

Quantum Onsager relations

Mankei Tsang^{1,2,*}

¹*Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering,
National University of Singapore, 4 Engineering Drive 3, Singapore 117583*

²*Department of Physics, National University of Singapore, 2 Science Drive 3, Singapore 117551*
(Dated: May 30, 2024)

Using quantum information geometry, I derive quantum generalizations of the Onsager rate equations, which model the dynamics of an open system near a steady state. The generalized equations hold for a flexible definition of the forces as well as a large class of statistical divergence measures and quantum-Fisher-information metrics beyond the conventional definition of entropy production. I also derive quantum Onsager-Casimir relations for the transport tensors by proposing a general concept of time reversal and detailed balance for open quantum systems. The results establish a remarkable connection between statistical mechanics and parameter estimation theory.

I. INTRODUCTION

In statistical mechanics, one is often interested in the dynamics of a system close to a steady state. A crown jewel of near-equilibrium statistical mechanics is the Onsager relations, which refer to a symmetry of the transport coefficients for a broad class of irreversible processes in diverse areas of physics and chemistry [1–4].

The basic idea of Onsager’s theory is as follows. It was noticed that, for a wide range of open systems near equilibrium, the rate of entropy production, denoted as R , can be expressed as

$$R = f^j \dot{y}_j, \quad (1.1)$$

where Einstein summation is assumed, $\{f^1, f^2, \dots\}$ are thermodynamic forces, such as inverse temperatures and chemical potentials at various parts of a system, each y_j is the thermodynamic variable conjugate to the force f^j , such as energy or particle number, and \dot{y}_j is the rate of change of y_j in time called a current. Moreover, the currents were often observed to follow the relation

$$\dot{y}_j = O_{jk} f^k, \quad (1.2)$$

where O is called the Onsager transport tensor. Onsager argued that, if the system satisfies detailed balance, then the tensor is symmetric, viz.,

$$O_{jk} = O_{kj}. \quad (1.3)$$

Eq. (1.3) is called the Onsager relation. The most famous example may be the relation between the Peltier and Seebeck thermoelectric coefficients [2]. Quantum versions of Eq. (1.3) have been proposed most notably by Alicki [5], Spohn and Lebowitz [6], and Lendi [7]; see also Refs. [8–10].

Eq. (1.3) can also be generalized for variables that transform nontrivially under time reversal or when time-reversal symmetry is broken by, for example, an external magnetic field. The resulting relations are called Onsager-Casimir relations [11, 12], which relate the transport tensors before and after the external field is reversed.

Most classical derivations of the Onsager theory assume Gaussian statistics and linear dynamics, that is, $\dot{y} = Ly$ for some rate matrix L [3, 4]. The approach of Alicki [5] and Lendi [7], on the other hand, may be the most general so far, as they are based on open quantum system theory and do not assume Gaussian statistics or linear dynamics. This work further generalizes their approach using quantum information geometry [13, 14], showing that Eqs. (1.1)–(1.3) can hold for a flexible definition of the forces beyond the thermodynamic setting and a large class of statistical divergence measures, not just the conventional entropy production. I show that the theory of Fisher information [13, 14] is the hitherto unappreciated foundation underlying Eqs. (1.1) and (1.2), thereby establishing a remarkable connection between statistical mechanics and parameter estimation theory.

To derive quantum Onsager-Casimir relations, one needs to invoke the concept of time reversal. Time reversal for a closed system in terms of an antiunitary operator is, of course, a well established concept in quantum mechanics [15, Sec. 4.4], but its

* mankei@nus.edu.sg; <https://blog.nus.edu.sg/mankei/>

definition for open quantum systems is far trickier. Here I propose a definition that generalizes Agarwal's approach [16] and use it to derive quantum Onsager-Casimir relations.

This work is organized as follows. Secs. II and III introduce the necessary background of open quantum system theory [17] and quantum information geometry [13, 14]. Sec. IV presents two key results of this work: Theorem 1, which is a somewhat abstract analog of Eqs. (1.1)–(1.3) in the context of quantum information geometry, and Theorem 2, which uses Theorem 1 to prove a more physical generalization of Eqs. (1.1) and (1.2). Sec. V proposes a general theory of time reversal for open quantum systems and uses it to derive quantum Onsager-Casimir relations, generalizing Eq. (1.3). Sec. VI is the conclusion, while the appendices contain miscellaneous calculations and proofs that support the main text.

II. OPEN QUANTUM SYSTEM THEORY

Let $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ be the set of all operators on a complex Hilbert space \mathcal{H} and $\mathcal{O}_s(\mathcal{H}) \equiv \{A \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}) : A = A^\dagger\}$ be the set of Hermitian operators, where \dagger denotes the Hermitian conjugate. Model the state of an open quantum system in the Schrödinger picture at time $t \geq 0$ by a density operator $\rho(t) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{O}_s(\mathcal{H})$, where $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ is the set of positive-definite operators with unit trace. Model the dynamics by a quantum Markov semigroup

$$\{\mathcal{F}(t) = \exp(\mathcal{L}t) : t \geq 0\}, \quad (2.1)$$

where each $\mathcal{F}(t) : \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ is a completely positive, trace-preserving (CPTP) map that maps Hermitian operators to Hermitian operators and density operators to density operators. \mathcal{L} is called the semigroup generator and can be expressed in the Gorini-Kossakowski-Sudarshan-Lindblad (GKSL) form [18, 19]. Denoting the time derivative as $\dot{g}(t) \equiv \partial g(t)/\partial t$, one can write

$$\rho(t) = \mathcal{F}(t)\rho(0), \quad \dot{\mathcal{F}}(t) = \mathcal{L}\mathcal{F}(t), \quad \dot{\rho}(t) = \mathcal{L}\rho(t). \quad (2.2)$$

In quantum optics, quantum thermodynamics, and quantum information theory, quantum Markov semigroup is a basic tool for modeling the effective dynamics of open quantum systems coupled with reservoirs [17, 20–22]. Its use may be less prevalent in condensed matter physics [23], but its complete positivity and Markovianity make it the appropriate basis for a quantum Onsager theory: complete positivity ensures conformance with the second law of thermodynamics [17, 24], while Markovianity is a standard assumption in the classical Onsager theory [4, 25].

Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ be a steady state of the semigroup, viz.,

$$\mathcal{F}(t)\sigma = \sigma \quad \forall t, \quad \mathcal{L}\sigma = 0. \quad (2.3)$$

To model all the possible ways an experimenter can perturb the initial state $\rho(0)$ away from the steady state, suppose that $\rho(0)$ depends on a p -dimensional parameter $\theta \in \Phi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$. The dependence is modeled by a function $\tau : \Phi \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$, so that $\rho(0) = \tau(\theta)$. Suppose that $0 \in \Phi$ without loss of generality and $\tau(0)$ coincides with the steady state, viz., $\tau(0) = \sigma$. To model the near-equilibrium condition in the Onsager theory, assume that the initial state $\rho(0)$ is close to the steady state, such that it can be approximated by the first-order Taylor series

$$\rho(0) = \tau(\epsilon v) = \sigma + \epsilon v^j \partial_j \tau + o(\epsilon), \quad (2.4)$$

where $\partial_j g(\theta) \equiv \partial g(\theta)/\partial \theta^j |_{\theta=0}$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a vector, $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ is an infinitesimal real number, and $o(\epsilon)$ denotes terms asymptotically smaller than ϵ . $\rho(t)$ can then be approximated as

$$\rho(t) = \mathcal{F}(t)\rho(0) = \sigma + \epsilon v^j \mathcal{F}(t)\partial_j \tau + o(\epsilon). \quad (2.5)$$

The following two physical examples will be used to illustrate the theory throughout this work.

Example 1. Consider a system with a steady state given by a generalized Gibbs state [26]

$$\sigma = \frac{\exp(\lambda^j G_j)}{\text{tr} \exp(\lambda^j G_j)}, \quad (2.6)$$

where each $\lambda^j \in \mathbb{R}$ is a real parameter and each $G_j \in \mathcal{O}_s(\mathcal{H})$ is a Hermitian operator. In practice, $\{G_j\}$ may be a set of energy and particle-number operators for different parts of the system. $\{\lambda^j\}$ are then proportional to the inverse temperatures and chemical potentials of the subsystems at the steady state. Suppose that the parameters can be controlled by a reservoir coupled to the system. Some time before $t = 0$, some controls at the reservoir are switched on to prepare the system in a perturbed Gibbs

state at $t = 0$ given by

$$\rho(0) = \tau(\epsilon v) = \frac{\exp[(\lambda^j + \epsilon v^j)G_j]}{\text{tr} \exp[(\lambda^j + \epsilon v^j)G_j]}. \quad (2.7)$$

The controls are then switched off at $t = 0$, such that the dynamics is modeled by the semigroup $\mathcal{F}(t)$ for $t \geq 0$, σ is the steady state of the dynamics, and the system evolves from the initial state $\rho(0)$ that is slightly perturbed from σ .

Example 2. Suppose that the system is in a steady state σ for $t < 0$ but experiences a gentle kick right before $t = 0$, modeled by a unitary operator

$$U = \exp(-i\epsilon v^j G_j), \quad (2.8)$$

where each $G_j \in \mathcal{O}_s(\mathcal{H})$ is a generator of the unitary. The kick in practice may be a force on a mechanical system, an applied voltage on charges, a magnetic field on spins, a source generating electromagnetic fields, a phase modulation on light, or any combination of them on a hybrid system. Then the state at $t = 0$ becomes

$$\rho(0) = \tau(\epsilon v) = U\sigma U^\dagger = \sigma - i\epsilon v^j [G_j, \sigma] + o(\epsilon). \quad (2.9)$$

The dynamics for $t \geq 0$ is again assumed to be modeled by $\mathcal{F}(t)$.

In the following, a physicist's level of mathematical rigor will be adopted, in the sense that functions are as continuous as needed for differentiation, terms denoted by $o(\epsilon^n)$ are always assumed to be negligible, all proofs assume finite-dimensional spaces, and the results will be applied to a bosonic field in Example 2 despite the finite-dimensional assumptions in the proofs.

III. QUANTUM INFORMATION GEOMETRY

To introduce information geometry to the problem, assume a divergence measure between $\rho(t)$ and σ that can be approximated as

$$D(\rho(t) \parallel \sigma) = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 v^j J_{jk}(t) v^k + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (3.1)$$

$$J_{jk}(t) \equiv \text{tr} [\mathcal{F}(t) \partial_j \tau] \mathcal{E}_\sigma^{-1} [\mathcal{F}(t) \partial_k \tau], \quad (3.2)$$

where tr denotes the trace and $\mathcal{E}_\sigma : \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ is a linear map that depends on σ . I call \mathcal{E}_σ a density map. To make J well behaved, the density map is required to be self-adjoint and positive-definite with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product

$$\langle A, B \rangle \equiv \text{tr} A^\dagger B \quad \forall A, B \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}). \quad (3.3)$$

Then J is positive-semidefinite and can be regarded as a Riemannian metric. In estimation theory, J is called a quantum Fisher information [13, 14, 27]. Another common form of Eq. (3.2) can be obtained by defining an operator $X_j(t) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ as the solution to

$$\partial_j \mathcal{F}(t) \tau = \mathcal{F}(t) \partial_j \tau = \mathcal{E}_\sigma X_j(t), \quad (3.4)$$

such that

$$J_{jk}(t) = \langle X_j(t), X_k(t) \rangle_\sigma, \quad (3.5)$$

where the weighted inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\sigma$ is defined as

$$\langle A, B \rangle_\sigma \equiv \langle A, \mathcal{E}_\sigma B \rangle = \text{tr} A^\dagger \mathcal{E}_\sigma B \quad \forall A, B \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}). \quad (3.6)$$

$X_j(t)$ is called a score, a logarithmic derivative, or the e representation of a tangent vector in information geometry [13, 14, 27]. In what follows, I assume that \mathcal{E}_σ maps Hermitian operators to Hermitian operators (a property called symmetric), such that each score is Hermitian, each $J_{jk}(t)$ entry is real, and the J tensor is symmetric, viz.,

$$J_{jk}(t) = J_{kj}(t). \quad (3.7)$$

Another vital property of information metrics is monotonicity, which means that $v^j J_{jk} v^k$ for any v cannot increase after any

CPTP map is applied to $\tau(\theta)$. For a finite-dimensional $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$, Petz has completely characterized the class of density maps that give monotone information metrics [27, 28], and I assume such a map in the following. To be explicit, the information metric is monotonic if and only if [27, 28]

$$\mathcal{E}_\sigma = \mathcal{R}_\sigma \phi(\Delta_\sigma), \quad (3.8)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_\sigma A \equiv A\sigma, \quad (3.9)$$

$$\Delta_\sigma A \equiv \sigma A \sigma^{-1}, \quad (3.10)$$

where $\phi : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an operator monotone function [27, Sec. 11.6], \mathcal{R}_σ is called the right product map, and Δ_σ is called the modular map. In addition, \mathcal{E}_σ is symmetric if and only if ϕ satisfies $\phi(u) = u\phi(1/u)$ [28, Theorem 7]. $\phi(1) = 1$ may also be assumed with little loss of generality to normalize \mathcal{E}_σ , such that $\mathcal{E}_\sigma A = \sigma A$ if σ and A commute. Define the rate at which the system converges to the steady state as

$$R(t) \equiv -\frac{d}{dt} D(\rho(t) \parallel \sigma) = -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 v^j \dot{J}_{jk}(t) v^k + o(\epsilon^2). \quad (3.11)$$

Monotonicity of J implies

$$v^j \dot{J}_{jk}(t) v^k \leq 0 \quad \forall t, v, \quad (3.12)$$

and the convergence rate is always nonnegative under the approximation given by Eq. (3.11). In other words, monotonicity is a generalization of the second law of thermodynamics.

