

Quantum-classical hybrid dynamics: coupling mechanisms and diffusive approximation

Adrián A. Budini

*Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET),
Centro Atómico Bariloche, Avenida E. Bustillo Km 9.5, (8400) Bariloche,
Argentina, and Universidad Tecnológica Nacional (UTN-FRBA),
Fanny Newbery 111, (8400) Bariloche, Argentina*

(Dated: September 17, 2024)

In this paper we demonstrate that any Markovian master equation defining a completely positive evolution for a quantum-classical hybrid state can always be written in terms of four basic coupling mechanisms. Each of them is characterized by a different “backaction” on each subsystem. On this basis, for each case, we find the conditions under which a diffusive limit is approached, that is, the time evolution can be approximated in terms of the first and second derivatives of the hybrid state with respect to a classical coordinate. In this limit, the restricted class of evolutions that guaranty the positivity of the hybrid state at all times (quantum Fokker-Planck master equations) emerges when the coupling mechanisms lead to infinitesimal (non-finite) changes in both the quantum and classical subsystems. A broader class of diffusive evolutions is obtained when positivity is only granted after a transient time or alternatively is granted after imposing an initial finite width on the state of the classical subsystem. A set of representative examples support these results.

I. INTRODUCTION

Classical non-equilibrium dynamics are characterized by phenomena such as dissipation and diffusion. These emergent dynamical effects admit a simple description when approaching a Markovian limit. In fact, in this regime the main descriptive theoretical tools are classical master equations, Fokker-Planck equations, as well as their underlying description in terms of stochastic Langevin equations [1–3]. In a quantum regime, since the underlying dynamics takes place in a Hilbert space, non-equilibrium dynamics are characterized by dissipation, but also by decoherence. In a Markovian regime, the theory of open quantum systems [4] allows these effects to be described in terms of Lindblad (Lindblad-Kossakovski-Sudarshan-Gorini) dynamics, that is, quantum master equations [4, 5]. The stochastic representation of these evolutions intrinsically involves which measurement process is performed on the system of interest [6–8].

Quantum-classical hybrid systems are bipartite arrangements that lie on the frontier between the above ones, that is, the nature of one subsystem is classical [1–3] while the other is quantum [4–8]. Their description involves a hybrid state that lies on a Hilbert space which in turn depends parametrically on the state of the classical (incoherent) system. Different physical situations motivated the study of hybrid dynamics such as for example measurement theory [9], Bloch-Boltzmann equations [10], and non-Markovian master equations [11] induced by complex structured reservoirs [12–14]. In the latter context, information encoded in the classical subsystem acts as a source of memory effects for the partial quantum dynamics.

For Hilbert spaces of arbitrary dimension and *discrete* (even infinite countable) classical degrees of freedom the most general time-evolution of the hybrid state was determine in Ref. [15] and also [16]. Due to their quantum-classical structure the corresponding evolutions

were termed as “Lindblad rate equations” [15] and alternatively as “generalized Lindblad master equations” [16]. A similar characterization was subsequently presented in Ref. [17]. Specific applications were found in the context of spin baths [18] and single-molecule spectroscopy [19], that is, the study of (quantum) fluorescent systems coupled to (classically) structured environments [20, 21] in which the scattered electromagnetic field is usually observed by photon-detection measurements [21–23]. Stochastic representations of the hybrid state were also studied from different perspectives [21–25]. The quantum regression theorem [6, 26], quantum state smoothing [27] to improve the efficiency of a photon-detector [28] as well as the thermodynamics induced by finite baths [29, 30] were also physical applications of hybrid dynamics studied in recent literature.

The previous advancements in the study of quantum-classical hybrid dynamics are mainly based on considering classical subsystems defined by a countable set of possible states, while the quantum subsystem is arbitrary. A related but different research line is defined by the complementary case, that is, when the classical degrees of freedom can be labeled by a *continuous real coordinate*. In this situation, it is possible to endow the evolution of the classical (incoherent) subsystem with its own Hamiltonian dynamics (symplectic structure). These elements arise, for example, in the study of physicochemical processes [31]. Moreover, this type of hybrid dynamics has been obtained by considering continuous-in-time measurement processes [32–34]. Furthermore, they have been proposed as a possible model to describe the interaction between quantum matter and classical gravitational fields [35–37]. Phenomena such as a gravity induced decoherence emerge in this situation [35–41]. Notably, the most general time-evolution for an hybrid state with a continuous classical coordinate was recently established in Refs. [42, 43] and lightened in [44]. Interestingly, with a completely different motivation, the resulting “quan-

tum Fokker-Planck master equation” was also obtained in Ref. [45] on the basis of a measurement-feedback protocol.

Despite the above advances, some features or questions about hybrid dynamics remain open. First, we ask what is the minimal set of possible quantum-classical coupling mechanisms that allow any hybrid evolution to be written in terms of them. This question has not yet been clearly characterized. Second, we ask under which conditions the evolution of the hybrid state can be approximated by a diffusive one. The main goal of this paper is to answer these questions.

Similarly to Refs. [15, 17], the present approach is based on embedding the hybrid state in a bipartite Hilbert space. Furthermore, to address the above issues, the bipartite state is assumed to obey a local-in-time (Markovian) completely positive Lindblad dynamics [4, 5]. After imposing that one of the subsystems is incoherent at all times in a given fixed basis, the bipartite Lindblad structure allow us to characterize all possible quantum-classical coupling mechanisms. The *backaction*, that is, the impact of each subsystem on the other, is also studied in detail.

The developed approach leads to hybrid dynamics where the classical subsystem is characterized by a set of discrete states. On this basis, similarly to classical systems where diffusive (Fokker-Planck) equations are derived from (discrete) master equations [3], we study under what conditions a diffusive limit is approached. Quantum Fokker-Planck master equations that preserve the positivity of the hybrid state at all times [42–45] emerge in the particular case in which the coupling mechanisms lead to “infinitesimal” (smallest scale of the problem) transformations in both subsystems. However, we also show that a broader family of evolutions can be consistently taken into account after disregarding an initial transient time or by restricting the wide of the classical subsystem initial state. A set of representative examples supports the main conclusions.

The paper is outlined as follows. In Sec. II we derive the set of all possible quantum-classical coupling mechanisms that define any local-in-time hybrid evolution. In Sec. III we analyze under which conditions a diffusive limit emerges. In Sec. IV we study a set of specific examples. In Sec. V we provide the Conclusions.

II. QUANTUM-CLASSICAL COUPLING MECHANISMS

We consider a bipartite arrangement consisting of two parts, the quantum subsystem (s) and extra degrees of freedom that in a second step will be associated to the classical subsystem (c). In correspondence, the total Hilbert \mathcal{H}_{sc} is the product of each subsystem Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{sc} = \mathcal{H}_s \otimes \mathcal{H}_c$. By assumption, the density matrix Ξ_t of the bipartite arrangement obeys a Lindblad

equation [4, 5],

$$\frac{d\Xi_t}{dt} = -i[H, \Xi_t]_- + \sum_{i,j} a_{ij} (A_i \Xi_t A_j^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{A_j^\dagger A_i, \Xi_t\}_+). \quad (1)$$

Here, $[a, b]_- \equiv ab - ba$ and $\{a, b\}_+ \equiv ab + ba$ denote a commutator and anticommutator operations respectively. H is an arbitrary Hamiltonian operator, while $\{A_i\}$ is an arbitrary basis of operators in \mathcal{H}_{sc} . Finally, $\{a_{ij}\}$ is a Hermitian (positive semi-definite) matrix of rate coefficients. The indexes i and j run from one up to $(\dim \mathcal{H}_{sc})^2$, where $\dim \mathcal{H}_{sc}$ is the dimension of \mathcal{H}_{sc} .

Eq. (1) is the most general local-in-time evolution for the density matrix Ξ_t . Both subsystems are in general quantum ones. A hybrid quantum-classical solution is obtained when the bipartite state, at arbitrary times, can be written as

$$\Xi_t = \sum_c \rho_t^c \otimes |c\rangle\langle c|. \quad (2)$$

Here, $\{|c\rangle\}$ is an (fixed) orthogonal basis in \mathcal{H}_c , $\langle c|c'\rangle = \delta_{cc'}$, which in turn fulfills $\sum_c |c\rangle\langle c| = I_c$. With I we denote the identity operator. ρ_t^c are (conditional) quantum states in \mathcal{H}_s . Introducing the partial subsystems states, $\rho_t \equiv \text{Tr}_c[\Xi_t]$ and $\sigma_t \equiv \text{Tr}_s[\Xi_t]$, where $\text{Tr}[\bullet]$ is the trace operation, it follows the partial quantum state

$$\rho_t = \sum_c \rho_t^c, \quad (3)$$

while for the classical subsystem we get

$$\sigma_t = \sum_c p_t^c |c\rangle\langle c|, \quad p_t^c \equiv \text{Tr}_s[\rho_t^c]. \quad (4)$$

The state of the quantum subsystem ρ_t is defined by the addition of the unnormalized states $\{\rho_t^c\}$. The state σ_t corresponding to the classical subsystem is an incoherent statistical mixture, where the weights (probabilities p_t^c) of each projector $|c\rangle\langle c|$ is given by $\text{Tr}_s[\rho_t^c]$. Thus, classicality here means a system that is always incoherent in a given fixed basis.

In general, the solution of Eq. (1) cannot be written as a hybrid state [Eq. (2)]. Nevertheless, such kind of state becomes a solution if one restrict the Hamiltonian H , the operators $\{A_i\}$, and the matrix of coefficients $\{a_{ij}\}$. In fact, an appropriate choice of these elements allows us to embed an arbitrary (completely positive) hybrid time-evolution in the bipartite Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{sc} . The bipartite initial condition must also be restricted. An uncorrelated state is the most simple assumption, $\Xi_0 = \rho_0 \otimes \sigma_0 = \rho_0 \otimes \sum_c p_0 |c\rangle\langle c|$, where the weights satisfy $0 \leq p_0 \leq 1$ and $\sum_c p_0 = 1$.

Depending on the choice of the above elements different quantum-classical coupling mechanisms emerge. For their specific formulation it is necessary to introduce a basis of operators for each subsystem. For the quantum system the basis is taken as $I_s \cup \{V_\mu\}$, where

$\mu = 1, \dots, (\dim \mathcal{H}_s)^2 - 1$. Notice that the identity operator I_s is one element of this basis. Consequently, the set of operators $\{V_\mu\}$ is traceless. For the “classical” subsystem the basis of operators is $\{|c\rangle\langle c'|\}$ where $c, c' = 1, \dots, \dim \mathcal{H}_c$. In this case, the identity operator is obtained as $\sum_c |c\rangle\langle c| = I_c$. By construction, the following bipartite embedding guarantees that each coupling mechanism is independent of the other ones.

