, 422 (2018).
- [104] T. Chanda, *QIClib*, <https://titaschanda.github.io/QIClib>.