It can be shown that, as time goes on, the expected score with respect to $\mathcal{F}(t)\tau(0) = \mathcal{F}(t)\sigma = \sigma$ for any density map always remains zero, viz.,

$$\text{tr } X_j(t)\sigma = 0 \quad \forall t, \quad (3.13)$$

and its time evolution can be expressed as

$$X_j(t) = \mathcal{F}_*(t) X_j(0), \quad (3.14)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_*(t) \equiv \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{F}(t)\sigma}^{-1} \mathcal{F}(t) \mathcal{E}_\sigma = \mathcal{E}_\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{F}(t) \mathcal{E}_\sigma = \exp(\mathcal{L}_* t), \quad (3.15)$$

$$\dot{X}_j(t) = \mathcal{L}_* X_j(t), \quad (3.16)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_* \equiv \mathcal{E}_\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{L} \mathcal{E}_\sigma, \quad (3.17)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_*(t)$ is called a generalized conditional expectation, a pushforward, or a retrodiction [13, 29–31], and \mathcal{L}_* is its generator. Fig. 1 illustrates these concepts in geometric terms.

I stress that $X_j(t)$ is not the Heisenberg picture of $X_j(0)$, and this work assumes the Schrödinger picture exclusively. Rather, $X_j(t)$ can be interpreted as the closest approximation of $X_j(0)$ at time t with respect to a certain distance measure, as discussed in Refs. [29, 30], generalizing the least-squares interpretation of the classical conditional expectation.

An alternative definition of the retrodiction map is as follows. Let \mathcal{M}^* be the Hilbert-Schmidt adjoint of a map \mathcal{M} , viz.,

$$\langle A, \mathcal{M}B \rangle = \langle \mathcal{M}^* A, B \rangle \quad \forall A, B \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}). \quad (3.18)$$

The Hilbert-Schmidt adjoint $\mathcal{F}^*(t)$ of the CPTP map $\mathcal{F}(t)$ is also a generalized conditional expectation, except that it is predictive [30]. The retrodictive $\mathcal{F}_*(t)$ can then be defined as the adjoint of the predictive $\mathcal{F}^*(t)$ with respect to the weighted inner product, viz.,

$$\langle \mathcal{F}^*(t)A, B \rangle_\sigma = \langle A, \mathcal{F}_*(t)B \rangle_\sigma \quad \forall A, B \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}). \quad (3.19)$$

I call \mathcal{F}_* the weighted adjoint of \mathcal{F}^* in this mathematical context. Similarly, let \mathcal{L}^* be the Hilbert-Schmidt adjoint of \mathcal{L} . Then \mathcal{L}_* is the weighted adjoint of \mathcal{L}^* , viz.,

$$\langle \mathcal{L}^* A, B \rangle_\sigma = \langle A, \mathcal{L}_* B \rangle_\sigma \quad \forall A, B \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}). \quad (3.20)$$

An illuminating example is the classical case shown in Appendix A, when all the operators commute. The quantum case is more complicated because many quantities depend on the choice of the density map. To clarify, Tables I list the main quantities in this work and whether each depends the choice of \mathcal{E}_σ .




FIG. 1. Top left: the curved surface represents a manifold of density operators $\{\tau(\theta) : \theta \in \Phi\}$ that can be prepared for the initial state. The $\tau(\theta_1, 0)$ curve represents the set of density operators for varying θ_1 and fixed $\theta_2 = 0$; the $\tau(0, \theta_2)$ curve is defined similarly. Each score $X_j(0) = \mathcal{E}_\sigma^{-1} \partial_j \tau$ represents the tangent vector of a curve at $\tau(0) = \sigma$. Top right: The CPTP map $\mathcal{F}(t)$ maps the manifold of density operators to a new manifold, while the pushforward $\mathcal{F}_*(t)$ maps each tangent vector $X_j(0)$ of a curve to the tangent vector $X_j(t) = \mathcal{F}_*(t)X_j(0)$ of the corresponding curve in the new manifold. Bottom left: Given an initial state $\tau(\epsilon v)$, $v^j X_j(0)$ represents the tangent vector that points from σ to $\tau(\epsilon v)$, which can be expressed in terms of $v^j X_j(0)$ as $\tau(\epsilon v) = \sigma + \epsilon \mathcal{E}_\sigma[v^j X_j(0)] + o(\epsilon)$. The tangent vector can be assigned a length $\sqrt{v^j \langle X_j(0), X_k(0) \rangle_\sigma v^k} = \sqrt{v^j J_{jk}(0) v^k}$ determined by the Fisher metric $J(0)$ at $t = 0$. The squared length $v^j J_{jk}(0) v^k$ determines the divergence between σ and $\tau(\epsilon v)$ in the leading order. Bottom right: The pushforward $\mathcal{F}_*(t)$ determines the new tangent vectors after time t . The rate at which the squared length $v^j J_{jk}(t) v^k$ shrinks determines the convergence rate $R(t)$ in the leading order.

Symbol	$\mathcal{F}(t)$	\mathcal{L}	σ	$\rho(0) = \tau(\theta)$	$\theta = \epsilon v$	$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\sigma$
Meaning	Markov semigroup	generator of $\mathcal{F}(t)$	steady state of $\mathcal{F}(t)$	initial state	parameters of initial state	weighted inner product
Depends on the choice of \mathcal{E}_σ ?	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Symbol	$J(t)$	$X_j(t)$	$\mathcal{F}_*(t)$	\mathcal{L}_*	$\mathcal{F}^*(t)$	\mathcal{L}^*
Meaning	Fisher information	score	retrodiction	generator of $\mathcal{F}_*(t)$	prediction	generator of $\mathcal{F}^*(t)$
Depends on the choice of \mathcal{E}_σ ?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No

TABLE I. The main quantities used in this work, their meanings, and whether each depends on the choice of the density map \mathcal{E}_σ .

The most popular divergence may be the Umegaki relative entropy

$$D(\rho||\sigma) = \text{tr } \rho (\ln \rho - \ln \sigma). \quad (3.21)$$

$R(t)$ is then the commonly assumed entropy production rate in quantum thermodynamics [17]. The Umegaki relative entropy can be approximated by Eq. (3.1) in terms of the so-called Bogoliubov version of the Fisher information [13, Eq. (6.34)]. This Bogoliubov version is given by Eq. (3.2) (or equivalently Eqs. (3.4) and (3.5)) in terms of the density map [13, Eq. (6.9)]

$$\mathcal{E}_{\sigma, \text{Bog}} A \equiv \int_0^1 \sigma^\lambda A \sigma^{1-\lambda} d\lambda, \quad (3.22)$$

where the second subscript of $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma, \text{version}}$ specifies the version of the density map.

Example 1 (continued). For the Gibbs parametrization given by Eqs. (2.6) and (2.7), one can use the identities (see Refs. [13,

Eq. (6.32)] and [27, Theorem 11.9])

$$\mathcal{E}_{\sigma, \text{Bog}}(\partial_j \ln \tau) = \partial_j \tau, \quad \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \text{tr} \exp(A + \lambda B) \right|_{\lambda=0} = \text{tr} B \exp A \quad (3.23)$$

to obtain the Bogoliubov score

$$X_j(0) = \partial_j \ln \tau = G_j - \text{tr} G_j \sigma. \quad (3.24)$$

As (θ^j, G_j) can be regarded as a pair of conjugate variables in thermodynamics, $(\epsilon v^j, X_j(0))$ are the deviations of the conjugate variables from the steady-state values $(\lambda^j, \text{tr} G_j \sigma)$.

Another popular divergence measure is the squared Bures distance [13]

$$D(\rho \parallel \sigma) = 4 \left(1 - \text{tr} \sqrt{\sqrt{\rho} \sigma \sqrt{\rho}} \right), \quad (3.25)$$

which has the useful advantage of remaining finite for pure states and is important for quantum hypothesis testing. As is well known [13, 27, 32, 33], it can be approximated by Eq. (3.1) [13, Eq. (6.33)] using Helstrom's version of the Fisher information, which is Eq. (3.2) in terms of the density map [13, Eqs. (6.8) and (6.33)]

$$\mathcal{E}_{\sigma, \text{Hel}} A \equiv \frac{1}{2} (\sigma A + A \sigma). \quad (3.26)$$

The Helstrom information plays a fundamental role in quantum estimation theory [13, 34].

Example 2 (continued). Consider a bosonic field with s modes and $2s$ canonical observables

$$Q \equiv (q_1 \ \dots \ q_s \ p_1 \ \dots \ p_s)^\top, \quad (3.27)$$

where \top denotes the matrix transpose such that Q is a column vector. The canonical observables satisfy the commutation relation

$$[q_j, p_k] = i \delta_{jk}, \quad (3.28)$$

where δ_{jk} denotes the Kronecker delta. The commutation relation can also be expressed as

$$[Q_j, Q_k] = i \Omega_{jk}, \quad (3.29)$$

where Ω is the $2s \times 2s$ symplectic matrix defined by

$$\Omega_{jk} \equiv \begin{cases} 0, & j = 1, \dots, s, k = 1, \dots, s, \\ 1, & j = 1, \dots, s, k = s + 1, \dots, 2s, \\ -1, & j = s + 1, \dots, 2s, k = 1, \dots, s, \\ 0, & j = s + 1, \dots, 2s, k = s + 1, \dots, 2s. \end{cases} \quad (3.30)$$

In matrix form, one can write

$$\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ -I & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.31)$$

where 0 is the $s \times s$ zero matrix and I is the $s \times s$ identity matrix. Define also the annihilation operators

$$a_j \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (q_j + i p_j), \quad j = 1, \dots, s, \quad (3.32)$$

satisfying

$$[a_j, a_k^\dagger] = \delta_{jk}. \quad (3.33)$$

For this example, no insight is gained by distinguishing between upper and lower indices, so I use only lower indices in the

following for clarity, although Einstein summation remains in use.

The Helstrom density map given by Eq. (3.26) is hereafter assumed in this example. Let the steady state be the thermal state

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{(\bar{n} + 1)^s} \left(\frac{\bar{n}}{\bar{n} + 1} \right)^{a_j^\dagger a_j}, \quad (3.34)$$

where \bar{n} is the mean particle number in each mode ($a_j^\dagger a_j$ with Einstein summation means $\sum_j a_j^\dagger a_j$). It can be shown that

$$\text{tr } \sigma Q_j = 0, \quad \langle Q_j, Q_k \rangle_\sigma = \left(\bar{n} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \delta_{jk}. \quad (3.35)$$

Let the initial state $\rho(0)$ be the kicked state given by Eq. (2.9), and let the kick generators in Eq. (2.9) be

$$G_j = \Omega_{jk} Q_k. \quad (3.36)$$

ϵv then quantifies the displacement of the initial state in phase space. It can be shown using the Gaussian theory in Appendix B and in particular Prop. B.1 that the scores are given by

$$\partial_j \tau = -i \Omega_{jk} [Q_k, \sigma] = \mathcal{E}_{\sigma, \text{Hel}} X_j(0), \quad (3.37)$$

$$X_j(0) = r Q_j, \quad (3.38)$$

$$r \equiv \frac{1}{\bar{n} + 1/2}. \quad (3.39)$$

The initial Helstrom information becomes

$$J_{jk}(0) = r \delta_{jk}. \quad (3.40)$$

Both the Umegaki relative entropy and the Bures distance are exactly monotonic, although only the monotonicity of J is needed in what follows.

Among Petz's class of symmetric and normalized density maps, the Helstrom version gives the minimum quantum Fisher information, while

$$\mathcal{E}_{\sigma, \text{M}}^{-1} A \equiv \frac{1}{2} (\sigma^{-1} A + A \sigma^{-1}) \quad (3.41)$$

gives the maximum [27, Eqs. (10.23) and (10.26)]. To be precise, for any symmetric and normalized \mathcal{E}_σ in Petz's class,

$$\text{tr } A \mathcal{E}_{\sigma, \text{Hel}}^{-1} A \leq \text{tr } A \mathcal{E}_\sigma^{-1} A \leq \text{tr } A \mathcal{E}_{\sigma, \text{M}}^{-1} A = \text{tr } A \sigma^{-1} A \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{O}_s(\mathcal{H}). \quad (3.42)$$

These inequalities may be useful for bounding the Fisher information in case one's preferred version is difficult to compute. For example, the Helstrom version can be used to lower-bound the Bogoliubov version for a study of entropy production, or the Bogoliubov version can be used to upper-bound the Helstrom version for a study of parameter estimation.

The stage is now set for the core results of this work.

IV. QUANTUM ONSAGER THEORY

I first prove an analog of Eqs. (1.1)–(1.3) that is natural in the context of quantum information geometry.

Theorem 1. Define a generalized force as

$$f^j \equiv -\epsilon v^j, \quad (4.1)$$

and an averaged conjugate variable as

$$x_j(t) \equiv \text{tr } X_j(t) \rho(t), \quad (4.2)$$

which I call a geometric variable. The convergence rate is then given by

$$R(t) = \frac{1}{2} f^j \dot{x}_j(t) + o(\epsilon^2). \quad (4.3)$$

The geometric current $\dot{x}(t)$ obeys the equation of motion

$$\dot{x}_j(t) = K_{jk}(t) f^k + o(\epsilon), \quad (4.4)$$

where the transport tensor K is the information loss rate given by

$$K_{jk}(t) = -\dot{J}_{jk}(t) = -\langle X_j(t), (\mathcal{L}^* + \mathcal{L}_*) X_k(t) \rangle_\sigma. \quad (4.5)$$

For any time t , $K(t)$ is symmetric, viz.,

$$K_{jk}(t) = K_{kj}(t), \quad (4.6)$$

and positive-semidefinite, so K can be regarded as a Riemannian metric.

The proof is delegated to Appendix F.