A. First case

The first case we dealt with emerges after taking the operators

$$A_i \rightarrow V_\mu \otimes |c\rangle\langle c|, \quad H = \sum_c H_c \otimes |c\rangle\langle c|, \quad (5)$$

and the coefficients $a_{ij} \rightarrow a_{(\mu c)(\nu c')} \delta_{cc'} \rightarrow \eta_c^{\mu\nu}$. Inserting these elements in Eq. (1) the evolution of the quantum states $\{\rho_t^c\}$ can be written as

$$\frac{d\rho_t^c}{dt} = -i[H_c, \rho_t^c]_- + \sum_{\mu\nu} \eta_c^{\mu\nu} (V_\mu \rho_t^c V_\nu^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{V_\nu^\dagger V_\mu, \rho_t^c\}_+). \quad (6)$$

Here, H_c is an arbitrary Hamiltonian parametrized by c . The indexes μ and ν run in the interval $1, \dots, (\dim \mathcal{H}_s)^2 - 1$ (the identity matrix I_s is not included in the addition). The coefficients $\{\eta_c^{\mu\nu}\}$ for each index c must to define a positive semi-definite matrix (with matrix indexes μ and ν). This property is inherited from the positivity constraint valid for a_{ij} in Eq. (1).

The evolution (6) has a simple interpretation. The states $\{\rho_t^c\}$ evolve independently of each other. Their dynamics is set by the Hamiltonian H_c and the matrix of rate coefficients $\eta_c^{\mu\nu}$. Both objects are parametrized by the state (c) of the incoherent subsystem. Thus, *the evolution of the quantum subsystem depends on the state of the classical one while the probabilities $\{p_t^c\}$ are invariant ones*. There is not any backaction on the classical subsystem. In fact, from Eq. (6) straightforwardly it follows $(d/dt)\text{Tr}_s[\rho_t^c] = 0$, which implies that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\sigma_t = 0. \quad (7)$$

Consequently, from Eq. (3) the system state ρ_t can be read as a statistical mixture of the solutions of the Lindblad dynamics (6). We notice that its time evolution, $(d/dt)\rho_t$, cannot be written in general as a time-independent Lindblad equation.

A self-independent dynamics of the quantum subsystem is covered by taking $H_c \rightarrow H_s + H_c$ and $\eta_c^{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \eta^{\mu\nu} + \eta_c^{\mu\nu}$. Furthermore, by changing the basis of operators $\{V_\mu\}$ it is always possible to obtain a diagonal matrix of rate coefficients, $\eta_c^{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \delta_{\mu\nu}\eta_c^\mu$.

B. Second case

The second case emerges by taking $H = 0$,

$$A_i \rightarrow I_s \otimes |c\rangle\langle c'|, \quad c \neq c', \quad (8)$$

and $a_{ij} \rightarrow \delta_{ij}a_i \rightarrow \phi_{cc'}$. From Eq. (1) it follows that

$$\frac{d\rho_t^c}{dt} = \sum_{\substack{c' \\ c' \neq c}} \phi_{cc'} \rho_t^{c'} - \sum_{\substack{c' \\ c' \neq c}} \phi_{c'c} \rho_t^c, \quad (9)$$

where the rates fulfill $\phi_{cc'} \geq 0 \forall c, c'$. In this case, the states $\{\rho_t^c\}$ are coupled between all of them. In fact, Eq. (9) has the structure of a classical master equation [1–3] where the coupling terms do not involve any information about the quantum system. Consequently, the probabilities $p_t^c = \text{Tr}_s[\rho_t^c]$ obey a classical master equation

$$\frac{dp_t^c}{dt} = \sum_{\substack{c' \\ c' \neq c}} \phi_{cc'} p_t^{c'} - \sum_{\substack{c' \\ c' \neq c}} \phi_{c'c} p_t^c, \quad (10)$$

defined by the rates $\{\phi_{c'c}\}$. In contrast, from Eq. (9) it is simple to check that the state of the quantum subsystem [Eq. (3)] does not evolve at all,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_t = 0. \quad (11)$$

Thus, *this mechanism endow the classical system with a proper time-irreversible self dynamics*, and there is not any backaction on the quantum subsystem. We notice that the combination of the first and second cases allow to describe hybrid dynamics where the classical subsystem has an independent self-evolution [Eqs. (10)] whose state in turn determine the (conditional) evolution of the quantum subsystem Eq. (6)].

C. Third case

The third case emerges by taking $H = 0$, the operators

$$A_i \rightarrow V_\mu \otimes |c\rangle\langle c'|, \quad c \neq c', \quad V_\mu \neq I_s, \quad (12)$$

and $a_{ij} \rightarrow a_{(\mu cc')(\nu \bar{c}\bar{c}')} \delta_{c\bar{c}} \delta_{c'\bar{c}'} \rightarrow \gamma_{cc'}^{\mu\nu}$. From Eq. (1) we get

$$\frac{d\rho_t^c}{dt} = \sum_{\substack{\mu, \nu, c' \\ c' \neq c}} \gamma_{cc'}^{\mu\nu} V_\mu \rho_t^{c'} V_\nu^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{\mu, \nu, c' \\ c' \neq c}} \gamma_{c'c}^{\mu\nu} \{V_\nu^\dagger V_\mu, \rho_t^c\}_+, \quad (13)$$

where the Hermitian matrices $\{\gamma_{c'c}^{\mu\nu}\}$ (with indexes μ and ν) must be positive semi-definite $\forall c, c'$. The evolution of the states $\{\rho_t^c\}$ has the structure of a classical master equation. Nevertheless, the couplings are mediated by operators of the quantum subsystem. Motivated by this property, this kind of evolutions were named as Lindblad rate equations [15].

The underlying stochastic dynamics associated to Eq. (13) can be read straightforwardly by considering the diagonal case $\gamma_{c'c}^{\mu\nu} = \delta^{\mu\nu}\gamma_{c'c}^\mu$ (this property can always be achieved by changing the basis of operators $\{V_\mu\}$). Thus, we realize that whenever the quantum subsystem suffers a transition induced by the operator V_μ , that is, $\rho_t^c \rightarrow V_\mu \rho_t^c V_\mu^\dagger$, the classical subsystem simultaneously realize the (incoherent) transition $|c\rangle \rightarrow |c'\rangle$. Therefore, *both subsystems are inherently coupled to each other*. In fact, a transition in one subsystem is always endowed by a corresponding transition in the other subsystem. There is a mutual backaction between both subsystems.

Coupling symmetries and backaction properties

In general, due to their intrinsic coupling, the evolution of each part cannot be written without involving information about the other. However, there are two exceptions to this rule. The *first* case emerges when it is fulfilled the coupling symmetry property

$$\gamma_{c'c}^{\mu\nu} = \gamma_{c'c}^{\nu\mu} \quad \forall \mu, \nu, c, c'. \quad (14)$$

Hence, the transition rates do not depend on the “starting” state $|c\rangle$. From Eqs. (3) and (13) the state of the quantum subsystem evolves as

$$\frac{d\rho_t}{dt} = \sum_{\mu,\nu} \gamma_0^{\mu\nu} (V_\mu \rho_t V_\nu^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{V_\nu^\dagger V_\mu, \rho_t\}_+), \quad (15)$$

where $\gamma_0^{\mu\nu} \equiv \sum_{c'} \gamma_{c'c}^{\mu\nu}$. This is a standard Lindblad equation that does not depend on the classical subsystem, which implies that there is not any backaction on the quantum subsystem. On the other hand, under the assumption (14) it is not possible to obtain a closed expression for $(d/dt)\rho_t^c$ without involving information about the quantum subsystem.

The *second* case occurs when it is fulfilled that

$$\sum_{\mu,\nu} \gamma_{c'c}^{\mu\nu} V_\nu^\dagger V_\mu = \gamma_{c'c}^0 \mathbf{I}_s \quad \forall c, c', \quad (16)$$

where $\{\gamma_{c'c}^0\}$ are constant (rates) of proportionality. From Eqs. (4) and (13) the evolution of the probabilities of the classical subsystem read

$$\frac{dp_t^c}{dt} = \sum_{\substack{c' \\ c' \neq c}} \gamma_{cc'}^0 p_t^{c'} - \sum_{\substack{c' \\ c' \neq c}} \gamma_{c'c}^0 p_t^c. \quad (17)$$

This classical master equation does not depend on the degrees of freedom of the quantum system, which implies that there is none backaction on the classical subsystem. On the other hand, it is not possible to write a closed evolution for the quantum state ρ_t .

In general the condition (14) neither condition (16) are fulfilled. Nevertheless, there are also dynamics where both conditions are satisfied. Thus, in this case the hybrid dynamics correlates both subsystems but their partial dynamics are independent of the other [see Eqs. (15) and (17)].

D. Fourth case

The fourth case can be read as a “*coherent superposition*” of the *second* and *third* cases [Eqs. (8) and (12) respectively]. In Eq. (1) we take $H = 0$ and

$$A_i \rightarrow (a_\mu \mathbf{I}_s + b_\mu V_\mu) \otimes |c\rangle\langle c'|, \quad c \neq c', \quad V_\mu \neq \mathbf{I}_s, \quad (18)$$

where $\{a_\mu\}$ and $\{b_\mu\}$ are arbitrary complex coefficients. Thus, the conditions $a_\mu \neq 0, b_\mu = 0$ and alternatively $a_\mu = 0, b_\mu \neq 0$, recover the *second* and *third* cases respectively. Under the replacements $a_{ij} \rightarrow a_{(\mu c c')(\nu \bar{c} \bar{c}')}\delta_{cc'}\delta_{c'\bar{c}'} \rightarrow \gamma_{cc'}^{\mu\nu}$, from Eq. (1) we get

$$\frac{d\rho_t^c}{dt} = \sum_{\substack{(\mu,\nu) \cup \mathbf{I}, c' \\ c' \neq c}} \lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\nu} V_\mu \rho_t^{c'} V_\nu^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{(\mu,\nu) \cup \mathbf{I}, c' \\ c' \neq c}} \lambda_{c'c}^{\mu\nu} \{V_\nu^\dagger V_\mu, \rho_t^c\}_+. \quad (19)$$

This equation is similar to Eq. (13). Nevertheless, here the identity operator \mathbf{I}_s is also included in the addition. In fact, the coefficients μ and ν run in the intervals $1, \dots, [(\dim \mathcal{H}_s)^2 - 1] \cup \mathbf{I}$. In addition, the rates are

$$\lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\nu} = b_\mu \gamma_{cc'}^{\mu\nu} b_\nu^*, \quad \lambda_{cc'}^{\mathbf{I}} = \sum_{\mu\nu} a_\mu \gamma_{cc'}^{\mu\nu} a_\nu^*, \quad (20a)$$

$$\lambda_{cc'}^{\mathbf{I}} = \sum_{\nu} b_\mu \gamma_{cc'}^{\mu\nu} a_\nu^*, \quad \lambda_{cc'}^{\mathbf{I}\nu} = \sum_{\mu} a_\mu \gamma_{cc'}^{\mu\nu} b_\nu^*, \quad (20b)$$

where the Hermitian matrices $\{\gamma_{c'c}^{\mu\nu}\}$ (indexes μ and ν) must be positive semi-definite $\forall c, c'$.