By identifying $f = -\epsilon v$ as the force, Theorem 1 shows that, under minimal assumptions, the approximation of the divergence by the Fisher information as per Eq. (3.1) can be regarded as the origin of the standard quadratic approximation of the entropy production rate in the Onsager theory [25, Eq. (2-7)]. The connection between the Fisher information and the Onsager theory is hence fundamental, though hitherto unappreciated. Once the connection is made, Eq. (4.3) for the convergence rate follows; it depends on the force and a current in the same manner as Eq. (1.1). The symmetry of K given by Eq. (4.5) is also analogous to the Onsager relation given by Eq. (1.3).

Even though Theorem 1 resembles the Onsager theory, it differs from earlier versions of the theory in the following ways:

- (i) The theorem requires only the assumption of a Markov semigroup, the existence of a steady state σ as per Eqs. (2.3), states being close to it in the sense of the Taylor approximation given by Eq. (2.5), and a divergence measure given by Eq. (3.1). No other thermodynamic concepts are involved; no explicit parametrization of $\tau(\theta)$ is even needed. On the other hand, the literature often assumes Gaussian statistics and linear dynamics for the variables [3, 4, 10], Spohn and Lebowitz made heavy assumptions about the whole model based on thermodynamics [6], Alicki assumed an exponential parametrization similar to Eq. (2.7) [5], and Lendi assumed a linear parametrization [7].
- (ii) Theorem 1 is proven for a large class of divergence measures and information metrics. Refs. [5–9], for example, focus on the Umegaki case.
- (iii) No detailed balance of any kind has been assumed to prove the symmetry of the transport tensor K —its symmetry is inherited from the information metric.
- (iv) Theorem 1 holds for time-varying rates at any t and the transport tensor there is time-dependent. Previous studies often derive the Onsager relations by considering the rates at $t = 0$ only—see, for example, Refs. [4, Sec. 7.4], [6, Eq. (V.6)], [7, Eq. (9)], and [17, Eq. (306)]—and they require further assumptions, such as slow dynamics, to extrapolate the relations to longer times.
- (v) Compared with Eq. (1.1), the convergence rate equation given by Eq. (4.3) has an extra factor of 1/2 on the right-hand side.

I emphasize that all these points remain true for the classical case, except point (ii). Since there is only one classical Fisher metric, all the classical divergence measures assumed by Eq. (3.1) end up having the same leading order.

The physical meaning of the geometric variable $x(t)$ comes from Eq. (4.3)—its rate $\dot{x}(t)$ is precisely the covector that determines the convergence rate at all times, in the same manner as Eq. (1.1) in the original Onsager theory. To measure $x_j(t)$, one should measure the averaged variable given by Eq. (4.2), which is in terms of an observable $X_j(t)$ with an explicit time dependence. A von Neumann measurement of $X_j(t)$ at each time is modeled by the projection-valued measure $\Pi(\lambda, t)$ in the spectral resolution $X_j(t) = \sum_\lambda \lambda \Pi(\lambda, t)$, and $\Pi(\lambda, t)$ here is time-varying and may be difficult to perform. However, $x_j(t)$ is only the average of $X_j(t)$, and there is more freedom in how the average can be estimated, as illustrated by the following example.

Example 2 (continued). Suppose that $\mathcal{F}(t)$ is a Gaussian channel [22]. With each initial score $X_j(0)$ given by Eq. (3.38), which is proportional to a canonical observable, Ref. [30, Proposition 1] has shown that $\mathcal{F}_*(t)X_j(0)$ given by Eq. (3.14) remains a

linear function of the canonical observables, viz.,

$$X_j(t) = c_j(t) + C_{jk}(t)Q_k \quad (4.7)$$

for some $c(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{2s}$ and $C(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{2s \times 2s}$; see also Prop. B.2 in Appendix B. The expected value becomes

$$x_j(t) = \text{tr } X_j(t)\rho(t) = c_j(t) + C_{jk}(t) \text{tr } Q_k \rho(t). \quad (4.8)$$

If the field is optical, then each $X_j(t)$ is a time-varying quadrature, and the expected value can be estimated, for example, by heterodyne detection of all the relevant quadratures $\{Q_k\}$ over many trials, followed by averaging and data processing in accordance with Eq. (4.8).

Since \mathcal{F}^* , \mathcal{F}_* , \mathcal{L}^* , and \mathcal{L}_* for a Gaussian channel can be shown to map canonical observables to canonical observables, while the scores are also linear functions of canonical observables, it suffices in the following to consider their effects on Q only, rather than the full $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ or $\mathcal{O}_s(\mathcal{H})$.

To give a more concrete example of a Gaussian channel, suppose that the system consists of passively coupled and damped harmonic oscillators, such that the semigroup generator is given by [20]

$$\mathcal{L}\rho = -i\omega_{jk} [a_j^\dagger a_k, \rho] + \frac{1}{2}(\bar{n} + 1)\gamma_{jk}(2a_k \rho a_j^\dagger - a_j^\dagger a_k \rho - \rho a_j^\dagger a_k) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{n}\gamma_{jk}(2a_j^\dagger \rho a_k - a_k a_j^\dagger \rho - \rho a_k a_j^\dagger), \quad (4.9)$$

where $\omega \in \mathbb{C}^{s \times s}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}^{s \times s}$ are complex Hermitian matrices, viz.,

$$\omega = \omega^\dagger, \quad \gamma = \gamma^\dagger. \quad (4.10)$$

Moreover, γ must be positive-semidefinite so that \mathcal{L} is in the GKSL form. It can be shown that the thermal state given by Eq. (3.34) is a steady state; see Prop. C.1 in Appendix C. It can also be shown that the \mathcal{L}_* map for this example turns out to be the same for any density map in Petz's class; see Props. C.2 and C.3 in Appendix C.

With Eq. (4.9), the equation of motion for the mean field $\bar{a}_j(t) \equiv \text{tr } a_j \rho(t)$ becomes

$$\frac{d\bar{a}_j}{dt} = \Lambda_{jk}\bar{a}_k, \quad \Lambda_{jk} \equiv -i\omega_{jk} - \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{jk}. \quad (4.11)$$

This form of coupled-mode equations is well known in classical optics, where ω governs the conservative coupling between the optical modes and γ governs the loss. The equation of motion for $\bar{Q}_j(t) \equiv \text{tr } Q_j \rho(t)$ becomes

$$\frac{d\bar{Q}_j}{dt} = L_{jk}\bar{Q}_k \quad (4.12)$$

with a certain rate matrix $L \in \mathbb{R}^{2s \times 2s}$. If \bar{a} and \bar{Q} are regarded as column vectors, then L is related to Λ , ω , and γ by

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re } \Lambda & -\text{Im } \Lambda \\ \text{Im } \Lambda & \text{Re } \Lambda \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Im } \omega - \text{Re } \gamma/2 & \text{Re } \omega + \text{Im } \gamma/2 \\ -\text{Re } \omega - \text{Im } \gamma/2 & \text{Im } \omega - \text{Re } \gamma/2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.13)$$

where Re denotes the entry-wise real part and Im denotes the entry-wise imaginary part. Defining

$$F(t) \equiv \exp(Lt), \quad (4.14)$$

assuming the thermal steady state given by Eq. (3.34), and using Appendix B and in particular Prop. B.2, it can be shown that

$$\mathcal{F}^*(t)Q_j = F_{jk}(t)Q_k, \quad \mathcal{F}_*(t)Q_j = F_{kj}(t)Q_k, \quad (4.15)$$

or, in matrix form,

$$\mathcal{F}^*(t)Q = F(t)Q, \quad \mathcal{F}_*(t)Q = F^\top(t)Q, \quad (4.16)$$

$$\mathcal{L}^*Q = LQ, \quad \mathcal{L}_*Q = L^\top Q, \quad (4.17)$$

where $\mathcal{M}Q$ for a map \mathcal{M} is understood as the column vector $(\mathcal{M}Q_1 \ \mathcal{M}Q_2 \ \dots)^\top$. Starting with Eq. (3.38), the scores become

$$X(t) = \mathcal{F}_*(t)X(0) = rF^\top(t)Q, \quad (4.18)$$

while the Helstrom information matrix and the information loss rate are respectively given by

$$J(t) = rF^\top(t)F(t), \quad (4.19)$$

$$K(t) = -rF^\top(t)(L^\top + L)F(t). \quad (4.20)$$

Theorem 1 may seem abstract, but it can be used to prove a more physical generalization of the Onsager equations given by Eqs. (1.1) and (1.2) in the next theorem; points (i) and (ii) remain true for the following theorem, while points (iii)–(v) no longer apply.

Theorem 2. *Define*

$$y_j(t) \equiv \text{tr } X_j(0)\rho(t), \quad (4.21)$$

which I call an experimental variable. Eq. (4.21) differs from the geometric version given by Eq. (4.2) in assuming that each observable $X_j(0)$ is fixed in time. Its current at $t = 0$ obeys

$$\dot{y}_j(0) = O_{jk}f^k + o(\epsilon), \quad (4.22)$$

where the Onsager transport tensor O is given by

$$O_{jk} = -\langle X_j(0), \mathcal{L}_* X_k(0) \rangle_\sigma. \quad (4.23)$$

The two versions of the transport tensors are related by

$$K_{jk}(0) = O_{jk} + O_{kj}, \quad (4.24)$$

and O is positive-semidefinite. The convergence rate becomes

$$R(0) = f^j \dot{y}_j(0) + o(\epsilon^2). \quad (4.25)$$

The proof is delegated to Appendix F.

Example 1 (continued). Assume the Gibbs state given by Eq. (2.7) and let

$$G = (E_1 \dots E_s \ N_1 \dots N_s)^\top \quad (4.26)$$

be a vector of energy operators $\{E_j\}$ and particle-number operators $\{N_j\}$ of s subsystems. Write the generalized forces as

$$f = -\epsilon v = (\delta\beta^1 \dots \delta\beta^s \ \delta\mu^1 \dots \delta\mu^s)^\top, \quad (4.27)$$

which are perturbations to the inverse temperatures $\{\delta\beta^j\}$ and the (negative and normalized) chemical potentials $\{\delta\mu^j\}$ of the subsystems. Treating both G and f as column vectors, the Onsager matrix can be partitioned as

$$O = \begin{pmatrix} O^{(E,\beta)} & O^{(E,\mu)} \\ O^{(N,\beta)} & O^{(N,\mu)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.28)$$

where each $O^{(G,f)}$ submatrix models the response of the currents $\{\text{tr } G_j \dot{\rho}(0)\}$ to the forces $\{f^j\}$. The Onsager symmetry given by Eq. (1.3) would imply

$$O_{jk}^{(E,\beta)} = O_{kj}^{(E,\beta)}, \quad O_{jk}^{(N,\mu)} = O_{kj}^{(N,\mu)}, \quad O_{jk}^{(E,\mu)} = O_{kj}^{(N,\beta)}. \quad (4.29)$$

The last relation is a classic example of the Onsager relation, showing that the transport coefficients $O^{(E,\mu)}$ for the energy currents due to $\delta\mu$ are related to the coefficients $O^{(N,\beta)}$ for the particle currents due to $\delta\beta$.

Like Theorem 1, Theorem 2 makes minimal assumptions about the system and is valid for arbitrary parametrizations of the initial state and a large class of divergence measures and information metrics. The important feature of Theorem 2 is its more physical definition of the currents, so that it is closer to conventional experimental settings. Theorem 2 holds at only one time, however, meaning that it is relevant only to systems with near-static dynamics, while a generalization of the Onsager relations for the transport tensor given by Eq. (4.23) must wait until Sec. V.

The mysterious factor of $1/2$ in Eq. (4.3) in Theorem 1 is absent from Eq. (4.25) in Theorem 2, because the experimental current \dot{y} does not include the rate due to \dot{X}_j in the geometric version, which comes from the explicit time dependence of $X_j(t)$.

Omitting the $o(\epsilon^n)$ terms for brevity, Eqs. (4.3) and (4.25) can be reconciled at $t = 0$ by noting that

$$\frac{1}{2}f^j\dot{x}_j(0) = f^j\dot{y}_j(0), \quad (4.30)$$

even though $\dot{x}_j(0)/2 = K_{jk}(0)f^k/2$ and $\dot{y}_j(0) = O_{jk}f^k$ may be different. An intuitive viewpoint, as expounded in the classical literature [35], is to think of

$$\frac{1}{2}\dot{x}_j(0) = \frac{1}{2}(O_{jk} + O_{kj})f^k \quad (4.31)$$

as the dissipative component of the current $\dot{y}_j(0)$ that contributes to the convergence rate, and their difference

$$\dot{y}_j(0) - \frac{1}{2}\dot{x}_j(0) = \frac{1}{2}(O_{jk} - O_{kj})f^k \quad (4.32)$$

as the conservative component of the current that does not, since the latter is orthogonal to the force, viz.,

$$f^j \left[\dot{y}_j(0) - \frac{1}{2}\dot{x}_j(0) \right] = 0. \quad (4.33)$$

Example 2 (continued). For the kicked initial state given by Eq. (2.9), the kick generators given by Eq. (3.36), and the dynamics governed by Eq. (4.9), it can be shown by following the previous discussion in this example that the Onsager matrix is given by

$$O = -rL, \quad (4.34)$$

where r is given by Eq. (3.39) and L is the rate matrix given by Eq. (4.13). The information loss rate K given by Eq. (4.20) at $t = 0$ becomes

$$K(0) = -r(L^\top + L), \quad (4.35)$$

which is indeed equal to $O + O^\top$. Since ω and γ are Hermitian, $\text{Re } \omega$ and $\text{Re } \gamma$ are symmetric while $\text{Im } \omega$ and $\text{Im } \gamma$ are antisymmetric. The information loss rate at $t = 0$ becomes

$$K(0) = O + O^\top = -r(L + L^\top) = r \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re } \gamma & -\text{Im } \gamma \\ \text{Im } \gamma & \text{Re } \gamma \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.36)$$

which depends only on the γ matrix in the dissipative part of the semigroup generator \mathcal{L} .