By using that $\{V, \rho\}_+ = 2V\rho - [V, \rho]_-$ and $\{V^\dagger, \rho\}_+ = 2\rho V^\dagger + [V^\dagger, \rho]_-$, Eq. (19) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\rho_t^c}{dt} = & \sum_{\substack{\mu,\nu,c' \\ c' \neq c}} \lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\nu} V_\mu \rho_t^{c'} V_\nu^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{\mu,\nu,c' \\ c' \neq c}} \lambda_{c'c}^{\mu\nu} \{V_\nu^\dagger V_\mu, \rho_t^c\}_+ \\ & + \sum_{c' \neq c} \lambda_{cc'}^{\mathbf{I}} \rho_t^{c'} - \sum_{c' \neq c} \lambda_{c'c}^{\mathbf{I}} \rho_t^c \\ & - i[H_c, \rho_t^c]_- \\ & + \sum_{\substack{\mu,c' \\ c' \neq c}} \lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\mathbf{I}} V_\mu \rho_t^{c'} - \sum_{\substack{\mu,c' \\ c' \neq c}} \lambda_{c'c}^{\mu\mathbf{I}} V_\mu \rho_t^c \\ & + \sum_{\substack{\nu,c' \\ c' \neq c}} \lambda_{cc'}^{\mathbf{I}\nu} \rho_t^{c'} V_\nu^\dagger - \sum_{\substack{\nu,c' \\ c' \neq c}} \lambda_{c'c}^{\mathbf{I}\nu} \rho_t^c V_\nu^\dagger, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where the Hamiltonian H_c reads

$$H_c = \frac{i}{2} \sum_{\substack{\mu,c' \\ c' \neq c}} (\lambda_{c'c}^{\mu\mathbf{I}} V_\mu - \lambda_{c'c}^{\mathbf{I}\mu} V_\mu^\dagger). \quad (22)$$

In Eq. (21), the contributions given by the first two lines are equivalent to the couplings defined by Eqs. (9) and (13). The remaining three lines are the extra coupling terms that define the fourth case. The physical mechanism introduced by the vector $\{\lambda_{c'c}^{\mathbf{I}\mu}\}$ can be related to a feedback mechanism [7] involving both the

quantum and classical subsystems. On the other hand, we notice that the Hamiltonians $\{H_c\}$ cannot be chosen freely. They are part of the same coupling mechanism.

Coupling symmetries and backaction properties

Similarly to the third case, the quantum and classical subsystems are inherently coupled. Their time-evolution cannot be written without involving information about the other part. Nevertheless, the situation defined by Eq. (14) can be extended to this case. If in Eq. (19) the coupling rates fulfill the symmetry

$$\lambda_{c'c}^{\mu\nu} = \lambda_{c'}^{\mu\nu} \quad \forall (\mu, \nu) \cup \text{I}, c, c', \quad (23)$$

the evolution of the quantum subsystem can be written as a Lindblad equation with an extra Hamiltonian contribution

$$\frac{d\rho_t}{dt} = -i[H_0, \rho_t]_- + \sum_{\mu, \nu} \lambda_0^{\mu\nu} (V_\mu \rho_t V_\nu^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{V_\nu^\dagger V_\mu, \rho_t\}_+), \quad (24)$$

where $\lambda_0^{\mu\nu} = \sum_c \lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\nu} = \sum_c \lambda_c^{\mu\nu}$ and $H_0 = (i/2) \sum_{\mu, c'} (\lambda_{c'}^{\mu\text{I}} V_\mu - \lambda_{c'}^{\text{I}\mu} V_\mu^\dagger)$. The above Lindblad structure follows straightforwardly from Eq. (21). On the other hand, the situation defined by Eqs. (16) and (17) cannot be extended to this case [Eq. (19)].

E. General case

Any quantum-classical hybrid evolution can be written as a combination of the above four coupling mechanisms, that is, an addition of the evolutions defined by Eqs. (6), (9), (13), and (19). The argument that support this result is that the above choice of bipartite operators [Eqs. (5), (8), (12), and (18)] cover all possible cases. As a matter of fact, here we analyze the case in which, for simplicity, $H = 0$ [the general form of a unitary evolution is envisaged by Eq. (5)] and

$$A_i \rightarrow \text{I}_s \otimes |c\rangle\langle c'|, \quad A_i \rightarrow V_\mu \otimes |c\rangle\langle c'|, \quad c \neq c', \quad V_\mu \neq \text{I}_s, \quad (25)$$

while $a_{ij} \rightarrow a_{(\mu c c')(\nu \bar{c} \bar{c}')} \delta_{c\bar{c}} \delta_{c' \bar{c}'}$. Notice that the operators I_s and V_μ are taken separately. After similar calculations steps one arrive to the evolution defined by Eq. (19). Nevertheless, here the matrix of rate coefficients defined by the parameters $\lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\nu}$ do not fulfill the relations (20). In fact, the unique constraint on these parameters is a positivity condition inherited from the underlying Lindblad structure, Eq. (1).

In order to analyze the consequences of the positivity constraint we explicitly write the matrix of rate coefficients as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \{\lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\nu}\} & \lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\text{I}} \\ \lambda_{cc'}^{\nu\mu} & \lambda_{cc'}^{\text{I}\mu} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_{cc'}^{11} & \lambda_{cc'}^{12} & \dots & \lambda_{cc'}^{\text{I}1} \\ \lambda_{cc'}^{21} & \lambda_{cc'}^{22} & \dots & \lambda_{cc'}^{\text{I}2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \lambda_{cc'}^{\text{I}1} & \lambda_{cc'}^{\text{I}2} & \dots & \lambda_{cc'}^{\text{I}\text{I}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (26)$$

This matrix (whose elements are labelled by indexes μ , ν , and I) must be positive definite for all possible c, c' ($c \neq c'$). The rate defined by $\lambda_{cc'}^{\text{I}\mu}$ has the same role than in Eq. (9). The submatrix defined by the coefficients $\{\lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\nu}\}$ has the same role than in Eq. (13). The vectors (for each c, c') $\lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\text{I}} = (\lambda_{cc'}^{\text{I}\mu})^*$ define extra coupling terms that are similar to those introduced in Eq. (19).

Given that all minor matrices must also be positive definite (Sylvester's criterion) [46] it follows that the submatrix $\{\lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\nu}\}$ must be positive definite and also that $\lambda_{cc'}^{\text{I}\mu} > 0$. Hence, the positivity of the matrix (26) can be reduced to a condition on the vector $\{\lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\text{I}}\}$ (whose components are labeled by index μ). First, we analyze the case in which $\{\lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\nu}\}$ is a diagonal matrix. This property can always be achieved by a proper choice of operators $\{V_\mu\}$. In this situation, it is possible to demonstrate that all submatrices of Eq. (26) are positive definite (equivalent to positivity of a Schur complement [46]) if

$$\lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\nu} = \delta_{\mu\nu} \lambda_{cc'}^\mu \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sum_{\mu \subset \text{M}} \frac{|\lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\text{I}}|^2}{(\lambda_{cc'}^\mu \lambda_{cc'}^{\text{I}\mu})} \leq 1 \quad \forall (c, c'), \quad (27)$$

where M is an arbitrary subset of the possible μ -values that define the corresponding minor matrix. The most stringent condition, that in turn cover all conditions, is when $\text{M} = \{1, \dots, (\dim \mathcal{H}_s)^2 - 1\}$. In this case, Eq. (27) is equivalent to the positivity of the determinant of the matrix (26) (with $\lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\nu} = \delta_{\mu\nu} \lambda_{cc'}^\mu$).

From Eq. (27) we notice that the allowed "space" for the complex vector $\{\lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\text{I}}\}$ is defined by the interior of a multidimensional complex ellipse whose parameters are $(\lambda_{cc'}^\mu, \lambda_{cc'}^{\text{I}\mu})$ (notice that $\lambda_{cc'}^\mu > 0$ and $\lambda_{cc'}^{\text{I}\mu} > 0$). Using that $|\lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\text{I}}|^2 = \lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\nu} \lambda_{cc'}^{\nu\text{I}}$, from Eq. (27) the positivity of the rate coefficients [matrix (26)] is guaranteed *in general* if

$$\sum_{\mu\nu} \lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\nu} [\lambda_{cc'}^{-1}]^{\nu\mu} \lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\text{I}} \leq \lambda_{cc'}^{\text{I}\mu} \quad \forall (c, c'), \quad (28)$$

where $[\lambda_{cc'}^{-1}]^{\nu\mu}$ are the components of the inverse matrix defined by $\{\lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\nu}\}$ (which in the general case is non-diagonal). Similarly to the diagonal case [Eq. (27)], given $\{\lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\nu}\}$ and $\lambda_{cc'}^{\text{I}\mu}$ the expression (28) defines a constraint to be fulfilled by the complex vector $\{\lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\text{I}}\}$.

It is simple to check that the matrix of the fourth coupling mechanism [Eq. (20)] satisfies the equality defined by Eq. (28). Equivalently, in the diagonal version, the fourth mechanism corresponds to the external boundary of the ellipsoid defined by Eq. (27). Thus, given an arbitrary evolution defined by the positive definite matrix (26) it can always be written as a combination of the fourth mechanism and extra contributions of the second and third coupling mechanisms. These last contributions induce the inequality defined by Eq. (28) [equivalently the interior of the ellipsoid (27)]. We notice that the previous decomposition is always possible because it implies to writing a positive definite matrix [Eq. (26)] in terms of other positive definite matrices [matrices of rate coefficients associated to Eq. (9), (13), and (19)].

III. DIFFUSIVE APPROXIMATION

The mechanisms characterized in the previous section are independent. Each can be added freely to define a specific hybrid dynamics. Here, we study the situation in which the incoherent classical subsystem can be labeled by a continuous variable. Basically, this assumption implies the replacements $c \rightarrow q$ and $\sum_c \rightarrow \int dq$, where q is a real and continuous coordinate that label the state of the classical subsystem. Furthermore, under the replacement $\rho_c \rightarrow \varrho_t(q)$ the hybrid state [Eq. (2)] is written as

$$\Xi_t = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dq \varrho_t(q) \otimes |q\rangle\langle q|. \quad (29)$$

Consequently, the partial states [Eqs. (3) and (4)] become

$$\rho_t = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dq \varrho_t(q), \quad \sigma_t = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dq \text{Tr}_s[\varrho_t(q)]|q\rangle\langle q|. \quad (30)$$

Notice that $\varrho_t(q)$ can be read as a density (in the classical space with coordinate q) of the state of the quantum subsystem. In fact, $dq \varrho_t(q)$ is the density matrix operator when the classical coordinate is “projected” into the interval $(q, q + dq)$.

Under a straightforward change of notation all previous hybrid models can be extended to the present situation. The question we dealt out now is when the time-evolution of the “state” $\varrho_t(q)$ approach a *diffusive limit*. Specifically, this means that $(\partial/\partial t)\varrho_t(q)$ can be approached in terms of the first and second “spatial” derivatives $(\partial/\partial q)\varrho_t(q)$ and $(\partial/\partial q)^2\varrho_t(q)$ respectively.

A. First case

For the first coupling mechanism [Eq. (6)], under the replacements $\rho_c^c \rightarrow \varrho_t(q)$, $\eta_c^{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \eta^{\mu\nu}(q)$, the time evolution in the continuous case becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \varrho_t(q)}{\partial t} = & -i[H(q), \varrho_t(q)]_- + \sum_{\mu\nu} \eta^{\mu\nu}(q) V_\mu \varrho_t(q) V_\nu^\dagger \\ & - \sum_{\mu\nu} \eta^{\mu\nu}(q) \frac{1}{2} \{V_\nu^\dagger V_\mu, \varrho_t(q)\}_+. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Here, the matrix of rate coefficients $\eta^{\mu\nu}(q)$ must be positive definite $\forall q$. Given that the states $\{\varrho_t(q)\}$ are not coupled to each other, the time evolution does not involve any coordinate partial derivative.

B. Second case

For the continuous limit of the second case [Eq. (9)], the associated rates are rewritten as $\phi_{cc'} \rightarrow \phi(q, q') \rightarrow \phi(q - q'|q')$. This last object gives the rate for a “jump”

of size $(q - q')$ given that the starting coordinate is q' . Under the change of variables $r = q - q'$ it follows

$$\frac{\partial \varrho_t(q)}{\partial t} = \int dr \phi(r|q-r) \varrho_t(q-r) - \int dr \phi(r|q) \varrho_t(q). \quad (32)$$

This expression provides the basis for establishing the assumptions under which a diffusive approximation applies [3]. (i) The *first assumption* is that only “small jumps” occur, that is, $\phi(r|q)$ is a sharply peaked function of r but varies slowly with q . (ii) The *second assumption* is that the solution $\varrho_t(q)$ [which obeys Eq. (32)] also varies slowly with q . This last assumption must be valid in *any basis associated to the Hilbert space of the quantum subsystem*. Therefore, in Eq. (32) it is possible to deal with the shift from q to $q - r$ by means of a (second order) Taylor expansion

$$\phi(r|q-r) \varrho_t(q-r) \simeq \left(1 - r \frac{\partial}{\partial q} + \frac{r^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial q^2}\right) [\phi(r|q) \varrho_t(q)], \quad (33)$$

which delivers the *diffusive approximation*

$$\frac{\partial \varrho_t(q)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial q} [\Phi_1(q) \varrho_t(q)] + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial q^2} [\Phi_2(q) \varrho_t(q)]. \quad (34)$$

In here, the “jump moments” are

$$\Phi_m(q) \equiv \int dr \phi(r|q) r^m. \quad (35)$$

The “Fokker-Planck structure” (34) is an approximation to the original master equation (32). It is relevant to enforce that it is valid in both a coarse-grained time-scale Δt and coarse-grained coordinate-scale Δq ,

$$\Delta t \equiv 1/\Phi_0, \quad \Delta q \equiv \sqrt{\Phi_2/(2\Phi_0)}. \quad (36)$$

The parameter Δt defines the average time between consecutive jumps of the classical coordinate while Δq measures their size (for simplicity the dependence with q here is omitted). In particular, at the *initial stage* Eq. (34) provides an approximation to Eq. (32) if

$$\Phi_0 t \gg 1, \quad |q| \left(\frac{\Phi_2}{2\Phi_0}\right)^{-1/2} \gg 1. \quad (37)$$

In fact, the diffusive approximation becomes valid only after several jump processes have occurred. The second inequality relies on assuming a coordinate initial condition concentrated in $q = 0$. On the other hand, we remark that, independently of which initial conditions are considered, *here the diffusive approximation guarantees that $\varrho_t(q)$ is a physical state even in the short time and small length scales* [complementary regime to that defined by Eq. (37)]. While Eq. (34) does not depend explicitly on Φ_0 , this time-scale becomes relevant in the next cases.

In order to clarify the underlying assumptions of the above diffusive approximation we introduce an explicit example of transition rate,

$$\phi(r|q) = \left[\frac{1}{\tau_0} + \frac{1}{\delta\tau_0} \text{sgn}(r)\right] \left(\frac{1}{2r_0} e^{-|r|/r_0}\right). \quad (38)$$

Here, $\tau_0 > 0$ and $|\delta\tau_0| \leq \tau_0$ are characteristic times, while the characteristic length fulfills $r_0 > 0$. The sign function is defined as $\text{sgn}(r) = \pm 1$ for $r \gtrless 0$. The relevant moments [Eq. (35)] that define the diffusive approximation are [47]

$$\Phi_0 = \frac{1}{\tau_0}, \quad \Phi_1 = \frac{r_0}{\delta\tau_0}, \quad \Phi_2 = \frac{2r_0^2}{\tau_0}. \quad (39)$$

With these expressions the approximation (34) can also be obtained under the formal limits $\tau_0 \rightarrow 0$, $r_0 \rightarrow 0$, $2r_0^2/\tau_0 \rightarrow \Phi_2$, jointly with $r_0/\delta\tau_0 \rightarrow \Phi_1$ [3].

C. Third case

For simplifying the presentation, the third case is studied in its diagonal form. Hence, in Eq. (13) we take $\gamma_{cc'}^{\mu\nu} = \delta_{\mu\nu}\gamma_{cc'}^\mu$. Similarly to the previous case, under the replacements $\gamma_{cc'}^\mu \rightarrow \gamma^\mu(q, q') \rightarrow \gamma^\mu(q - q'|q')$, and the change of variable $r = q - q'$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \varrho_t(q)}{\partial t} = & + \int dr \gamma^\mu(r|q-r) V_\mu \varrho_t(q-r) V_\mu^\dagger \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \int dr \gamma^\mu(r|q) \{V_\mu^\dagger V_\mu, \varrho_t(q)\}_+. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

For shorten the expression, a sum symbol \sum_μ is omitted on the right side. The same notation is used in the following expressions and sections.

While the structure of Eq. (40) seems to be similar to that of Eq. (32) they differ radically. In order to show this feature, first we introduce the jump moments

$$\Gamma_m^\mu(q) \equiv \int dr \gamma^\mu(r|q) r^m, \quad (41)$$

which allow us to rewrite Eq. (40) as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \varrho_t(q)}{\partial t} = & \Gamma_0^\mu(q) (V_\mu \varrho_t(q) V_\mu^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{V_\mu^\dagger V_\mu, \varrho_t(q)\}_+) \\ & + V_\mu \left\{ \int dr \gamma^\mu(r|q-r) \varrho_t(q-r) \right. \\ & \left. - \int dr \gamma^\mu(r|q) \varrho_t(q) \right\} V_\mu^\dagger. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

In contrast to Eq. (32), here the first line on the right side consists of a Lindblad contribution whose rate is $\Gamma_0^\mu(q)$. Consistently with a diffusive approximation, this parameter, $\Gamma_0^\mu(q)$, should define the minor time scale of the problem.

The second and third lines, $\int dr \gamma^\mu(r|q-r) \varrho_t(q-r) - \int dr \gamma^\mu(r|q) \varrho_t(q)$, have the same structure than Eq. (32). Nevertheless, these contributions are under the action of the superoperator $V_\mu \{\bullet\} V_\mu^\dagger$. Given that the operators $\{V_\mu\}$ do not include the identity matrix, this superoperator couples the discrete states of the quantum system, inducing, in general, underlying finite transformations of the state $\varrho_t(q)$. Consequently, even when the jump rates

$\{\gamma^\mu(r|q)\}$ are sharply peaked functions of r (first assumption), the solution $\varrho_t(q)$ [which obeys Eq. (42)] does not varies slowly with q (second condition does not applies). In general, the diffusive approximation [Eq. (33)] may only applies in a given “direction” in the Hilbert space (defined by the eigenvectors of V_μ) but it cannot be applied to arbitrary directions. We conclude that *a diffusive approximation cannot be applied to the third case.*

Combined second and third cases

A diffusive approximation can be applied in we consider the combined action of the dynamics corresponding to the second and third coupling mechanisms. From Eqs. (32) and (42) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \varrho_t(q)}{\partial t} \approx & \Gamma_0^\mu(q) (V_\mu \varrho_t(q) V_\mu^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{V_\mu^\dagger V_\mu, \varrho_t(q)\}_+) \\ & - \frac{\partial}{\partial q} [\Phi_1(q) \varrho_t(q)] + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial q^2} [\Phi_2(q) \varrho_t(q)] \\ & + V_\mu \left\{ - \frac{\partial}{\partial q} [\Gamma_1^\mu(q) \varrho_t(q)] + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial q^2} [\Gamma_2^\mu(q) \varrho_t(q)] \right\} V_\mu^\dagger. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

This approximation applies when the second coupling mechanism is dominant. Thus, it must be fulfilled that

$$\Gamma_0^\mu(q) \neq 0, \quad \Gamma_m^\mu(q) \ll \Phi_m(q) \quad \forall \mu, q, m. \quad (44)$$

The condition $\Gamma_0^\mu(q) \neq 0$ inherently arises from the third case. On the other hand, the inequalities between the jump moments, $\Gamma_m^\mu(q) \ll \Phi_m(q)$, guaranty that the second coupling mechanism is the dominant one, allowing in consequence a diffusive approximation (in any possible direction of the quantum subsystem Hilbert space). In addition, the approximation (43) is valid under the scale constraints (37). In contrast to the second case [Eq. (34)], here it is not possible to guaranty that $\varrho_t(q)$ is a physical state (positive definite) in the short time and small length scales. This condition is recovered in the limit $\Gamma_m^\mu(q)/\Phi_m(q) \rightarrow 0$, which from Eq. (43) delivers

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \varrho_t(q)}{\partial t} = & \Gamma_0^\mu(q) (V_\mu \varrho_t(q) V_\mu^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{V_\mu^\dagger V_\mu, \varrho_t(q)\}_+) \\ & - \frac{\partial}{\partial q} [\Phi_1(q) \varrho_t(q)] + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial q^2} [\Phi_2(q) \varrho_t(q)]. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

In this expression, any contribution related to third case is taken into account solely by the first line, which has the structure of a Lindblad equation. While Eq. (45) preserves the positivity of $\varrho_t(q)$ notice that there is not any backaction (related to the third case) on the classical subsystem. In fact, the evolution of the probability density $\text{Tr}_s[\varrho_t(q)]$ is governed by a classical Fokker-Planck equation associated to the second mechanism.

D. Fourth case

Similarly to third case, in order to simplify the expressions in this case [Eq. (19)] we assume a diagonal matrix of rate coefficients, $\lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\nu} = \delta_{\mu\nu}\lambda_{cc'}^\mu$, which in terms of the relations (20) implies that $\gamma_{cc'}^{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \delta^{\mu\nu}\gamma_{cc'}^\mu \rightarrow \delta^{\mu\nu}\gamma^\mu(r|q)$. The jump rates becomes $\lambda_{cc'}^{\text{II}} \rightarrow \lambda^{\text{II}}(r|q)$, $\lambda_{cc'}^\mu \rightarrow \lambda^\mu(r|q)$, leading to the expressions

$$\lambda^\mu(r|q) = |b_\mu|^2 \gamma^\mu(r|q), \quad \lambda^{\text{II}}(r|q) = \sum_\mu |a_\mu|^2 \gamma^\mu(r|q). \quad (46)$$

Similarly, under the notational replacement $\lambda_{c'c}^{\text{II}} \rightarrow \lambda^{\text{II}}(r|q)$ and $\lambda_{c'c}^\mu \rightarrow \lambda^\mu(r|q)$, it follows

$$\lambda^{\text{II}}(r|q) = b_\mu \gamma^\mu(r|q) a_\mu^*, \quad \lambda^\mu(r|q) = a_\mu \gamma^\mu(r|q) b_\mu^*. \quad (47)$$

In the above expressions $\gamma^\mu(r|q)$ is a positive jumping rate while a_μ and b_μ define the bipartite coupling operator (18).