V. QUANTUM ONSAGER-CASIMIR RELATIONS

Theorem 2 generalizes Eqs. (1.1) and (1.2) in the Onsager theory; the remaining task is to generalize the Onsager relation given by Eq. (1.3). As Eq. (1.3) is often regarded as a consequence of detailed balance and detailed balance is in turn most commonly associated with time-reversal symmetry [36], I begin with a review of the standard treatment of time reversal in quantum mechanics; see, for example, [15, Sec. 4.4].

The treatment is centered on the definition of an antiunitary operator $\vartheta : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ and a motion-reversal map $\Theta : \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ defined as

$$\Theta A \equiv \vartheta A \vartheta^{-1}. \quad (5.1)$$

Θ can be shown to be antiunitary with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product, viz., $\langle \Theta A, \Theta B \rangle = \langle B, A \rangle$ for any $A, B \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$. A Hilbert-Schmidt adjoint Θ^* of Θ can be defined by $\langle A, \Theta B \rangle = \langle B, \Theta^* A \rangle$ for any A, B , and one has $\Theta^* = \Theta^{-1}$ because of the antiunitarity. It can also be shown that Θ maps Hermitian operators to Hermitian operators. A standard example is a Θ that gives $\Theta q_j = q_j$ for a position operator q_j and $\Theta p_j = -p_j$ for a momentum operator p_j .

A Hamiltonian H is said to satisfy time-reversal symmetry if $\Theta H = H$. The Heisenberg picture illustrates the concept: if the evolution from an operator $A(0)$ to another operator $A(t)$ after time t is described by the equation of motion

$$A(t) = U^\dagger(t)A(0)U(t), \quad (5.2)$$

$$U(t) \equiv \exp(-iHt), \quad (5.3)$$

then reversing the final $A(t)$ by Θ and setting $\Theta A(t)$ as the initial condition of the dynamics would lead to $\Theta A(0)$ after time t , because

$$\Theta A(0) = U^\dagger(t)[\Theta A(t)]U(t). \quad (5.4)$$

Even if a system does not satisfy time-reversal symmetry, it is often possible to prepare another system with a Hamiltonian given by ΘH , by reversing an external classical magnetic field for example. Defining the reverse unitary as

$$V(t) \equiv \exp(-i\Theta H t), \quad (5.5)$$

one obtains the reversed equation of motion

$$\Theta A(0) = V^\dagger(t)[\Theta A(t)]V(t) \quad (5.6)$$

under the Heisenberg picture of the reverse unitary.

In Refs. [11, 12], Onsager and Casimir considered systems under external fields that change their signs under motion reversal, such as a magnetic field or a Coriolis force. They proposed that, upon reversing the external fields, the new Onsager tensor \tilde{O} should be related to the original O . To generalize the Onsager-Casimir relations to the quantum case, I need to generalize the concept of time reversal and the reverse unitary given by Eq. (5.5) for open systems.

Assume a second open system with dynamics modeled by a quantum dynamical semigroup $\{\mathcal{G}(t) = \exp(\mathcal{K}t) : t \geq 0\}$. Inspired by Ref. [37], I say that \mathcal{G} is the reverse of the \mathcal{F} map of the first system if they satisfy

$$\mathcal{G}^* = \Theta \mathcal{F}_* \Theta^*, \quad (5.7)$$

which is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{K}^* = \Theta \mathcal{L}_* \Theta^* \quad (5.8)$$

for the semigroup generators. To see why this definition makes sense, observe that it generalizes the reverse unitary given by Eq. (5.5): Given $\mathcal{F}A = UAU^\dagger$, one obtains

$$\mathcal{F}^*A = U^\dagger AU, \quad \mathcal{F}_*A = UAU^\dagger, \quad \mathcal{G}^*A = V^\dagger AV. \quad (5.9)$$

One can also arrive at Eq. (5.7) by assuming the reverse unitary for the total system including the reservoir on a larger Hilbert space—see Appendix D. In general, the right-hand side of Eq. (5.7) may not be completely positive, but it is guaranteed to be so if the density map is given by the so-called Connes version [37–39]

$$\mathcal{E}_{\sigma, \text{Con}} A \equiv \sigma^{1/2} A \sigma^{1/2}, \quad (5.10)$$

since $\mathcal{F}_* = \mathcal{E}_{\sigma, \text{Con}}^{-1} \mathcal{F} \mathcal{E}_{\sigma, \text{Con}}$ and thus $\Theta \mathcal{F}_* \Theta^*$ can be expressed in terms of Kraus operators [37]. A form of time reversal proposed by Crooks [40] and generalized by Manzano *et al.* [41] can be shown to be a special case of Eq. (5.7) in terms of Eq. (5.10); see Appendix E for details. Prop. C.2 in Appendix C may also be used to check whether \mathcal{F}_* turns out to be the same regardless of the chosen density map and there is no ambiguity about the reversal relation. The following results work for any density map and do not require \mathcal{G} to be completely positive, but \mathcal{G} must, of course, be a good model of physical dynamics for the results to be useful.

Let $\tilde{\sigma}$ be a steady state of the second system satisfying $\mathcal{G}\tilde{\sigma} = \tilde{\sigma}$ and $\mathcal{K}\tilde{\sigma} = 0$. Given the reversal relation, it is straightforward to show that

$$\tilde{\sigma} = \Theta \sigma \quad (5.11)$$

is a steady state of the second system. Assuming Eqs. (5.7) and (5.11), the first system is also the reverse of the second, since $\sigma = \Theta^* \tilde{\sigma}$ and

$$\mathcal{F}^* = \Theta^* \mathcal{G}_* \Theta, \quad \mathcal{G}_* \equiv \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\sigma}}^{-1} \mathcal{G} \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\sigma}}, \quad (5.12)$$

as shown by Prop. F.1 in Appendix F.

Let $\tilde{\tau} : \Phi \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ be a parametrization of the initial state of the second system with $\tilde{\tau}(0) = \tilde{\sigma}$. The scores are defined by

$$\partial_j \tilde{\tau} = \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\sigma}} \tilde{X}_j(0). \quad (5.13)$$

Following Theorem 2, the Onsager tensor for the second system can be defined as

$$\tilde{O}_{jk} \equiv - \left\langle \tilde{X}_j(0), \mathcal{K}_* \tilde{X}_k(0) \right\rangle_{\tilde{\sigma}}, \quad \mathcal{K}_* \equiv \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\sigma}}^{-1} \mathcal{K} \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\sigma}}. \quad (5.14)$$

A quantum Onsager-Casimir relation for the two systems can now be given.

Theorem 3. *Suppose that two systems are reverses of each other in the sense of Eqs. (5.8) and (5.11). Suppose, furthermore, that the parametrization of the second system is related to that of the first by*

$$\tilde{\tau}(\theta) = \Theta \tau(\theta) \quad (5.15)$$

in a neighborhood of $\theta = 0$, such that the scores are related by

$$\tilde{X}_j(0) = \Theta X_j(0). \quad (5.16)$$

Then their Onsager tensors given by Eqs. (4.23) and (5.14) obey

$$O_{jk} = \tilde{O}_{kj}. \quad (5.17)$$

The proof is delegated to Appendix F.

Since it may be difficult to prepare a second system that is the reverse of the first in everything, including the initial-state preparation, I offer a variation of Theorem 3 for two systems with identical steady states and initial-state preparations as follows.

Theorem 4. *Suppose that two systems are reverses of each other in the sense of Eqs. (5.8) and (5.11). Suppose, furthermore, that the steady states and the initial-state preparations are identical, viz.,*

$$\tilde{\sigma} = \Theta \sigma = \sigma, \quad \tilde{\tau}(\theta) = \tau(\theta), \quad \tilde{X}_j(0) = X_j(0). \quad (5.18)$$

If the scores transform as

$$\Theta X_j(0) = T_j^k X_k(0), \quad T \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}, \quad (5.19)$$

then the two Onsager tensors are related by

$$O_{jk} = T_k^l \tilde{O}_{lm} T_j^m. \quad (5.20)$$

The proof is delegated to Appendix F.

The assumption given by Eqs. (5.18) in Theorem 4 means that the only difference between the two systems is the dynamics governed by the \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} maps, so that it can model a device before and after an external field is reversed with all the other settings intact. Theorem 4 is thus closer in spirit to the original Onsager-Casimir relations, though less general than Theorem 3. Eq. (5.19) is a generalization of the common assumption that observables are either even ($\Theta A = A$) or odd ($\Theta A = -A$) under motion reversal.

A quantum detailed-balance condition can now be defined by positing that a system is its own reverse, with

$$\mathcal{G}(t) = \mathcal{F}(t), \quad \mathcal{K} = \mathcal{L}, \quad \tilde{\sigma} = \sigma, \quad (5.21)$$

such that

$$\mathcal{L}^* = \Theta \mathcal{L}_* \Theta^*, \quad \sigma = \Theta \sigma. \quad (5.22)$$

Eqs. (5.22) coincide with the standard definition of detailed balance in the classical case—see Eqs. (A11) in Appendix A. By generalizing an argument of Carmichael and Walls [42], Appendix D shows that time-reversal symmetry of the total system on a larger Hilbert space, together with some additional assumptions, can lead to Eqs. (5.22). Eqs. (5.22) have the same form as the detailed-balance condition proposed by Agarwal [16] if one assumes the density map $\mathcal{E}_\sigma = \mathcal{R}_\sigma$ given by Eq. (3.9). Eqs. (5.22) also give the so-called SQDB- θ condition proposed by Fagnola and Umanità [43] if the Connes density map given by Eq. (5.10) is assumed; Roberts *et al.* have worked out many examples that satisfy the SQDB- θ condition [44, 45]. It should be noted that a plethora of other quantum detailed-balance conditions have been proposed in the literature [5, 43, 46–50] but it is outside the scope of this work to study those—the version here is chosen because of its connections with time-reversal symmetry and the Onsager-Casimir relations.

Under the detailed-balance condition given by Eqs. (5.22), Theorem 3 becomes a statement about the Onsager tensors for the same system with two different initial-state preparations, while Theorem 4 implies a symmetry of the Onsager tensor.

Corollary 1. *Assume that a system satisfies the detailed-balance condition given by Eqs. (5.22) and the scores transform as Eq. (5.19) in terms of a matrix T under motion reversal. Then the Onsager tensor satisfies*

$$O_{jk} = T_k^l O_{lm} T_j^m. \quad (5.23)$$

If T is the Kronecker delta, meaning that

$$\Theta X_j = X_j, \quad (5.24)$$

then the original Onsager relation given by Eq. (1.3) is obtained.

Proof. Under the detailed-balance condition, $\tilde{O} = O$ if one assumes the same initial-state preparation. Theorem 4 then implies Eq. (5.23). \square

Example 2 (continued). *Assume a Θ that satisfies*

$$\Theta = \Theta^*, \quad \Theta q_j = q_j, \quad \Theta p_j = -p_j. \quad (5.25)$$

The map can also be expressed in matrix form

$$\Theta Q = TQ, \quad T \equiv \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & -I \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.26)$$

Assume a second system that consists of s bosonic modes with the same GKSL form given by Eq. (4.9) for \mathcal{K} , except that the matrices ω and γ are denoted by ω' and γ' instead. The rate matrix for the second system can be defined by

$$\mathcal{K}^* Q = \tilde{L} Q, \quad \tilde{L} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \text{Im } \omega' - \text{Re } \gamma'/2 & \text{Re } \omega' + \text{Im } \gamma'/2 \\ -\text{Re } \omega' - \text{Im } \gamma'/2 & \text{Im } \omega' - \text{Re } \gamma'/2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.27)$$

in the same form as the L matrix given by Eq. (4.13) for the first. The reversal condition given by Eq. (5.8) would imply

$$\tilde{L} = T L^\top T = \begin{pmatrix} -\text{Im } \omega - \text{Re } \gamma/2 & \text{Re } \omega - \text{Im } \gamma/2 \\ -\text{Re } \omega + \text{Im } \gamma/2 & -\text{Im } \omega - \text{Re } \gamma/2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.28)$$

which is satisfied if

$$\text{Re } \omega = \text{Re } \omega', \quad \text{Im } \omega = -\text{Im } \omega', \quad \text{Re } \gamma = \text{Re } \gamma', \quad \text{Im } \gamma = -\text{Im } \gamma', \quad (5.29)$$

meaning that ω and ω' should be the entry-wise complex conjugate of each other; likewise for γ and γ' . This relation is reminiscent of the effect of reversing an external magnetic field on the permittivity matrix of a magneto-optic medium [51], although a more careful study is needed to ascertain the connection.

Suppose that the steady state $\tilde{\sigma}$ of the second system is the thermal state given by Eq. (3.34). One has

$$\tilde{\sigma} = \sigma = \Theta \sigma. \quad (5.30)$$

Suppose also that the scores of the second system are the reverse of Eq. (3.38), viz.,

$$\tilde{X}(0) = \Theta X(0) = r T Q. \quad (5.31)$$

The second Onsager matrix becomes

$$\tilde{O} = -r T \tilde{L} T = -r L^\top = O^\top, \quad (5.32)$$

in accordance with Theorem 3. If the initial-state preparations are identical, then the scores become

$$\tilde{X}(0) = X(0) = r Q \quad (5.33)$$

instead of Eq. (5.31), and the second Onsager matrix becomes

$$\tilde{O} = -r\tilde{L} = -rTL^\top T = TO^\top T, \quad (5.34)$$

in accordance with Theorem 4.