Starting from the equivalent expression (21), and assuming that the rate $\lambda^{\text{II}}(r|q)$ is dominant over the processes induced by $\lambda^\mu(r|q)$, $\lambda^{\text{II}}(r|q)$, and $\rightarrow \lambda^\mu(r|q) = \lambda^\mu(r|q)^*$, it is simple to arrive to the diffusive approximation [see Appendix]

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \varrho_t(q)}{\partial t} &\approx \Lambda_0^\mu(q) (V_\mu \varrho_t(q) V_\mu^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{V_\mu^\dagger V_\mu, \varrho_t(q)\}_+) \\ &+ V_\mu \left\{ -\frac{\partial}{\partial q} [\Lambda_1^\mu(q) \varrho_t(q)] + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial q^2} [\Lambda_2^\mu(q) \varrho_t(q)] \right\} V_\mu^\dagger \\ &- \frac{\partial}{\partial q} [\Lambda_1^{\text{II}}(q) \varrho_t(q)] + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial q^2} [\Lambda_2^{\text{II}}(q) \varrho_t(q)] \\ &- i[H_0(q), \varrho_t(q)]_- \\ &+ V_\mu \left\{ -\frac{\partial}{\partial q} [\Lambda_1^{\mu\text{I}}(q) \varrho_t(q)] + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial q^2} [\Lambda_2^{\mu\text{I}}(q) \varrho_t(q)] \right\} \\ &+ \left\{ -\frac{\partial}{\partial q} [\Lambda_1^{\text{I}\mu}(q) \varrho_t(q)] + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial q^2} [\Lambda_2^{\text{I}\mu}(q) \varrho_t(q)] \right\} V_\mu^\dagger, \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where, for simplicity, on the right side terms that depend on index μ we omitted a sum symbol \sum_μ . The Hamiltonian contribution is

$$H_0(q) = \frac{i}{2} \sum_\mu (\Lambda_0^{\mu\text{I}}(q) V_\mu - \Lambda_0^{\text{I}\mu}(q) V_\mu^\dagger), \quad (49)$$

while the jump moments read

$$\Lambda_m^\mu(q) \equiv \int dr \lambda^\mu(r|q) r^m, \quad \Lambda_m^{\text{II}}(q) \equiv \int dr \lambda^{\text{II}}(r|q) r^m, \quad (50)$$

and similarly for the nondiagonal contributions

$$\Lambda_m^{\mu\text{I}}(q) \equiv \int dr \lambda^{\mu\text{I}}(r|q) r^m, \quad \Lambda_m^{\text{I}\mu}(q) \equiv \int dr \lambda^{\text{I}\mu}(r|q) r^m. \quad (51)$$

The approximation (48) relies on assuming that the diffusive process induced by $\lambda^{\text{II}}(r|q)$, which does not depend on the Hilbert space orientation, is dominant over

the processes induced by $\lambda^\mu(r|q)$ and $\lambda^{\mu\text{I}}(r|q)$ (notice that $\lambda^{\mu\text{I}} = [\lambda^{\mu\text{I}}(r|q)]^*$). Consequently, Eq. (48) approximates the original evolution [Eq. (21) or equivalently Eq. (A.1)] if the jump moments satisfy

$$\Lambda_m^\mu(q) \ll \Lambda_m^{\text{II}}(q), \quad |\Lambda_2^{\mu\text{I}}(q)|^2 = |\Lambda_2^{\text{I}\mu}(q)|^2 \ll \Lambda_2^{\text{II}}(q), \quad (52)$$

where $m = 1, 2$.

Quantum Fokker-Planck master equation

Similarly to the previous analysis [second-third case, Eq. (43)] the approximation (48) does not guarantee the positivity on the state $\varrho_t(q)$ at short time and small length scales [here defined from $\lambda^{\text{II}}(r|q)$, see conditions (37) and model (38)]. The lack of positivity originates from quantum-classical *coupling terms* that represent “finite” discrete (underlying) changes in the hybrid state $\varrho_t(q)$. These changes are induced by the operators $(a_\mu \mathbf{I}_s + b_\mu V_\mu)$ [see Eq. (18)]. Consequently, the transformations associated to these operators are *infinitesimal*, approach the identity, if one assumes

$$|b_\mu| \ll |a_\mu| \approx 1. \quad (53)$$

Introducing these conditions in the definitions of the jump moments [Eqs. (50) and (51)] expressed in terms of the underlying rates [Eqs. (46) and (47)], from Eq. (48) we write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \varrho_t(q)}{\partial t} &= \Lambda_0^\mu(q) (V_\mu \varrho_t(q) V_\mu^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{V_\mu^\dagger V_\mu, \varrho_t(q)\}_+) \\ &- \frac{\partial}{\partial q} [\Lambda_1^{\text{II}}(q) \varrho_t(q)] + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial q^2} [\Lambda_2^{\text{II}}(q) \varrho_t(q)], \\ &- i[H_0(q), \varrho_t(q)]_- \\ &- \frac{\partial}{\partial q} V_\mu(q) \varrho_t(q) - \frac{\partial}{\partial q} \varrho_t(q) V_\mu^\dagger(q). \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Here, the Hamiltonian is defined by Eq. (49). For simplifying the expression we introduced the operators $V_\mu(q) \equiv \Lambda_1^{\mu\text{I}}(q) V_\mu$ and $V_\mu^\dagger(q) \equiv \Lambda_1^{\text{I}\mu}(q) V_\mu^\dagger$.

The quantum Fokker-Planck master equation (54) has fewer terms than the diffusive approximation (48). This feature is a consequence of maintaining only contributions up to second order in $|b_\mu|$ and the small coordinate scale $\Delta q \equiv \sqrt{\Lambda_2^{\text{II}}/(2\Lambda_0^{\text{II}})}$ [see example (38)]. The moment Λ_0^{II} defines the minor-time scale of the dynamics (48). The moments $|\Lambda_0^{\mu\text{I}}|$ and $\Lambda_0^{\text{I}\mu}$, with respect to Λ_0^{II} , are of first and second order in $|b_\mu|$ respectively. They define the Hamiltonian and Lindblad contributions in both expressions. The moment Λ_1^{II} (a “velocity”) is proportional to Δq . The moments $|\Lambda_1^{\mu\text{I}}|$ and $\Lambda_1^{\text{I}\mu}$ are proportional to $|b_\mu|$ and $|b_\mu|^2$ respectively. Thus, to maintain second order contributions, the derivative proportional to $\Lambda_1^{\text{I}\mu}$ is disregarded in Eq. (54). Finally, the moment Λ_2^{II} (a diffusion coefficient) is proportional to Δq^2 . Consequently, the contributions proportional to $|\Lambda_2^{\mu\text{I}}|$ and $\Lambda_2^{\text{I}\mu}$ (order $|b_\mu|$

and $|b_\mu|^2$) are also disregarded. Hence, Eq. (54) applies when the underlying transformations associated to the quantum and classical subsystems are infinitesimal, this property being scaled by b_μ and Δq .

In order to guaranty positivity of the hybrid state, in Eq. (54) it must be fulfilled $\forall \mu$ that

$$\Lambda_0^\mu(q) \neq 0, \quad \Lambda_1^{I\mu}(q) \frac{1}{\Lambda_0^\mu(q)} \Lambda_1^{\mu I}(q) \leq \Lambda_2^{\text{II}}(q). \quad (55)$$

This inequality is a direct consequence of the completely positive condition defined by Eq. (27). It expresses that the “quadratic velocity” associated to the diagonal contribution, $\Lambda_2^{\text{II}}(q)\Lambda_0^\mu(q)$, must be larger than the “quadratic velocity” associated to the “non-diagonal” coupling mechanisms, $|\Lambda_1^{\mu I}(q)|^2 = |\Lambda_1^{I\mu}(q)|^2$. Notice that the fourth case [Eq. (18)] corresponds to $|\Lambda_1^{\mu I}(q)|^2 = \Lambda_0^\mu(q)\Lambda_2^{\text{II}}(q)$. Thus, the inequality in Eq. (55) takes into account the possibility of the joint action of the second, third and fourth coupling mechanisms [Eq. (45)]. In this situation Eq. (48) can also be applied to the general case defined by Eq. (26).

We remark that the structure (54) and the condition (55) are consistent with the results of Refs. [42–45]. The general non-diagonal case, index $\mu \rightarrow (\mu, \nu)$, can be recovered straightforwardly from these expressions.

IV. EXAMPLES

Here we study a set of dynamics that corroborate our main results. The hybrid state [Eq. (2)] has the structure $\Xi_t = \sum_n \rho_n(t) \otimes |n\rangle\langle n|$. The basis $\{|n\rangle\}_{-\infty}^{+\infty}$ corresponds to the classical subsystem while the quantum subsystem is a two-level system, being characterized by the conditional (unnormalized) states

$$\rho_n(t) = \begin{pmatrix} p_n^+(t) & c_n(t) \\ c_n^*(t) & p_n^-(t) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (56)$$

These matrix elements are defined in a basis $\{|\pm\rangle\}$ of the two-level system. The initial condition reads

$$\rho_n(0) = \begin{pmatrix} \langle +|\rho_0|+ \rangle & \langle +|\rho_0|- \rangle \\ \langle -|\rho_0|+ \rangle & \langle -|\rho_0|- \rangle \end{pmatrix} p_n(0), \quad (57)$$

where ρ_0 and $\{p_n(0)\}_{-\infty}^{+\infty}$ are the initial conditions of the quantum and classical subsystems respectively. For simplicity we assume $p_n(0) = \delta_{n,n_0}$, where n_0 is an arbitrary position in the discrete (classical) space.

The examples studied below are defined in terms of a set of quantum and classical superoperators. In the quantum Hilbert space we denote a Lindblad contribution as

$$\mathcal{L}_V[\rho] \equiv V\rho V^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\{V^\dagger V, \rho\}_+, \quad (58)$$

which depends on the operator V while ρ is an arbitrary matrix in the quantum Hilbert space. In the classical

space, we introduce a discrete “force” operator

$$\mathcal{L}_1[f_n] \equiv \frac{1}{2}(f_{n+1} - f_{n-1}), \quad (59)$$

while a discrete “diffusion” operator is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_2[f_n] \equiv f_{n+1} + f_{n-1} - 2f_n. \quad (60)$$

Both operators act on a space of countable functions $\{f_n\}_{-\infty}^{+\infty}$. We notice that the quantum and classical operators commute, that is, $\mathcal{L}_A\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathcal{L}_1\mathcal{L}_A$ and $\mathcal{L}_A\mathcal{L}_2 = \mathcal{L}_2\mathcal{L}_A$.

A *continuous limit* is defined by introducing the coordinate $q \equiv nr_0$, where r_0 is the small length scale of the problem. The hybrid state [Eq. (29)] becomes $\Xi_t = \int dq \varrho_q(t) \otimes |q\rangle\langle q|$, where the (density of) quantum state, $\varrho_q(t) dq = r_0 \rho_n(t)$, is denoted as

$$\varrho_q(t) = \begin{pmatrix} P_q^+(t) & C_q(t) \\ C_q^*(t) & P_q^-(t) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (61)$$

In the continuous limit, the operators (59) and (60) are replaced by

$$\mathcal{L}_1 \rightarrow r_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial q}, \quad \mathcal{L}_2 \rightarrow r_0^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial q^2}, \quad (62)$$

when the a diffusive limit is approached.

A. Dephasing correlated random walk

In the first example we consider the time evolution

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\rho_n}{dt} &= \gamma(\sigma_z \rho_{n+1} \sigma_z + \sigma_z \rho_{n-1} \sigma_z - 2\rho_n) \\ &+ \phi(\rho_{n+1} + \rho_{n-1} - 2\rho_n). \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

For simplicity, from now on we omit the time-dependence of all statistical objects; here $\rho_n(t) \rightarrow \rho_n$. With σ_z we denote the z -Pauli matrix in the basis $\{|\pm\rangle\}$ of the two-level system.