Now assume the detailed-balance condition given by Eqs. (5.22) for the first system, implying

$$L = TL^\top T, \quad (5.35)$$

or equivalently

$$\text{Im } \omega = 0, \quad \text{Im } \gamma = 0, \quad (5.36)$$

meaning that all entries of ω and γ are real. The Onsager matrix then satisfies

$$O = TO^\top T, \quad (5.37)$$

in accordance with Corollary 1.

VI. CONCLUSION

Using the Fisher-information approach put forth, one can treat any parameter of the initial state as a generalized force, and the conjugate variables that determine the entropy production rate are automatically given by the scores, which generalize the concept of macroscopic state variables in thermodynamics. This approach allows one to study entropy production with arbitrary perturbations that may not be well described by traditional thermodynamic concepts. For example, the concept of Gibbs ensemble, temperature, and chemical potential in Example 1 may be ill-defined for quantum systems under fast control; one may instead adopt a more sophisticated model of the initial state as a function of the experimental control parameters.

The connection between the entropy production rate and the Fisher information loss rate is another discovery that may broaden the utility of the Onsager theory and enable more cross-pollination between thermodynamics and parameter estimation theory. The Helstrom information, for example, plays a fundamental role for important applications in quantum metrology, such as gravitational-wave detection [52–54] and optical imaging [55]; its loss in open quantum systems is an important problem under active research [56–59]. Can the Onsager theory offer new insights about how information flows in a quantum sensor and how information loss can be mitigated, or can quantum metrology bring new ideas or new testbeds to the area of quantum thermodynamics?

By adopting the concept of density maps pioneered by Petz, the results put forth are valid for a large class of divergence measures and information metrics, unlike many prior works that focus on specific versions. Even if one is interested in only one version of divergence, other versions may still be useful for bounding it if they are easier to compute.

Theorem 1 reveals a geometric form of the Onsager theory that is remarkable in its generality but admittedly obscure in its physical relevance. Theorem 2 offers a more physical version derived from Theorem 1, while Theorems 3 and 4 establish quantum Onsager-Casimir relations based on a general concept of time reversal and detailed balance for open quantum systems. The many versions of time reversal and detailed balance depending on the density map, though bewildering, may also be regarded as intriguing features of the quantum theory—they suggest that one must be a lot more careful about the assumption of detailed balance in the quantum regime. More studies beyond the examples put forth are needed to determine the physical significance of the various versions.

It is noteworthy that some quantum Onsager-Casimir relations for spintronics have been proposed by Jacquod *et al.* [60], but their approach is very different from Onsager's, does not involve entropy at all, and seems specific to electronic systems. Optics is another area where the Onsager-Casimir relations are of recent interest, as they have been proposed as the origin of electromagnetic reciprocity [51]. Given the confusion regarding reciprocity in lossy optical devices [61, 62], a quantum treatment to ensure conformance with both quantum mechanics and thermodynamics may be worthwhile. It is an interesting open question how the formalism here can be applied to specific areas.

Despite the significant generalizations made in this work, the Onsager theory remains limited in its ability to deal with far-from-equilibrium conditions, time-dependent perturbations, and fast dynamics. Such situations can, of course, be modeled by other methods in statistical mechanics [23] and are also of significant interest to quantum metrology [52, 53, 58]. The intersection of the two areas is a fertile ground awaiting further explorations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by the National Research Foundation, Singapore, under its Quantum Engineering Programme (QEP-P7). Correspondence with Mark Mitchison and the hospitality of Alex Lvovsky, the Keble College, and the Department of Physics at the University of Oxford, where part of this work was performed, are gratefully acknowledged.

Appendix A: Classical case

Commuting Hermitian operators can be diagonalized with respect to the same orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H} ; let such a basis be $\{|z\rangle\}$. Let $\{Z(t) : t \geq 0\}$ be a classical Markov process with conditional distribution $P_{Z(t)|Z(0)}(z|z')$ and rate matrix

$$r(z|z') \equiv \dot{P}_{Z(t)|Z(0)}(z|z'). \quad (\text{A1})$$

$Z(t)$ can be regarded as the trajectory of all the microscopic variables in thermodynamics. Let

$$\rho = \sum_z P(z) |z\rangle \langle z| \quad (\text{A2})$$

be a generic density operator in terms of a probability distribution P (Einstein summation is abandoned in this appendix for clarity). The semigroup can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{F}(t)\rho = \sum_{z,z'} P_{Z(t)|Z(0)}(z|z') P(z') |z\rangle \langle z|, \quad \mathcal{L}\rho = \sum_{z,z'} r(z|z') P(z') |z\rangle \langle z|. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Let a steady state be

$$\sigma = \sum_z S(z) |z\rangle \langle z| \quad (\text{A4})$$

with a distribution S that satisfies

$$\sum_{z'} P_{Z(t)|Z(0)}(z|z') S(z') = S(z). \quad (\text{A5})$$

In terms of generic observables

$$A = \sum_z a(z) |z\rangle \langle z|, \quad B = \sum_z b(z) |z\rangle \langle z|, \quad (\text{A6})$$

where a and b are real classical random variables, one can write

$$\mathcal{E}_\sigma A = \sum_z a(z) S(z) |z\rangle \langle z|, \quad \langle A, B \rangle_\sigma = \sum_z a(z) b(z) S(z), \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$\mathcal{F}^*(t)A = \sum_{z,z'} a(z') P_{Z(t)|Z(0)}(z'|z) |z\rangle \langle z|, \quad \mathcal{F}_*(t)A = \sum_{z,z'} \frac{P_{Z(t)|Z(0)}(z|z') S(z')}{S(z)} a(z') |z\rangle \langle z|, \quad (\text{A8})$$

$$\mathcal{L}^* A = \sum_{z,z'} a(z') r(z'|z) |z\rangle \langle z|, \quad \mathcal{L}_* A = \sum_{z,z'} \frac{r(z|z') S(z')}{S(z)} a(z') |z\rangle \langle z|. \quad (\text{A9})$$

$\mathcal{F}^*(t)$ corresponds to the predictive conditional expectation, while $\mathcal{F}_*(t)$ corresponds to the retrodictive conditional expectation via Bayes theorem.

The quantum detailed-balance condition given by Eqs. (5.22) can be applied to the classical case by assuming

$$\Theta(|z\rangle \langle z|) = |T^{-1}z\rangle \langle T^{-1}z|, \quad (\text{A10})$$

where z is assumed to be a column vector and T is some invertible matrix. Then Eqs. (5.22) imply

$$r(z'|z) S(z) = r(Tz|Tz') S(Tz'), \quad S(z) = S(Tz), \quad (\text{A11})$$

which agree with the classical definition [36, Eqs. (5.3.45) and (5.3.46)].

If the parametrization of the initial state is expressed in terms of a parametrized distribution $P(z|\theta)$ as

$$\rho(0) = \tau(\theta) = \sum_z P(z|\theta) |z\rangle \langle z|, \quad (\text{A12})$$

then

$$P(z|0) = S(z), \quad (\text{A13})$$

$$\mathcal{F}(t)\tau(\theta) = \sum_z P(z, t|\theta) |z\rangle \langle z|, \quad (\text{A14})$$

$$P(z, t|\theta) \equiv \sum_{z'} P_{Z(t)|Z(0)}(z|z')P(z'|\theta), \quad (\text{A15})$$

$$J_{jk}(t) = \sum_z \frac{[\partial_j P(z, t|\theta)][\partial_k P(z, t|\theta)]}{S(z)} = \sum_z S(z) s_j(z, t) s_k(z, t), \quad (\text{A16})$$

$$s_j(z, t) \equiv \frac{1}{S(z)} \partial_j P(z, t|\theta) = \partial_j \ln P(z, t|\theta) = \sum_{z'} \frac{P_{Z(t)|Z(0)}(z|z') S(z')}{S(z)} s_j(z', 0), \quad (\text{A17})$$

$$X_j(t) = \sum_z s_j(z, t) |z\rangle \langle z|, \quad (\text{A18})$$

$$\dot{s}_j(z, t) = \sum_{z'} \frac{r(z|z') S(z')}{S(z)} s_j(z', t). \quad (\text{A19})$$

J coincides with the classical Fisher information, while s_j coincides with the classical score function.

Appendix B: Gaussian states and channels

This appendix follows Refs. [22, 63]. Let Q be the vector of canonical observables of s bosonic modes given by Eq. (3.27) and $W(z)$ be the Weyl operator defined by

$$W(z) \equiv \exp(iz^j Q_j), \quad (\text{B1})$$

$$z \equiv (x^1 \dots x^s \ y^1 \dots y^s) \in \mathbb{R}^{2s}. \quad (\text{B2})$$

Some useful identities are as follows.

$$\frac{1}{2} [W(z)Q_j + Q_j W(z)] = -i \frac{\partial}{\partial z^j} W(z), \quad (\text{B3})$$

$$[W(z), Q_j] = \Omega_{jk} z^k W(z). \quad (\text{B4})$$

A Gaussian state ρ is defined by having a Gaussian characteristic function in the form of

$$\text{tr } \rho W(z) = \exp \left(iz^j m_j - \frac{1}{2} z^j \Sigma_{jk} z^k \right), \quad (\text{B5})$$

$$m_j \equiv \text{tr } \rho Q_j, \quad (\text{B6})$$

$$\Sigma_{jk} \equiv \langle Q_j - m_j, Q_k - m_k \rangle_{\rho, \text{Hel}}, \quad (\text{B7})$$

where m is the mean vector, Σ is the covariance matrix, and the weighted inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\rho, \text{Hel}}$ here is defined with respect to the Helstrom density map $\mathcal{E}_{\rho, \text{Hel}}$ given by Eq. (3.26). Such a Gaussian state is labeled by (m, Σ) .

Proposition B.1 (Ref. [63, Proposition 5.6.3]). *For an (m, Σ) Gaussian state ρ and the Helstrom density map given by Eq. (3.26),*

$$i[Q_j, \rho] = \Omega_{jl} \Sigma^{lk} \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \text{Hel}}(Q_k - m_k), \quad (\text{B8})$$

where Σ with the superscripts denotes the inverse of Σ , viz.,

$$\Sigma_{jl} \Sigma^{lk} = \delta_j^k, \quad (\text{B9})$$

and δ_j^k is the Kronecker delta.

Proof. Using Eq. (B4), the characteristic function of the left-hand side of Eq. (B8) becomes

$$i \operatorname{tr} W(z)[Q_j, \rho] = i \operatorname{tr}[W(z), Q_j]\rho = i\Omega_{jl}z^l \operatorname{tr} W(z)\rho. \quad (\text{B10})$$

while the characteristic function of the right-hand side of Eq. (B8), using Eq. (B3), becomes

$$\Omega_{jl}\Sigma^{lk} \operatorname{tr} W(z)\mathcal{E}_{\rho, \text{Hel}}(Q_k - m_k) = \Omega_{jl}\Sigma^{lk} \left(-i \frac{\partial}{\partial z^k} - m_k \right) \operatorname{tr} W(z)\rho = i\Omega_{jl}z^l \operatorname{tr} W(z)\rho, \quad (\text{B11})$$

which is equal to Eq. (B10). \square

A Gaussian channel \mathcal{F} that maps s modes to s' modes is defined by

$$\mathcal{F}^* \tilde{W}(\zeta) = g(\zeta)W(\zeta F), \quad (\text{B12})$$

$$(\zeta F)^j = \zeta^\mu F_\mu^j, \quad (\text{B13})$$

$$g(\zeta) = \exp \left(i\zeta^\mu l_\mu - \frac{1}{2}\zeta^\mu S_{\mu\nu}\zeta^\nu \right), \quad (\text{B14})$$

where $\tilde{W}(\zeta)$ is the Weyl operator for s' modes, $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{2s'}$, $l \in \mathbb{R}^{2s'}$, $F \in \mathbb{R}^{2s' \times 2s}$, and $S \in \mathbb{R}^{2s' \times 2s'}$. Such a Gaussian channel is labeled by (l, F, S) . It follows that the characteristic function after an application of an (l, F, S) channel to an (m, Σ) state is given by

$$\operatorname{tr}(\mathcal{F}\rho)\tilde{W}(\zeta) = \operatorname{tr} \rho \mathcal{F}^* \tilde{W}(\zeta) = \exp \left(i\zeta^\mu \tilde{m}_\mu - \frac{1}{2}\zeta^\mu \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mu\nu}\zeta^\nu \right), \quad (\text{B15})$$

$$\tilde{m}_\mu = F_\mu^j m_j + l_\mu, \quad (\text{B16})$$

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mu\nu} = F_\mu^j \Sigma_{jk} F_\nu^k + S_{\mu\nu}. \quad (\text{B17})$$

In matrix form, the last two equations can be expressed as

$$\tilde{m} = Fm + l, \quad \tilde{\Sigma} = F\Sigma F^\top + S. \quad (\text{B18})$$

Proposition B.2. For an (m, Σ) Gaussian state, an (l, F, S) Gaussian channel \mathcal{F} , and the Helstrom density map given by Eq. (3.26),

$$\mathcal{F}^* Q_\mu = F_\mu^j Q_j + l_\mu, \quad (\text{B19})$$

$$\mathcal{F}_* Q_j = m_j + \tilde{F}_j^{\cdot\mu} (Q_\mu - \tilde{m}_\mu), \quad (\text{B20})$$

$$\tilde{F}_j^{\cdot\mu} \equiv \Sigma_{jk} F_\nu^k \tilde{\Sigma}^{\nu\mu}, \quad (\text{B21})$$

where \tilde{m} is given by Eq. (B16), $\tilde{\Sigma}$ is given by Eq. (B17), and $\tilde{\Sigma}$ with the superscripts denotes the inverse of $\tilde{\Sigma}$. Eq. (B21) can also be expressed in the matrix form

$$\tilde{F} = \Sigma F^\top \tilde{\Sigma}^{-1}. \quad (\text{B22})$$

Proof. Eq. (B21) has been derived in Ref. [30, Proposition 1]. To derive Eq. (B19), use Eq. (B3) and Eqs. (B12)–(B14) to write

$$\mathcal{F}^* Q_\mu = \mathcal{F}^*[Q_\mu \circ \tilde{W}(0)] = -i \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta^\mu} \mathcal{F}^* \tilde{W}(\zeta) \Big|_{\zeta=0} = -i \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta^\mu} g(\zeta)W(\zeta F) \Big|_{\zeta=0} = l_\mu + F_\mu^j Q_j. \quad (\text{B23})$$

\square

Appendix C: Some results for coupled and damped harmonic oscillators

Proposition C.1. For the thermal state σ given by Eq. (3.34) and the generator \mathcal{L} given by Eq. (4.9),

$$\mathcal{L}\sigma = 0. \quad (\text{C1})$$

Proof. Using the basic identities $a_j |n_j\rangle = \sqrt{n_j} |n_j - 1\rangle$ and $a_j^\dagger |n_j\rangle = \sqrt{n_j + 1} |n_j + 1\rangle$ for a single-mode Fock state $|n_j\rangle$ and expressing σ in terms of the Fock basis, it can be shown that

$$a_j \sigma = z \sigma a_j, \quad a_j^\dagger \sigma = z^{-1} \sigma a_j^\dagger, \quad z \equiv \frac{\bar{n}}{\bar{n} + 1}. \quad (\text{C2})$$

It follows that

$$a_j^\dagger a_k \sigma = \sigma a_j^\dagger a_k, \quad a_k \sigma a_j^\dagger = z \sigma a_k a_j^\dagger, \quad a_j^\dagger \sigma a_k = z^{-1} \sigma a_j^\dagger a_k. \quad (\text{C3})$$

Plugging these expressions into Eq. (4.9) for $\rho = \sigma$ leads to Eq. (C1). □

The next proposition is a general condition for the weighted adjoints to be the same for any density map in Petz's class.