It is simple to realize that the dynamics (63) correspond to a combined action of the second [Eq. (9)] and third coupling mechanisms [Eq. (13)] with rates ϕ and γ respectively. Notice that in the third mechanism any classical transition $n' = n \pm 1 \rightarrow n$ is endowed by the quantum transformation $\rho_n \rightarrow \sigma_z \rho_{n'} \sigma_z$. The superoperator $(\sigma_z \bullet \sigma_z)$ changes the sign of the coherences of $\rho_{n \pm 1}$ while maintains invariant its populations. Thus, *dephasing is inherently correlated with the jumps in the classical space*.

The hybrid evolution (63) can straightforwardly be rewritten as

$$\frac{d\rho_n}{dt} = 2\gamma \mathcal{L}_{\sigma_z}[\rho_n] + \phi \mathcal{L}_2[\rho_n] + \gamma \mathcal{L}_2[\sigma_z \rho_n \sigma_z], \quad (64)$$

where the superoperators are defined by Eqs. (58) and (60). Written in terms of the matrix elements (56), it follows that the populations evolves as

$$\frac{dp_n^{(s)}}{dt} = (\phi + \gamma) \mathcal{L}_2[p_n^{(s)}], \quad s = \pm 1, \quad (65)$$

while for the coherences we get

$$\frac{dc_n}{dt} = -4\gamma c_n + (\phi - \gamma)L_2[c_n]. \quad (66)$$

The above time-evolutions can be solved in an exact way by means of a characteristic function approach [48]. For the populations, from Eq. (65) we get the solution

$$p_n^{(s)}(t) = e^{-2(\phi+\gamma)t} I_{|n-n_0|}[2(\phi+\gamma)t] \langle s|\rho_0|s\rangle, \quad (67)$$

where $s = \pm 1$, n_0 labels the initial position of the classical subsystem, and $I_n(x)$ is the n th modified Bessel function of the first kind. We notice that this expression correspond to the solution of a classical random walk on a discrete space [3] with characteristic rate $(\phi + \gamma)$.

For the coherences, from Eq. (66) it follows that

$$c_n(t) = e^{-4\gamma t} \{e^{-2(\phi-\gamma)t} I_{|n-n_0|}[2(\phi-\gamma)t]\} \langle +|\rho_0|- \rangle. \quad (68)$$

While this solution has the same structure than Eq. (67), the argument of the Bessel function depends on $(\phi - \gamma) \stackrel{\geq}{\leq} 0$. There is not any constraint on this difference of underlying rates. Using that $I_n(-x) = (-1)^n I_n(x)$, we notice that the coherences develops a change of sign between neighboring sites when the third mechanism dominates on the second one, $\phi < \gamma$. In spite of this property, the conditional states $\{\rho_n(t)\}$ [Eq. (56)] are positive definite $\forall n$. In fact, given that $p_n^{(s)}(t) > 0$ ($s = \pm 1$), the positivity of $\rho_n(t)$ is fulfilled when its determinant, denoted as $\det[\rho_n(t)]$, is a positive quantity,

$$\det[\rho_n(t)] = p_n^{(+)}(t)p_n^{(-)}(t) - |c_n(t)|^2 \geq 0. \quad (69)$$

This condition is always fulfilled when taking the matrix elements defined by the solutions (67) and (68).

Diffusive approximation

Here we study a diffusive approximation to the hybrid master equation (63). Taking into account the notation (61), from the equivalent master equation (64), we write the approximation $[\varrho_q(t) \rightarrow \varrho_q]$

$$\frac{\partial \varrho_q}{\partial t} \approx 2\gamma \mathcal{L}_{\sigma_z}[\varrho_q] + \frac{D_\phi}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 q} \varrho_q + \frac{D_\gamma}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 q} (\sigma_z \varrho_q \sigma_z). \quad (70)$$

Here, the diffusion coefficients, from the approximation (62), read

$$D_\phi = 2\phi r_0^2, \quad D_\gamma = 2\gamma r_0^2. \quad (71)$$

The time-evolution (70) has the structure obtained when analyzing the combined action of the second and third coupling mechanisms, Eq. (43).

The explicit solution of Eq. (70) can be written in terms of a Gaussian propagator,

$$\mathbb{G}_D[q, t|\sigma_0] \equiv \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi(\sigma_0^2 + Dt)}} \exp\left[-\frac{(q - q_0)^2}{2(\sigma_0^2 + Dt)}\right]. \quad (72)$$

Here, q_0 and σ_0 denote initial mean value and standard deviation respectively, while D is a diffusion coefficient. The propagator fulfills the diffusion equation $(\partial/\partial t)\mathbb{G}_D[q, t|\sigma_0] = (D/2)(\partial^2/\partial^2 q)\mathbb{G}_D[q, t|\sigma_0]$. The populations of $\varrho_q(t)$ [Eq. (61)] can be written as

$$P_q^{(s)}(t) = \mathbb{G}_{D_\phi + D_\gamma}[q, t|\sigma_0] \langle s|\rho_0|s\rangle, \quad s = \pm 1, \quad (73)$$

while the coherence reads

$$C_q(t) = e^{-4\gamma t} \mathbb{G}_{D_\phi - D_\gamma}[q, t|\sigma_0] \langle +|\rho_0|- \rangle. \quad (74)$$

The solutions for the populations correspond to a standard diffusive approximation to the classical random walk defined by Eq. (65). They always satisfies $0 \leq P_q^{(s)}(t) \leq 1$ ($s = \pm 1$) and the normalization $P_q^{(+)}(t) + P_q^{(-)}(t) = 1$. They provide a valid approximation independently of the value of the underlying characteristic parameters ϕ and γ , equivalently, D_ϕ and D_γ . On the other hand, consistently with the general constraints (44), the solution for the coherences imposes the condition

$$D_\phi > D_\gamma. \quad (75)$$

In this regime, the coherences performs a standard diffusion process that is very well approximated by Eq. (74). Nevertheless, when $D_\gamma > D_\phi$ the solution (74) *diverges in time*. The origin of this unphysical behavior reflects the change of sign of the discrete solution $\{c_n(t)\}$ in a scale of order r_0 [Eqs. (66) and (68)]. This property cannot be recovered in a diffusive approximation, confirming in addition that here the third coupling mechanism ($\phi = 0$, $\gamma > 0$) cannot be approximated in terms of the first and second derivatives of the conditional state $\varrho_q(t)$.

When condition (75) is fulfilled, both the populations $P_q^{(s)}(t)$ and coherence $C_q(t)$ are well behaved and provide a very well approximation to the discrete objects in the regime $\phi t > 1$ [see Eq.(37)]. Nevertheless, a physical solution is only granted when $\varrho_q(t)$ is a positive definite matrix. This condition is fulfilled when its determinant $\text{Det}[\varrho_q(t)]$ is positive,

$$\text{Det}[\varrho_q(t)] = P_q^{(+)}(t)P_q^{(-)}(t) - |C_q(t)|^2 \geq 0 \quad \forall q. \quad (76)$$

In Fig. 1 we plot both $\text{Det}[\varrho_q(t)]$ and $\det[\rho_n(t)]$ [Eq. (69)] at different times. The initial condition reads $\varrho_q(0) = \rho_0 \delta(q)$, where the quantum state ρ_0 is an eigenstate of the x -Pauli matrix, $\rho_0 = (1/2)\{\{1, 1\}, \{1, 1\}\}$. When $\phi t < 1$ [Fig. 1(a)] at the origin ($q = 0$) $\text{Det}[\varrho_q(t)]$ develops a peak with negative amplitude, which indicates an *unphysical solution*. At later times [Fig. 1(b)] at the origin $\text{Det}[\varrho_q(t)]|_{q=0} = 0$, and simultaneously it is positive $\forall q$. For times $\phi t > 1$ [Fig. 1(c)-(d)] $\text{Det}[\varrho_q(t)]$ approaches the discrete solution given by $\det[\rho_n(t)]$. In fact, when $\phi t \gg 1$ it is expected that $\text{Det}[\varrho_{nr_0}(t)]r_0^2 \approx \det[\rho_n(t)]$.

The previous features demonstrate that the diffusive approximation (70) only provides physical solutions when $\phi t > 1$. This result is consistent with our previous general




FIG. 1: Determinant of the conditional quantum state as a function of the dimensionless coordinate $q/r_0 = n$ at different times. The (blue) dots correspond to the discrete dephasing random walk model Eq. (63) where $\det[\rho_n(t)]$ is given by Eq. (69). The rates fulfill $\gamma/\phi = 2$. The times are (a) $\phi t = 0.1$, (b) $\phi t = 0.28$, (c) $\phi t = 1.0$, and (d) $\phi t = 5.0$. The full (cyan) lines correspond to the diffusive approximation, Eq. (70), where $\text{Det}[\varrho_q(t)]$ is given by Eq. (76). The initial width is $\sigma_0^2/r_0^2 = 0$, and $q_0/r_0 = n_0 = 0$.

analysis [Eq. (44)]. In order to characterize analytically this effect we develop $\text{Det}[\varrho_q(t)]$ around the initial condition ($q = 0$) and short times as

$$(\text{Det}[\varrho_q(t)])_{q=0} \approx \left(\text{Det}[\varrho_q(0)] + t \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \text{Det}[\varrho_q(t)] \right)_{t=0} \right)_{q=0}. \quad (77)$$

The most stringent condition emerges when the quantum subsystem starts in a pure state. In fact, in this case the zero order vanishes identically, $\det[\rho_0] = 0 \Rightarrow \text{Det}[\varrho_q(0)] = 0 \forall q$. After some algebra, demanding $(\text{Det}[\varrho_q(t)])_{q=0} \geq 0$ it follows the condition $t \geq t^*$ where

$$\phi t^* = \frac{\phi}{8\gamma} \ln \left(\frac{D_\phi + D_\gamma}{D_\phi - D_\gamma} \right) = \frac{\phi}{8\gamma} \ln \left(\frac{\phi + \gamma}{\phi - \gamma} \right) < 1. \quad (78)$$

Here, the second equality relies on the definitions (71). This expression defines the time t^* at which the determinant at $q = 0$ start to be positive. Furthermore, we introduced the condition $\phi t^* < 1$, which guarantees that unphysical behaviors occur in the short time scale [notice that this condition also guarantees the fulfillment of Eq. (75)]. As shown in Fig. 1(b) when $\phi t \simeq \phi t^* = 0.274$ the determinant is positive not only at the origin but also for any value of the classical coordinate.

In the plots of Fig. 1, as well as in the derivation of (78) we assumed a totally localized initial condition $\varrho_q(0) = \rho_0 \delta(q)$. This assumption is consistent with the initial condition of the underlying discrete model, $\rho_n(0) = \rho_0 \delta_{n,0}$. Correspondingly, in the Gaussian propagator (72) we assumed a vanishing initial width, $\sigma_0 = 0$. One can also




FIG. 2: Determinant of the conditional quantum state as a function of the dimensionless coordinate $q/r_0 = n$ at different times. The (blue) dots correspond to the discrete dephasing random walk model Eq. (63) while the full (cyan) lines correspond to the diffusive approximation Eq. (70). The parameters are the same than in Fig. 1, but here the initial width of the diffusive approximation is $\sigma_0^2/r_0^2 = 1/2$.

assume a finite initial value, $\sigma_0 > 0$. By performing the same series expansion [Eq. (77)] than in the derivation of Eq. (78), we found that it is possible to *guaranty the positivity of $\text{Det}[\varrho_q(t)]|_0$ at short times if*

$$\sigma_0^2 \geq \frac{D_\gamma}{4\gamma} = \frac{r_0^2}{2}. \quad (79)$$

This result can be read as follows. The diffusive approximation becomes physical on the short time scale $\phi t < 1$ if instead of a localized initial condition [$\sigma_0^2/r_0^2 = 0$] a minimal initial uncertainty is taken in the classical coordinate [$\sigma_0^2/r_0^2 = 1/2$]. This feature has a clear physical meaning. In fact, D_γ/γ can be read as the classical (quadratic) coordinate dispersion induced by the third coupling mechanism during its characteristic time scale $1/\gamma$. The isolated action of this mechanism cannot be approximated by a diffusive dynamics. On the other hand, the initial width σ_0 can be read as an initial spread induced by the second coupling mechanism. In fact, the initial spread applies independently of which direction in the quantum Hilbert space is taken into account. Thus, the condition $\sigma_0^2 \geq D_\gamma/(4\gamma)$ implies an initial predominance of the second coupling mechanism over the third one, which in turn leads to the positivity of $\text{Det}[\varrho_q(t)]$ at any time and space scales.

In Fig. 2 we take the same model and parameter values than in Fig. 1 but taking an initial finite width $\sigma_0^2/r_0^2 = 1/2$. Consistently with the previous analysis, in the short time scale ($\phi t < 1$) the determinant $\text{Det}[\varrho_q(t)]$ is positive [Figs. 1(a)-(b)], while in the large time scale ($\phi t > 1$) the influence of the initial width is negligible [Figs. 1(c)-

(d)]. In fact, these last plots are almost indistinguishable with those of Fig. 1. Therefore, we conclude that the diffusive approximation can lead to a positive definite solution when the initial width of the classical subsystem is consistently restricted [Eq. (79)].

B. Dephasing correlated random walk with non-diagonal coherent couplings

The second example can be read as a generalization of the previous one. The dynamics is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\rho_n}{dt} = & \gamma(\sigma_z\rho_{n+1}\sigma_z + \sigma_z\rho_{n-1}\sigma_z - 2\rho_n) \\ & + \phi(\rho_{n+1} + \rho_{n-1} - 2\rho_n) \\ & + \lambda^{\text{dn}}(\sigma_z\rho_{n+1} - \frac{1}{2}\{\sigma_z, \rho_n\}_+) + h.c. \\ & + \lambda^{\text{up}}(\sigma_z\rho_{n-1} - \frac{1}{2}\{\sigma_z, \rho_n\}_+) + h.c. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

In contrast to Eq. (63), here the third and fourth lines take into account coupling mechanisms corresponding to the fourth case [Eq. (19)]. The general constraints that guaranty positivity [Eq. (27)] here read

$$\frac{|\lambda^{\text{up}}|^2}{\gamma\phi} \leq 1, \quad \frac{|\lambda^{\text{dn}}|^2}{\gamma\phi} \leq 1. \quad (81)$$

Notice that each inequality defines an ellipse (strictly, a circle) in the space defined by the complex parameters λ^{up} and λ^{dn} .

Using the general equivalent expression (21), in terms of the classical operators (59) and (60), the evolution (80) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\rho_n}{dt} = & (2\gamma\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_z} + \phi L_2)[\rho_n] + \gamma L_2[\sigma_z\rho_n\sigma_z] - i\frac{\omega}{2}[\sigma_z, \rho_n]_- \\ & - (\delta\lambda L_1[\sigma_z\rho_n] + h.c.) + (\frac{\lambda}{2}L_2[\sigma_z\rho_n] + h.c.). \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

The Lindblad superoperator \mathcal{L}_{σ_z} is defined by Eq. (58). The parameters are

$$\lambda \equiv \lambda^{\text{up}} + \lambda^{\text{dn}}, \quad \delta\lambda \equiv \lambda^{\text{up}} - \lambda^{\text{dn}}, \quad (83)$$

while the (real) frequency is

$$\omega \equiv i(\lambda - \lambda^*). \quad (84)$$

From Eq. (82), the evolution of the quantum subsystem state, $\rho_t = \sum \rho_n$, is

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = 2\gamma\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_z}[\rho] - i\frac{\omega}{2}[\sigma_z, \rho]_-. \quad (85)$$

Thus, there is not any influence of the classical subsystem on the quantum one [see Eq. (24)]. On the other hand, for writing the evolution of the matrix elements

of ρ_n [Eq. (56)], in advance, we introduce the real and imaginary parts of the characteristic parameters,

$$\lambda = \lambda_R + i\lambda_I, \quad \delta\lambda = \delta\lambda_R + i\delta\lambda_I. \quad (86)$$

For the populations we get

$$\frac{dp_n^{(s)}}{dt} = -\alpha_1^{(s)}L_1[p_n^{(s)}] + \alpha_2^{(s)}L_2[p_n^{(s)}], \quad s = \pm 1, \quad (87)$$

where the coefficients are

$$\alpha_1^{(s)} = 2s\delta\lambda_R, \quad \alpha_2^{(s)} = \gamma + \phi + s\lambda_R \geq 0. \quad (88)$$

From the constraints (81) it follows the inequalities $-4\sqrt{\gamma\phi} \leq \alpha_1^{(s)} \leq 4\sqrt{\gamma\phi}$ and $0 \leq \alpha_2^{(s)} \leq (\sqrt{\phi} + \sqrt{\gamma})^2$. On the other hand, the coherence evolution reads

$$\frac{dc_n}{dt} = -(i\omega + 4\gamma)c_n - i\beta_1L_1[c_n] + \beta_2L_2[c_n], \quad (89)$$

where the coefficients are

$$\beta_1 = 2\delta\lambda_I, \quad \beta_2 = \phi - \gamma + i\lambda_I. \quad (90)$$

From Eq. (81) it follows the inequalities $-4\sqrt{\gamma\phi} \leq \omega \leq 4\sqrt{\gamma\phi}$, $-4\sqrt{\gamma\phi} \leq \beta_1 \leq 4\sqrt{\gamma\phi}$ and $|\beta_2|^2 \leq (\phi + \gamma)^2$.

Unlike the previous example, here in the evolution of the populations [Eq. (87)], both the discrete-force as well as the discrete-diffusion coefficients, $\alpha_1^{(s)}$ and $\alpha_2^{(s)}$ respectively, depend on the state (s) of the quantum subsystem. On the other hand, in the evolution of the coherences [Eq. (89)], the discrete-force and discrete-diffusion coefficients, $-i\beta_1$ and β_2 , are complex parameters.

The evolutions (87) and (89) can be solved analytically by using that a set of functions $\{f_n(t)\}_{-\infty}^{+\infty}$ that satisfy

$$\frac{df_n}{dt} = \alpha f_{n+1} + \beta f_{n-1} - (\alpha + \beta)f_n, \quad (91)$$

with initial condition $f_n(0) = \delta_{n,n_0}$, from a characteristic function approach [48], are given by

$$f_n(t) = e^{-(\alpha+\beta)t} I_{n-n_0}[2t\sqrt{\alpha\beta}] \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{n-n_0}{2}}. \quad (92)$$

Notice that Eq. (91) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{df_n}{dt} = -(\beta - \alpha)L_1[f_n] + \frac{\alpha + \beta}{2}L_2[f_n], \quad (93)$$

which has the structure of Eqs. (87) and (89).

Diffusive approximation

In a diffusive approximation, from Eq. (82) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \varrho_q}{\partial t} \approx & 2\gamma\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_z}[\varrho_q] + \frac{D_\phi}{2}\frac{\partial^2 \varrho_q}{\partial^2 q} + \frac{D_\gamma}{2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 q}(\sigma_z\varrho_q\sigma_z) \\ & - i\left(\omega + F_{\lambda_I}\frac{\partial}{\partial q} - \frac{D_{\lambda_I}}{2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 q}\right)\frac{1}{2}[\sigma_z, \varrho_q]_- \\ & - \left(F_{\lambda_R}\frac{\partial}{\partial q} - \frac{D_{\lambda_R}}{2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 q}\right)\frac{1}{2}\{\sigma_z, \varrho_q\}_+, \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$




FIG. 3: Populations of the conditional quantum state as a function of the dimensionless coordinate $q/r_0 = n$ at different times. The (large) dots correspond to the discrete dephasing random walk model Eq. (80) while the full lines correspond to the diffusive approximation Eq. (94). The parameters are $\gamma/\phi = 1/2$, $\lambda^{\text{up}}/\phi = \sqrt{1/20}(3-i)$, and $\lambda^{\text{dn}}/\phi = (1+i)/2$. The initial width of the Gaussian approximation is $\sigma_0^2/r_0^2 = 1/2$. The dotted and dashed lines correspond to the solutions of the quantum Fokker-Planck dynamics, Eq. (102).

where as before [Eq. (71)] the diffusion coefficients are $D_\phi = 2\phi r_0^2$, and $D_\gamma = 2\gamma r_0^2$. Furthermore, we introduced the extra coefficients associated to the fourth coupling mechanism

$$F_\lambda = 2\delta\lambda r_0 = F_{\lambda_R} + iF_{\lambda_I}, \quad (95)$$

$$D_\lambda = 2\lambda r_0^2 = D_{\lambda_R} + iD_{\lambda_I}. \quad (96)$$

Written in terms of the matrix elements [Eq. (61)], for the populations we get

$$\frac{\partial P_q^{(s)}}{\partial t} \approx -sF_{\lambda_R} \frac{\partial P_q^{(s)}}{\partial q} + \frac{D(s)}{2} \frac{\partial^2 P_q^{(s)}}{\partial^2 q}, \quad (97)$$

where $D(s) = D_\phi + D_\gamma + sD_{\lambda_R}$. Similarly, for the coherences we obtain

$$\frac{\partial C_q}{\partial t} \approx -(i\omega + 4\gamma)C_q - iF_{\lambda_I} \frac{\partial C_q}{\partial q} + \frac{\tilde{D}}{2} \frac{\partial^2 C_q}{\partial^2 q}, \quad (98)$$

where $\tilde{D} = D_\phi - D_\gamma + iD_{\lambda_I}$. The solution of Eqs. (97) and (98) can be written straightforwardly in terms of the Gaussian propagator (72).




FIG. 4: Real and imaginary part of the coherence of the conditional quantum state in an interaction representation (see text). The (large) dots correspond to the discrete dephasing random walk model Eq. (80) while the full lines correspond to the diffusive approximation Eq. (94). The parameters are the same than in Fig. 3. The dotted and dashed lines correspond to the solutions of Eq. (102).