Proposition C.2. Given a map $\mathcal{M}^* : \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$, define $\mathcal{M}_* : \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ as the adjoint of \mathcal{M}^* with respect to the weighted inner product given by Eq. (3.6), viz.,

$$\langle A, \mathcal{M}_* B \rangle_\sigma = \langle \mathcal{M}^* A, B \rangle_\sigma. \quad (\text{C4})$$

If \mathcal{M}^* commutes with the Δ_σ map defined by Eq. (3.10), then

$$\mathcal{M}_* = \mathcal{M}_{*,\mathcal{R}} \quad (\text{C5})$$

for any density map \mathcal{E}_σ in the form of Eq. (3.8), where $\mathcal{M}_{*,\mathcal{R}}$ is the weighted adjoint of \mathcal{M}^* in terms of the right product map $\mathcal{E}_\sigma = \mathcal{R}_\sigma$ defined by Eq. (3.9). To be explicit,

$$\langle A, \mathcal{R}_\sigma \mathcal{M}_{*,\mathcal{R}} B \rangle = \langle \mathcal{M}^* A, \mathcal{R}_\sigma B \rangle \quad \forall A, B \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}), \quad (\text{C6})$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{*,\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{R}_\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{M} \mathcal{R}_\sigma. \quad (\text{C7})$$

Proof. For any $A, B \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\langle A, \mathcal{M}_* B \rangle_\sigma = \langle \mathcal{M}^* A, B \rangle_\sigma \quad (\text{by Eq. (C4)}) \quad (\text{C8})$$

$$= \langle \mathcal{R}_\sigma \phi(\Delta_\sigma) \mathcal{M}^* A, B \rangle \quad (\text{by Eqs. (3.6) and (3.8), } \mathcal{E}_\sigma = \mathcal{E}_\sigma^*) \quad (\text{C9})$$

$$= \langle \mathcal{M}^* \phi(\Delta_\sigma) A, \mathcal{R}_\sigma B \rangle \quad (\mathcal{M}^* \text{ and } \Delta_\sigma \text{ commute, } \mathcal{R}_\sigma = \mathcal{R}_\sigma^*) \quad (\text{C10})$$

$$= \langle \phi(\Delta_\sigma) A, \mathcal{R}_\sigma \mathcal{M}_{*,\mathcal{R}} B \rangle \quad (\text{by Eq. (C6)}) \quad (\text{C11})$$

$$= \langle \mathcal{R}_\sigma \phi(\Delta_\sigma) A, \mathcal{M}_{*,\mathcal{R}} B \rangle \quad (\mathcal{R}_\sigma = \mathcal{R}_\sigma^*) \quad (\text{C12})$$

$$= \langle A, \mathcal{M}_{*,\mathcal{R}} B \rangle_\sigma \quad (\text{by Eqs. (3.6) and (3.8)}) \quad (\text{C13})$$

□

Proposition C.3. For the thermal steady state given by Eq. (3.34) and the semigroup generator given by Eq. (4.9), \mathcal{L}^* commutes with Δ_σ . Hence, \mathcal{L}_* is the same for all density maps in Petz's class by Prop. C.2.

Proof. Given Eq. (4.9), \mathcal{L}^* can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{L}^* A = -i\omega_{jk} \left[a_j^\dagger a_k, A \right] + \frac{1}{2} (\bar{n} + 1) \gamma_{jk} (2a_j^\dagger A a_k - A a_j^\dagger a_k - a_j^\dagger a_k A) + \frac{1}{2} \bar{n} \gamma_{jk} (2a_k A a_j^\dagger - A a_k a_j^\dagger - a_k a_j^\dagger A) \quad (\text{C14})$$

for any $A \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$. Eqs. (C2) imply

$$\sigma^{-1} a_j = z a_j \sigma^{-1}, \quad a_j^\dagger \sigma^{-1} = z \sigma^{-1} a_j^\dagger. \quad (\text{C15})$$

It follows from Eqs. (C2) and (C15) that

$$a_j^\dagger a_k (\Delta_\sigma A) = \Delta_\sigma (a_j^\dagger a_k A), \quad (\Delta_\sigma A) a_j^\dagger a_k = \Delta_\sigma (A a_j^\dagger a_k), \quad (\text{C16})$$

$$a_j^\dagger (\Delta_\sigma A) a_k = \Delta_\sigma (a_j^\dagger A a_k), \quad a_k (\Delta_\sigma A) a_j^\dagger = \Delta_\sigma (a_k A a_j^\dagger). \quad (\text{C17})$$

Hence, all the operations on A on the right-hand side of Eq. (C14) commute with Δ_σ , giving $\mathcal{L}^* \Delta_\sigma = \Delta_\sigma \mathcal{L}^*$. \square

Appendix D: Time reversal on a larger Hilbert space

Given a CPTP map \mathcal{F} , it can always be represented in a larger Hilbert space as

$$\mathcal{F}\rho = \text{tr}' U(\rho \otimes \chi)U^\dagger, \quad (\text{D1})$$

where χ is a density operator on a reservoir Hilbert space \mathcal{H}' , U is a unitary operator on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}'$, and tr' denotes the partial trace with respect to \mathcal{H}' . Now define another unitary operator V on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}'$ by

$$V \equiv \Theta U^\dagger \quad (\text{D2})$$

with respect to an antiunitary map Θ on $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}')$. If U is expressed as $U = \exp(-iHt)$ with respect to a Hamiltonian H , then $V = \exp(-i\Theta Ht)$. Assume that Θ is separable in the sense of

$$\Theta(A \otimes B) = (\Theta A) \otimes (\Theta B), \quad (\text{D3})$$

and suppose that another CPTP map \mathcal{G} is given by

$$\mathcal{G}\rho = \text{tr}' V(\rho \otimes \Theta\chi)V^\dagger. \quad (\text{D4})$$

The following proposition relating \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} is a generalization of Ref. [42], which focuses on the $\mathcal{E}_\sigma = \mathcal{R}_\sigma$ case.

Proposition D.1. *Assume that $\sigma \otimes \chi$ is a steady state of the total system, viz.,*

$$U(\sigma \otimes \chi)U^\dagger = \sigma \otimes \chi. \quad (\text{D5})$$

Then the \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} maps given by Eqs. (D1)–(D4) satisfy the reversal relation given by Eq. (5.7).

The proof is delegated to Appendix F.

Eq. (D5) is an additional assumption about the steady state of the total system. It implies that σ is a steady state of \mathcal{F} , but the converse need not be true. This assumption was also made by Carmichael and Walls—who called it microscopic stationarity [42, Eq. (2.9)]—to derive Agarwal’s detailed balance from time-reversal symmetry.

For a system satisfying time-reversal symmetry, $U = V$. By virtue of Prop. D.1, the time-reversal symmetry together with the assumption of a Θ -symmetric steady state $\Theta(\sigma \otimes \chi) = \sigma \otimes \chi$ lead to $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}$ and the detailed-balance condition defined by Eqs. (5.22).

Appendix E: Another definition of time reversal

Let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} : \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ be two linear maps and denote a certain dual of \mathcal{A} by $\mathcal{A}^\# : \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$. A criterion of the dual proposed by Crooks [40] and generalized by Manzano *et al.* [41, Eq. (7)] is

$$\text{tr } \mathcal{B}\mathcal{A}\sigma = \text{tr } \mathcal{A}^\# \mathcal{B}^\# \Theta\sigma, \quad (\text{E1})$$

where $\Theta\sigma \equiv \theta\sigma\theta^{-1}$ and θ is a unitary or antiunitary operator. Here I focus on the antiunitary case. It turns out that their assumed form of $\mathcal{A}^\#$ is only one possible solution of Eq. (E1); Eq. (5.7) for a class of density maps can satisfy it as well.

Proposition E.1. *Suppose that \mathcal{E}_σ is self-adjoint with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product ($\mathcal{E}_\sigma = \mathcal{E}_\sigma^*$) and satisfies $\mathcal{E}_\sigma I = \sigma$ and $\mathcal{E}_\sigma^{-1}\sigma = I$. In particular, any normalized density map in Petz’s class suffices. If one sets*

$$\mathcal{A}^\# = (\Theta \mathcal{A}_* \Theta^*)^* = \Theta \mathcal{E}_\sigma \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{E}_\sigma^{-1} \Theta^*, \quad (\text{E2})$$

then Eq. (E1) is satisfied.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{tr } \mathcal{A}^\# \mathcal{B}^\# \Theta \sigma &= \text{tr } \Theta \mathcal{E}_\sigma \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{E}_\sigma^{-1} \Theta^* \Theta \mathcal{E}_\sigma \mathcal{B}^* \mathcal{E}_\sigma^{-1} \Theta^* \Theta \sigma && \text{(by Eq. (E2))} && \text{(E3)} \\
&= \text{tr } \Theta \mathcal{E}_\sigma \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{B}^* \mathcal{E}_\sigma^{-1} \sigma && (\Theta^* = \Theta^{-1}) && \text{(E4)} \\
&= \text{tr } \Theta \mathcal{E}_\sigma \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{B}^* I && (\mathcal{E}_\sigma^{-1} \sigma = I) && \text{(E5)} \\
&= \langle I, \Theta \mathcal{E}_\sigma \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{B}^* I \rangle && \text{(by Eq. (3.3))} && \text{(E6)} \\
&= \langle \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{B}^* I, \mathcal{E}_\sigma \Theta^* I \rangle && \text{(by definition of } \Theta^*, \mathcal{E}_\sigma = \mathcal{E}_\sigma^*) && \text{(E7)} \\
&= \langle \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{B}^* I, \sigma \rangle && (\Theta^* I = I, \mathcal{E}_\sigma I = \sigma) && \text{(E8)} \\
&= \langle I, \mathcal{B} \mathcal{A} \sigma \rangle && \text{(by definition of Hilbert-Schmidt adjoint)} && \text{(E9)} \\
&= \text{tr } \mathcal{B} \mathcal{A} \sigma. && \text{(by Eq. (3.3))} && \text{(E10)}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Eq. (5.7) can be written as $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}^\#$ given Eq. (E2).

Suppose that \mathcal{A} can be expressed in terms of some operators $\{\alpha_j \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})\}$ as

$$\mathcal{A} \rho = \sum_j \alpha_j \rho \alpha_j^\dagger. \quad \text{(E11)}$$

Assume also the density map $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma, \text{Con}}$ given by Eq. (5.10). Then Eq. (E1) can be written as

$$\mathcal{A}^\# \rho = \sum_j \tilde{\alpha}_j \rho \tilde{\alpha}_j^\dagger, \quad \tilde{\alpha}_j \equiv \Theta \Delta_\sigma^{1/2} \alpha_j^\dagger = \theta \sigma^{1/2} \alpha_j^\dagger \sigma^{-1/2} \theta^{-1}. \quad \text{(E12)}$$

This form of $\mathcal{A}^\#$ is assumed by Crooks and Manzano *et al.* [40, 41], but it is not the only form that satisfies Eq. (E1), as Prop. E.1 demonstrates.

Appendix F: Miscellaneous results and proofs

Proof of Theorem 1. The most nontrivial part of the theorem is the relation between the definition of the geometric variable given by Eq. (4.2) and the equation of motion given by Eq. (4.4). To prove that, I first derive Eq. (4.5) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{J}_{jk}(t) &= \left\langle \dot{X}_j(t), X_k(t) \right\rangle_\sigma + \left\langle X_j(t), \dot{X}_k(t) \right\rangle_\sigma && \text{(by Eq. (3.5))} && \text{(F1)} \\
&= \langle \mathcal{L}_* X_j(t), X_k(t) \rangle_\sigma + \langle X_j(t), \mathcal{L}_* X_k(t) \rangle_\sigma && \text{(by Eq. (3.16))} && \text{(F2)} \\
&= \langle X_j(t), (\mathcal{L}^* + \mathcal{L}_*) X_k(t) \rangle_\sigma. && \text{(by Eq. (3.20))} && \text{(F3)}
\end{aligned}$$

Now I can go from Eq. (4.2) to Eq. (4.4) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}_j(t) &= \text{tr} \left[\dot{X}_j(t) \rho(t) + X_j(t) \dot{\rho}(t) \right] && \text{(by Eq. (4.2))} && \text{(F4)} \\
&= \text{tr} \left[\dot{X}_j(t) \rho(t) + X_j(t) \mathcal{L} \rho(t) \right] && \text{(by Eqs. (2.2))} && \text{(F5)} \\
&= \text{tr} \left\{ \dot{X}_j(t) \sigma + \epsilon v^k \left[\dot{X}_j(t) \mathcal{F}(t) \partial_k \tau + X_j(t) \mathcal{L} \mathcal{F}(t) \partial_k \tau \right] \right\} + o(\epsilon) && \text{(by Eqs. (2.3) and (2.5))} && \text{(F6)} \\
&= \epsilon v^k \text{tr} \left\{ [\mathcal{L}_* X_j(t)] \mathcal{E}_\sigma X_k(t) + X_j(t) \mathcal{L} \mathcal{E}_\sigma X_k(t) \right\} + o(\epsilon) && \text{(by Eqs. (3.4), (3.13), and (3.16))} && \text{(F7)} \\
&= \epsilon v^k \left[\langle \mathcal{L}_* X_j(t), X_k(t) \rangle_\sigma + \langle X_j(t), \mathcal{L}_* X_k(t) \rangle_\sigma \right] + o(\epsilon) && \text{(by Eqs. (3.6) and (3.17))} && \text{(F8)} \\
&= -\epsilon v^k K_{jk}(t) + o(\epsilon). && \text{(by Eqs. (3.20) and (4.5))} && \text{(F9)}
\end{aligned}$$

Eq. (4.3) is obtained simply by combining Eqs. (3.11), (4.1), (4.3), and (4.4). $K(t)$ is symmetric because $J(t)$ is symmetric as per Eq. (3.7). $K(t)$ is positive-semidefinite because J is monotonic as per Eq. (3.12). □

Proof of Theorem 2. Following steps similar to the proof of Theorem 1, it is straightforward to show that

$$\dot{y}_j(t) = -\langle X_j(0), \mathcal{L}_* X_k(t) \rangle_\sigma f^k + o(\epsilon). \quad \text{(F10)}$$

This current as a function of t does not seem to have any simple relation with the other quantities, but a relation at $t = 0$ is possible. Eqs. (4.22) and (4.23) are obtained by plugging $t = 0$ in Eq. (F10). Eq. (4.24) follows from Eq. (4.5). O is positive-semidefinite because

$$v^j O_{jk} v^k = \frac{1}{2} v^j K_{jk}(0) v^k \quad \forall v \quad (\text{F11})$$

and K is positive-semidefinite as per Theorem 1. Eq. (4.25) follows from Eqs. (4.3), (4.22), and (F11). \square

Before proving Theorems 3 and 4 and Props. D.1 and F.1, I need the following lemma.

Lemma F.1. *Assume a density map \mathcal{E}_ρ in the form of Eq. (3.8).*

1. *For any unitary or antiunitary map \mathcal{U} ,*

$$\mathcal{U}\mathcal{E}_\rho = \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U}\rho}\mathcal{U}, \quad (\text{F12})$$

$$\mathcal{U}\mathcal{E}_\rho^{-1} = \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U}\rho}^{-1}\mathcal{U}. \quad (\text{F13})$$

2. *For any $A \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$, $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$, $\chi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}')$, and $B \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}')$ that commutes with χ ,*

$$\mathcal{E}_{\rho \otimes \chi}(A \otimes B) = (\mathcal{E}_\rho A) \otimes (B\chi). \quad (\text{F14})$$

Proof. Assume the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product in the following. The Δ_ρ map defined by Eq. (3.10) is self-adjoint and positive-definite, because

$$\langle A, \Delta_\rho A \rangle = \text{tr } A^\dagger \rho A \rho^{-1} = \text{tr}(\rho A \rho^{-1})^\dagger A = \langle \Delta_\rho A, A \rangle, \quad (\text{F15})$$

$$\langle A, \Delta_\rho A \rangle = \text{tr } \rho^{-1/2} A^\dagger \rho^{1/2} \rho^{1/2} A \rho^{-1/2} = \left\langle \rho^{1/2} A \rho^{-1/2}, \rho^{1/2} A \rho^{-1/2} \right\rangle \geq 0, \quad (\text{F16})$$

and $\Delta_\rho^{-1} A = \rho^{-1} A \rho$ exists. Now define $\{E_j \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})\}$ as the orthonormal eigenvectors of Δ_ρ and $\{\lambda_j\}$ as the eigenvalues, such that

$$\Delta_\rho E_j = \lambda_j E_j, \quad \langle E_j, E_k \rangle = \delta_{jk}, \quad (\text{F17})$$

where Einstein summation is abandoned for clarity. Notice that

$$\mathcal{U}\Delta_\rho A = (\mathcal{U}\rho)(\mathcal{U}A)(\mathcal{U}\rho)^{-1} = \Delta_{\mathcal{U}\rho}\mathcal{U}A, \quad (\text{F18})$$

so if E_j is an eigenvector of Δ_ρ with eigenvalue λ_j , then $\mathcal{U}E_j$ is an eigenvector of $\Delta_{\mathcal{U}\rho}$ with the same eigenvalue λ_j . \mathcal{E}_ρ and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U}\rho}$ can then be expressed as

$$\mathcal{E}_\rho A = \mathcal{R}_\rho \phi(\Delta_\rho) A = \sum_j \phi(\lambda_j) E_j \rho \langle E_j, A \rangle, \quad (\text{F19})$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U}\rho} A = \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}\rho} \phi(\Delta_{\mathcal{U}\rho}) A = \sum_j \phi(\lambda_j) (\mathcal{U}E_j) (\mathcal{U}\rho) \langle \mathcal{U}E_j, A \rangle. \quad (\text{F20})$$

If \mathcal{U} is unitary,

$$\mathcal{U}\mathcal{E}_\rho A = \sum_j \phi(\lambda_j) (\mathcal{U}E_j) (\mathcal{U}\rho) \langle E_j, A \rangle \quad (\mathcal{U}(AB) = (\mathcal{U}A)(\mathcal{U}B)) \quad (\text{F21})$$

$$= \sum_j \phi(\lambda_j) (\mathcal{U}E_j) (\mathcal{U}\rho) \langle \mathcal{U}E_j, \mathcal{U}A \rangle \quad (\mathcal{U} \text{ is unitary}) \quad (\text{F22})$$

$$= \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U}\rho} \mathcal{U}A. \quad (\text{by Eq. (F20)}) \quad (\text{F23})$$

Similarly, if \mathcal{U} is antiunitary,

$$\mathcal{U}\mathcal{E}_\rho A = \sum_j \phi(\lambda_j)(\mathcal{U}E_j)(\mathcal{U}\rho) \langle A, E_j \rangle \quad (\mathcal{U}(AB) = (\mathcal{U}A)(\mathcal{U}B)) \quad (\text{F24})$$

$$= \sum_j \phi(\lambda_j)(\mathcal{U}E_j)(\mathcal{U}\rho) \langle \mathcal{U}E_j, \mathcal{U}A \rangle \quad (\mathcal{U} \text{ is antiunitary}) \quad (\text{F25})$$

$$= \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U}\rho} \mathcal{U}A. \quad (\text{by Eq. (F20)}) \quad (\text{F26})$$

Hence Eq. (F12) is proved. To prove Eq. (F13), use Eq. (F12) and $\mathcal{U}^{-1} = \mathcal{U}^*$ to obtain $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U}\rho} = \mathcal{U}\mathcal{E}_\rho\mathcal{U}^*$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U}\rho}^{-1} = \mathcal{U}\mathcal{E}_\rho^{-1}\mathcal{U}^*$. To prove Eq. (F14), assume any B that commutes with χ and note that

$$\Delta_{\rho \otimes \chi}(A \otimes B) = (\Delta_\rho A) \otimes B. \quad (\text{F27})$$

It follows that, if E_j is an eigenvector of Δ_ρ with eigenvalue λ_j , $E_j \otimes B$ is an eigenvector of $\Delta_{\rho \otimes \chi}$ with the same eigenvalue. Writing $A = \sum_j E_j \langle E_j, A \rangle$, one obtains

$$\mathcal{E}_{\rho \otimes \chi}(A \otimes B) = \mathcal{R}_{\rho \otimes \chi} \phi(\Delta_{\rho \otimes \chi})(A \otimes B) = \sum_j \phi(\lambda_j)(E_j \rho \otimes B \chi) \langle E_j, A \rangle = (\mathcal{E}_\rho A) \otimes (B \chi). \quad (\text{F28})$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3.

$$-\tilde{O}_{jk} = \left\langle \tilde{X}_j(0), \mathcal{K}_* \tilde{X}_k(0) \right\rangle_{\tilde{\sigma}} \quad (\text{by Eq. (5.14)}) \quad (\text{F29})$$

$$= \langle \mathcal{K}^* \Theta X_j(0), \Theta X_k(0) \rangle_{\tilde{\sigma}} \quad (\text{by definition of } \mathcal{K}_* \text{ and Eq. (5.16)}) \quad (\text{F30})$$

$$= \langle \Theta \mathcal{L}_* X_j(0), \Theta X_k(0) \rangle_{\tilde{\sigma}} \quad (\text{by Eq. (5.8)}) \quad (\text{F31})$$

$$= \langle \Theta \mathcal{L}_* X_j(0), \mathcal{E}_{\Theta\sigma} \Theta X_k(0) \rangle \quad (\text{by Eq. (3.6) and (5.11)}) \quad (\text{F32})$$

$$= \langle \Theta \mathcal{L}_* X_j(0), \Theta \mathcal{E}_\sigma X_k(0) \rangle \quad (\text{by Lemma F.1}) \quad (\text{F33})$$

$$= \langle \mathcal{E}_\sigma X_k(0), \mathcal{L}_* X_j(0) \rangle \quad (\Theta \text{ is antiunitary}) \quad (\text{F34})$$

$$= -O_{kj}. \quad (\text{by Eq. (4.23), } \mathcal{E}_\sigma = \mathcal{E}_\sigma^*) \quad (\text{F35})$$

□

Proof of Theorem 4.

$$-O_{jk} = \langle X_j(0), \mathcal{L}_* X_k(0) \rangle_\sigma \quad (\text{by Eq. (4.23)}) \quad (\text{F36})$$

$$= \langle X_j(0), \Theta^* \mathcal{K}^* \Theta X_k(0) \rangle_\sigma \quad (\text{by Eq. (5.8) and } \Theta^* = \Theta^{-1}) \quad (\text{F37})$$

$$= \langle \mathcal{K}^* \Theta X_k(0), \Theta X_j(0) \rangle_{\Theta\sigma} \quad (\text{by definition of } \Theta^* \text{ and Lemma F.1}) \quad (\text{F38})$$

$$= T_k^l T_j^m \langle \mathcal{K}^* X_l(0), X_m(0) \rangle_\sigma \quad (\text{by Eqs. (5.18) and (5.19)}) \quad (\text{F39})$$

$$= -T_k^l T_j^m \tilde{O}_{lm}. \quad (\text{by Eqs. (5.14) and (5.18)}) \quad (\text{F40})$$

□

Proof of Proposition D.1. Define

$$\mathcal{U}A \equiv \mathcal{U}A\mathcal{U}^\dagger, \quad (\text{F41})$$

$$\mathcal{V}A \equiv \mathcal{V}A\mathcal{V}^\dagger, \quad (\text{F42})$$

which are unitary maps with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product. Eq. (D2) leads to

$$\mathcal{V} = \Theta \mathcal{U}^* \Theta^*. \quad (\text{F43})$$

Then one can write, for any $A, B \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\langle A, \mathcal{F}_* B \rangle_\sigma = \langle A, \mathcal{F} \mathcal{E}_\sigma B \rangle \quad (\text{by Eqs. (3.6) and (3.15)}) \quad (\text{F44})$$

$$= \langle A, \text{tr}' \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{E}_\sigma B \otimes \chi) \rangle \quad (\text{by Eqs. (D1) and (F41)}) \quad (\text{F45})$$

$$= \langle A \otimes I, \mathcal{U} \mathcal{E}_{\sigma \otimes \chi}(B \otimes I) \rangle \quad (\text{by definition of tr}' and Lemma F.1) \quad (\text{F46})$$

$$= \langle \mathcal{U}^*(A \otimes I), \mathcal{E}_{\sigma \otimes \chi}(B \otimes I) \rangle. \quad (\text{by definition of } \mathcal{U}^*) \quad (\text{F47})$$

Similarly, one can write

$$\langle A, \Theta^* \mathcal{G}^* \Theta B \rangle_\sigma = \langle \mathcal{E}_\sigma A, \Theta^* \mathcal{G}^* \Theta B \rangle \quad (\text{by Eq. (3.6), } \mathcal{E}_\sigma = \mathcal{E}_\sigma^*) \quad (\text{F48})$$

$$= \langle \mathcal{G}^* \Theta B, \mathcal{E}_{\Theta^* \sigma} A \rangle \quad (\text{by definition of } \Theta^*, \text{ Lemma F.1}) \quad (\text{F49})$$

$$= \langle \mathcal{V}^* \Theta(B \otimes I), \mathcal{E}_{\Theta^* \sigma \otimes \Theta \chi} \Theta(A \otimes I) \rangle, \quad (\text{F50})$$

where the last step follows the same arguments that give Eq. (F47). Now Eqs. (F47) and (F50) can be shown to be equal as follows:

$$\langle \mathcal{V}^* \Theta(B \otimes I), \mathcal{E}_{\Theta^* \sigma \otimes \Theta \chi} \Theta(A \otimes I) \rangle = \langle \Theta^* \mathcal{V} \mathcal{E}_{\Theta^* \sigma \otimes \Theta \chi} \Theta(A \otimes I), B \otimes I \rangle \quad (\text{by definition of } \mathcal{V}^* \text{ and } \Theta^*) \quad (\text{F51})$$

$$= \langle \mathcal{U}^* \Theta^* \mathcal{E}_{\Theta^* \sigma \otimes \Theta \chi} \Theta(A \otimes I), B \otimes I \rangle \quad (\text{by Eq. (F43)}) \quad (\text{F52})$$

$$= \langle \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U}^*(\sigma \otimes \chi)} \mathcal{U}^*(A \otimes I), B \otimes I \rangle \quad (\text{by Lemma F.1, } \Theta^* = \Theta^{-1}) \quad (\text{F53})$$

$$= \langle \mathcal{E}_{\sigma \otimes \chi} \mathcal{U}^*(A \otimes I), B \otimes I \rangle. \quad (\text{by Eq. (D5)}) \quad (\text{F54})$$

Hence, the left-hand sides of Eqs. (F44) and (F48) are equal, leading to Eq. (5.7). \square

Proposition F.1. *With the reversal relation given by Eq. (5.7) for the \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} maps and the relation for their steady states given by Eq. (5.11), \mathcal{F} is also the reverse of \mathcal{G} in the sense of*

$$\mathcal{F}^* = \Theta^* \mathcal{G}_* \Theta. \quad (\text{F55})$$

Proof.

$$\Theta^* \mathcal{G}_* \Theta = \Theta^* \mathcal{E}_\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{G} \mathcal{E}_\sigma \Theta \quad (\text{by definition of } \mathcal{G}_*) \quad (\text{F56})$$

$$= \mathcal{E}_\sigma^{-1} \Theta^* \mathcal{G} \Theta \mathcal{E}_\sigma \quad (\text{by Eq. (5.11), Lemma F.1, } \Theta^* = \Theta^{-1}) \quad (\text{F57})$$

$$= \mathcal{E}_\sigma^{-1} (\Theta^* \mathcal{G}^* \Theta)^* \mathcal{E}_\sigma \quad ((\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B})^* = \mathcal{B}^* \mathcal{A}^*) \quad (\text{F58})$$

$$= \mathcal{E}_\sigma^{-1} (\mathcal{F}_*)^* \mathcal{E}_\sigma \quad (\text{by Eq. (5.7)}) \quad (\text{F59})$$

$$= \mathcal{E}_\sigma^{-1} (\mathcal{E}_\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{F} \mathcal{E}_\sigma)^* \mathcal{E}_\sigma \quad (\text{by definition of } \mathcal{F}_*) \quad (\text{F60})$$

$$= \mathcal{E}_\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{E}_\sigma \mathcal{F}^* \mathcal{E}_\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{E}_\sigma \quad ((\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B})^* = \mathcal{B}^* \mathcal{A}^*, \mathcal{E}_\sigma = \mathcal{E}_\sigma^*) \quad (\text{F61})$$

$$= \mathcal{F}^*. \quad (\text{F62})$$

\square

-
- [1] Lars Onsager, “Reciprocal relations in irreversible processes. i.” *Physical Review* **37**, 405–426 (1931).
[2] Donald G. Miller, “Thermodynamics of irreversible processes. the experimental verification of the onsager reciprocal relations.” *Chemical Reviews* **60**, 15–37 (1960).
[3] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Statistical Physics*, 2nd ed. (Pergamon Press, Oxford, UK, 1970).
[4] Linda E. Reichl, *A Modern Course in Statistical Physics, 4th Edition* (Wiley, Weinheim, Germany, 2016).
[5] Robert Alicki, “On the detailed balance condition for non-Hamiltonian systems,” *Reports on Mathematical Physics* **10**, 249–258 (1976).
[6] Herbert Spohn and Joel L. Lebowitz, “Irreversible thermodynamics for quantum systems weakly coupled to thermal reservoirs,” in *Advances in Chemical Physics* (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA, 1978) p. 109–142.
[7] K. Lendi, “Entropy production in coherence-vector formulation for n-level systems,” *Physical Review A* **34**, 662 (1986).
[8] K. Lendi and A. J. van Wonderen, “Generalized quantum onsager coefficients from a symmetrized campbell-hausdorff expansion,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **34**, 1285 (2001).
[9] César A. Rodríguez-Rosario, Thomas Frauenheim, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik, “Quantum coherences as a thermodynamic potential,” *Open Systems & Information Dynamics* **26**, 1950022 (2020).

- [10] Domingos S. P. Salazar and Gabriel T. Landi, “Nonlinear onsager relations for gaussian quantum maps,” *Physical Review Research* **2**, 033090 (2020).
- [11] Lars Onsager, “Reciprocal relations in irreversible processes. ii,” *Physical Review* **38**, 2265–2279 (1931).
- [12] H. B. G. Casimir, “On onsager’s principle of microscopic reversibility,” *Reviews of Modern Physics* **17**, 343–350 (1945).
- [13] Masahito Hayashi, *Quantum Information Theory: Mathematical Foundation*, 2nd ed. (Springer, Berlin, 2017).
- [14] Shun-ichi Amari and Hiroshi Nagaoka, *Methods of Information Geometry* (American Mathematical Society/Oxford University Press, Providence, 2000).
- [15] J. J. Sakurai and Jim Napolitano, *Modern Quantum Mechanics*, 2nd ed. (Addison-Wesley, Boston, 2011).
- [16] G. S. Agarwal, “Open quantum Markovian systems and the microreversibility,” *Zeitschrift für Physik A Hadrons and nuclei* **258**, 409–422 (1973).
- [17] Robert Alicki and Karl Lendi, *Quantum Dynamical Semigroups and Applications* (Springer, Berlin, Germany, 2007).
- [18] Vittorio Gorini, Andrzej Kossakowski, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, “Completely positive dynamical semigroups of n-level systems,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **17**, 821–825 (1976).
- [19] G. Lindblad, “On the generators of quantum dynamical semigroups,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **48**, 119–130 (1976).
- [20] Crispin W. Gardiner and Peter Zoller, *Quantum Noise*, 2nd ed. (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000).
- [21] Howard M. Wiseman and Gerard J. Milburn, *Quantum Measurement and Control* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010).
- [22] Alexander S. Holevo, *Quantum Systems, Channels, Information*, 2nd ed. (De Gruyter, Berlin, 2019).
- [23] Ulrich Weiss, *Quantum Dissipative Systems* (World Scientific, Singapore, 2008).
- [24] Göran Lindblad, “Completely positive maps and entropy inequalities,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **40**, 147–151 (1975).
- [25] L. Onsager and S. Machlup, “Fluctuations and irreversible processes,” *Physical Review* **91**, 1505–1512 (1953).
- [26] E. T. Jaynes, “Information Theory and Statistical Mechanics. II,” *Physical Review* **108**, 171–190 (1957).
- [27] Dénes Petz, *Quantum Information Theory and Quantum Statistics* (Springer, Berlin, Germany, 2010).
- [28] Dénes Petz, “Monotone metrics on matrix spaces,” *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **244**, 81–96 (1996).
- [29] Mankei Tsang, “Generalized conditional expectations for quantum retrodiction and smoothing,” *Physical Review A* **105**, 042213 (2022).
- [30] Mankei Tsang, “Operational meanings of a generalized conditional expectation in quantum metrology,” *Quantum* **7**, 1162 (2023), 2212.13162v6.
- [31] Arthur J. Parzygnat and James Fullwood, “From time-reversal symmetry to quantum bayes’ rules,” *PRX Quantum* **4**, 020334 (2023).
- [32] A. Uhlmann and B. Crell, “Geometry of state spaces,” in *Entanglement and Decoherence*, edited by Andreas Buchleitner, Carlos Viviescas, and Markus Tiersch (Springer, Berlin, 2009) p. 1–60.
- [33] Samuel L. Braunstein and Carlton M. Caves, “Statistical distance and the geometry of quantum states,” *Physical Review Letters* **72**, 3439–3443 (1994).
- [34] Carl W. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (Academic Press, New York, 1976).
- [35] Lorenzo Bertini, Alberto De Sole, Davide Gabrielli, Giovanni Jona-Lasinio, and Claudio Landim, “Macroscopic fluctuation theory,” *Reviews of Modern Physics* **87**, 593–636 (2015).
- [36] Crispin W. Gardiner, *Stochastic Methods: A Handbook for the Natural and Social Sciences* (Springer, Berlin, 2010).
- [37] Mankei Tsang, “Quantum reversal: a general theory of coherent quantum absorbers,” *ArXiv e-prints* (2024), 10.48550/arXiv.2402.02502, 2402.02502.
- [38] Alain Connes, “Caractérisation des espaces vectoriels ordonnés sous-jacents aux algèbres de von neumann,” *Annales de l’Institut Fourier* **24**, 121–155 (1974).
- [39] M. Ohya and Denes Petz, *Quantum Entropy and Its Use* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1993).
- [40] Gavin E. Crooks, “Quantum operation time reversal,” *Physical Review A* **77**, 034101 (2008).
- [41] Gonzalo Manzano, Jordan M. Horowitz, and Juan M. R. Parrondo, “Nonequilibrium potential and fluctuation theorems for quantum maps,” *Physical Review E* **92**, 032129 (2015).
- [42] H. J. Carmichael and D. F. Walls, “Detailed balance in open quantum Markoffian systems,” *Zeitschrift für Physik B Condensed Matter* **25**, 428 (1976).
- [43] Franco Fagnola and Veronica Umanità, “Generators of KMS symmetric Markov semigroups on $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h})$ symmetry and quantum detailed balance,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **298**, 523–547 (2010).
- [44] David Roberts and Aashish A. Clerk, “Driven-dissipative quantum kerr resonators: New exact solutions, photon blockade and quantum bistability,” *Physical Review X* **10**, 021022 (2020).
- [45] David Roberts, Andrew Lingenfelter, and A. A. Clerk, “Hidden time-reversal symmetry, quantum detailed balance and exact solutions of driven-dissipative quantum systems,” *PRX Quantum* **2**, 020336 (2021).
- [46] Andrzej Kossakowski, Alberto Frigerio, Vittorio Gorini, and Maurizio Verri, “Quantum detailed balance and KMS condition,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **57**, 97–110 (1977).
- [47] W. A. Majewski and R. F. Streater, “Detailed balance and quantum dynamical maps,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **31**, 7981 (1998).
- [48] Franco Fagnola and Veronica Umanità, “Generators of detailed balance quantum Markov semigroups,” *Infinite Dimensional Analysis, Quantum Probability and Related Topics* **10**, 335–363 (2007).
- [49] K. Temme, M. J. Kastoryano, M. B. Ruskai, M. M. Wolf, and F. Verstraete, “The χ^2 -divergence and mixing times of quantum markov processes,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **51** (2010), 10.1063/1.3511335.
- [50] Eric A. Carlen and Jan Maas, “Gradient flow and entropy inequalities for quantum Markov semigroups with detailed balance,” *Journal of Functional Analysis* **273**, 1810–1869 (2017).
- [51] Viktor S. Asadchy, Mohammad Sajjad Mirmoosa, Ana Díaz-Rubio, Shanhui Fan, and Sergei A. Tretyakov, “Tutorial on electromagnetic nonreciprocity and its origins,” *Proceedings of the IEEE* **108**, 1684–1727 (2020).
- [52] Vladimir B. Braginsky and Farid Ya. Khalili, *Quantum Measurement* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992).

- [53] Mankei Tsang, Howard M. Wiseman, and Carlton M. Caves, “Fundamental Quantum Limit to Waveform Estimation,” *Physical Review Letters* **106**, 090401 (2011).
- [54] Stefan L. Danilishin, Farid Ya. Khalili, and Haixing Miao, “Advanced quantum techniques for future gravitational-wave detectors,” *Living Reviews in Relativity* **22**, 2 (2019).
- [55] Mankei Tsang, “Resolving starlight: a quantum perspective,” *Contemporary Physics* **60**, 279–298 (2019).
- [56] B. M. Escher, R. L. de Matos Filho, and L. Davidovich, “General framework for estimating the ultimate precision limit in noisy quantum-enhanced metrology,” *Nature Physics* **7**, 406–411 (2011).
- [57] R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański, J. Kołodyński, and M. Guţă, “The elusive heisenberg limit in quantum-enhanced metrology,” *Nature Communications* **3**, 1063 (2012).
- [58] Mankei Tsang, “Quantum metrology with open dynamical systems,” *New Journal of Physics* **15**, 073005 (2013).
- [59] Sisi Zhou, Mengzhen Zhang, John Preskill, and Liang Jiang, “Achieving the heisenberg limit in quantum metrology using quantum error correction,” *Nature Communications* **9**, 1–11 (2018).
- [60] Philippe Jacquod, Robert S. Whitney, Jonathan Meair, and Markus Büttiker, “Onsager relations in coupled electric, thermoelectric, and spin transport: The tenfold way,” *Physical Review B* **86**, 155118 (2012).
- [61] Shanhui Fan, Roel Baets, Alexander Petrov, Zongfu Yu, John D. Joannopoulos, Wolfgang Freude, Andrea Melloni, Miloš Popović, Mathias Vanwolleghem, Dirk Jalas, Manfred Eich, Michael Krause, Hagen Renner, Ernst Brinkmeyer, and Christopher R. Doerr, “Comment on “nonreciprocal light propagation in a silicon photonic circuit”,” *Science* **335**, 38 (2012).
- [62] Mankei Tsang, “Quantum limits on the time-bandwidth product of an optical resonator,” *Optics Letters* **43**, 150–153 (2018).
- [63] Alexander S. Holevo, *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory* (Scuola Normale Superiore Pisa, Pisa, Italy, 2011).