Taking the coordinate $q/r_0 = n$, in the time scale $\phi t \gg 1$ it is expected that $\varrho_{nr_0}(t)r_0 \approx \rho_n(t)$. In Fig. 3 we plot the population of the discrete (balls) and continuous model (full lines), Eqs. (87) and (97) respectively. In Fig. 4 we plot the real and imaginary parts of the coherences corresponding to the discrete (balls) and continuous model (full lines), Eqs. (89) and (98) respectively. For clarity, the coherences are plotted in an interaction representation, $c_n(t) = \exp[-(i\omega + 4\gamma)t]c_n^I(t)$ and $C_q(t) = \exp[-(i\omega + 4\gamma)t]C_q^I(t)$. The initial conditions read $\rho_n(0) = \delta_{n,n_0}\rho_0$ and $\varrho_q(0) = \mathbb{G}_D[q, 0|\sigma_0]\rho_0$, where the quantum state is again the pure state $\rho_0 = (1/2)\{|1, 1\rangle, \{1, 1\rangle\}$. The chosen parameter values fulfill the equalities (81), that is, $(|\lambda^{\text{up}}/\phi|^2) = (|\lambda^{\text{dn}}/\phi|^2) = \gamma/\phi$. Hence, the dynamics only involves the fourth coupling mechanism.

From both figures we confirm that the diffusive approximation provides a very good fitting to the discrete model even when $\phi t \approx 1$. In addition, Fig. 3 explicitly shows that the state of the quantum subsystem ($s = \pm 1$) modify both the drift as well as the diffusion coefficients of the conditional populations (center of and width of the Gaussian densities respectively). Fig. 4 explicitly shows that




FIG. 5: Determinant of the conditional quantum state as a function of the dimensionless coordinate $q/r_0 = n$ at different times. The (blue) dots correspond to the discrete dephasing random walk model Eq. (80) while the full (cyan) lines correspond to the diffusive approximation Eq. (94). The parameters are the same than in Fig. 3 and 4, but here the initial width of the diffusive approximation is $\sigma_0^2/r_0^2 = 0$.

even when the drift and diffusion coefficients are complex parameters, the diffusive dynamics also provides a valid approximation to the underlying conditional coherences.

In Figs. 3 and 4, for the diffusive approximation we taken and initial width $(\sigma_0/r_0)^2 = 1/2$. The solutions with $(\sigma_0/r_0)^2 = 0$ are almost indistinguishable in the scale of the plots. Nevertheless, similarly to the previous example, the initial width has a strong influence on the determinant of the conditional states $\varrho_q(t)$. When $\sigma_0 = 0$, the determinant $\text{Det}[\varrho_q(t)]$ [Eq. (76) with the solutions of Eqs. (97) and (98)] may assume negative (unphysical) values. Taking $\sigma_0 = 0$, developing $\text{Det}[\varrho_q(t)]|_{q=0}$ in a short time series expansion [Eq. (77)], and assuming a pure quantum initial condition ($\text{det}[\rho_0] = 0$, which implies $\text{Det}[\varrho_q(0)] = 0 \forall q$) it follows that the determinant at the origin is positive at times $t \geq t^*$ where

$$0 \leq \phi t^* = \frac{\phi}{8\gamma} \frac{1}{(1-A)} \ln(B) < 1. \quad (99)$$

Here, we introduced the dimensionless parameters

$$A \equiv \frac{1}{8\gamma} \left[\frac{F_{\lambda_R}^2 (D_\phi + D_\gamma)}{(D_\phi + D_\gamma)^2 - D_{\lambda_R}^2} + \frac{F_{\lambda_I}^2 (D_\phi - D_\gamma)}{(D_\phi - D_\gamma)^2 + D_{\lambda_I}^2} \right], \quad (100)$$

and similarly

$$B \equiv \sqrt{\frac{(D_\phi + D_\gamma)^2 - D_{\lambda_R}^2}{(D_\phi - D_\gamma)^2 + D_{\lambda_I}^2}}. \quad (101)$$

The time t^* defined by Eq. (99) can be read as a generalization of Eq. (78). The inequalities $0 \leq \phi t^* < 1$,




FIG. 6: Determinant of the conditional quantum state as a function of the dimensionless coordinate $q/r_0 = n$ at different times. The (blue) dots correspond to the discrete dephasing random walk model Eq. (80) while the full (cyan) lines correspond to the diffusive approximation Eq. (94). The parameters are the same than in Fig. 3 and 4, where the initial width of the diffusive approximation is $\sigma_0^2/r_0^2 = 1/2$.

which restrict the possible values of the characteristic rates, guaranty that unphysical behaviors associated to the diffusive approximation [Eq. (94)] only occur in the short time scale. On the other hand, if one assume an initial non-vanishing width, it is possible to find out that the positivity of the determinant at the origin is guaranteed at all times if $\sigma_0^2 \geq D_\gamma/4\gamma = r_0^2/2$. This result is exactly the same than Eq. (79). Consequently, when the parameters are consistent with $0 < \phi t^* < 1$ and taking $\sigma_0^2 \geq r_0^2/2$ we expect that the determinant will be positive at any time t and any value of the classical coordinate q .

In order to check the previous conclusion in Fig. 5 we plot $\text{Det}[\varrho_q(t)]$ at different times taking a vanishing initial width, $\sigma_0 = 0$. Consistently when $\phi t \gtrsim \phi t^* = 0.0168$ the determinant at the origin becomes positive [Fig. 5(a)]. Nevertheless, in contrast with the previous example [see Fig. 1(b)], due to the influence of the extra coupling mechanism the initial negative value at $q = 0$ has been “transported” to $|q| > 0$ [Fig. 5(a) and (b)]. When $\phi t \gtrsim 1$ the determinant is positive for any value of q [Fig. 5(c) and (d)].

In Fig. 6 we plot $\text{Det}[\varrho_q(t)]$ at different times taking the initial width $\sigma_0^2 = r_0^2/2$. Consistently with the previous analysis we observe that now the determinant is positive at any time and position. In addition, a good fitting of the discrete model can be observed even in the transient regime $\phi t < 1$.

Quantum Fokker-Planck master equation

The lack of positivity of the determinant at the initial transient time regime is avoided if one consider the quantum Fokker-Planck master dynamics defined by Eq. (54). For the present model, this limit can be recovered from Eq. (94) assuming valid the conditions $D_\phi \gg D_\gamma$ and $D_\phi \gg |D_\lambda|$, which under the replacement $D_\gamma \rightarrow 0$ and $D_\lambda \rightarrow 0$ deliver

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho_q}{\partial t} = & 2\gamma \mathcal{L}_{\sigma_z}[\rho_q] + \frac{D_\phi}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \rho_q}{\partial^2 q} - i \frac{\omega}{2} [\sigma_z, \rho_q] - \\ & - \left(F_\lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial q} (\sigma_z \rho_q) + h.c. \right). \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

The positivity constraint (55) here lead to the conditions $\gamma > 0$, $D_\phi > 0$, and $|F_\lambda|^2 \leq 8\gamma D_\phi$, which in turn are consistent with the underlying condition of the discrete model, Eq. (81). Furthermore, they imply $A \leq 1$, $B = 0$, consequently $t^* = 0$ [Eq. (99)].

In Figs. 3 and 4 we also plotted the solution (dotted and dashed lines) corresponding to Eq. (102). The evolution of the populations $P_q^{(s)}(t)$ and coherences $C_q(t)$ can be read straightforwardly from Eqs. (97) and (98) after taking $D_\gamma \rightarrow 0$ and $D_\lambda \rightarrow 0$. As clearly observed in Fig. 3 the time evolution (102) is unable to capture the dependence of the diffusion coefficient with the state of the quantum system. In fact, both populations have the same width. On the other hand, strong deviations can be observed in Fig. 4 when considering the real and imaginary part of the coherences. In fact, Eq. (102), via de evolution (98) with $D_\gamma \rightarrow 0$ and $D_\lambda \rightarrow 0$, implies the symmetries $\text{Re}[C_{-q}(t)] = \text{Re}[C_q(t)]$ and $\text{Im}[C_{-q}(t)] = -\text{Im}[C_q(t)]$. Nevertheless, these properties are not fulfilled by the solution of the underlying discrete model neither by its diffusive approximation based on Eq. (94).

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We have introduced a deeper and general characterization of quantum-classical hybrid dynamics. The study is based on embedding a local-in-time Markovian hybrid dynamics in a bipartite Hilbert space where the corresponding density matrix obeys a time-irreversible Lindblad equation [Eq. (1)]. Requiring that one subsystem, at any time, must be incoherent in a given fixed basis [Eq. (2)] allowed us to recognize the existence of four possible coupling mechanisms.

In the *first coupling mechanism* [Eq. (6)] the dynamics of the quantum subsystem is given by a Lindblad dynamics whose parameters depend on the state of the classical subsystem. There is not any backaction on the classical subsystem, whose state is in fact a dynamical invariant [Eq. (7)]. In the *second coupling mechanism* [Eq. (9)] the classical subsystem obeys a classical master equation [Eq. (10)] while the state of the quantum subsystem remains invariant [Eq. (11)]. Consequently, in this

case there is no backaction between the two subsystems. In the *third coupling mechanism* [Eq. (13)] the transitions between the states of each subsystem are correlated with the transitions of the other. Thus, both subsystems influence each other. This symmetrical backaction precludes writing a closed sub-dynamics. However, we also characterized the conditions under which this is possible [Eqs. (15) and (17)]. The *fourth coupling mechanism* [Eq. (19)] can be read as a ‘‘coherent superposition’’ of the second and third cases. This property is derived from the structure of the underlying bipartite coupling operators [Eq. (18)]. In this case, there is always a backaction on the classical subsystem. Only under specific conditions the quantum subsystem can evolves independently of the previous one [Eq. (24)].

We *concluded* that, in general, any quantum-classical hybrid dynamics can be written in terms of the above four possible coupling mechanisms. This result follows from the positivity of the underlying matrix of rate coefficients [Eq. (26)], property that in turn controls the possible weights of the underlying coupling rates [Eq. (27) and equivalently Eq. (28)].

The above results allowed us to study in detail a *diffusive approximation*, where the evolution of the hybrid state is written only in terms of the first and second derivatives with respect to a continuous classical coordinate. Straightforwardly, the first mechanism can be extended to the continuous case [Eq. (31)]. Under standard conditions on the transition rates, the second mechanism can always be modelled by a diffusive mechanism [Eq. (34)]. In fact, in this case the coupling mechanism endow the classical subsystem with a time-irreversible dynamics that is independent of the state of the quantum subsystem. Thus, a diffusive process can be granted regardless of which direction in the Hilbert space is considered. On the contrary, the third mechanism cannot be addressed by a diffusive dynamics [Eq. (42)]. In fact, the underlying (coupled) quantum dynamics involves discrete changes which imply that diffusion cannot be granted for arbitrary directions in Hilbert space. Similarly to the fourth case, we conclude that a diffusive approximation applies when the influence of the second mechanism is simultaneously considered which is turn must be dominant over the others [Eqs. (43) and (48)].

When the underlying size of the (coupled) transformations undergone by the quantum and classical subsystems can be taken as the small scale of the problem, the hybrid evolution is given by a quantum Fokker-Planck master equation [Eq. (54)]. These evolutions preserve at all times the positivity of the hybrid state. However, they are unable to capture dynamical effects that are well described in a diffusive approximation. In this latter case the lack of positivity can only occurs in a short time scale [Eqs. (78) and (99)]. Moreover, considering initial conditions for the classical system with a finite width avoids the lack of positivity [Eq. (79)]. The previous statements and conclusions were established from a set of representative examples that admit and exact

solution [Eqs. (63) and (80)]. Dynamical effects such as the dependence of diffusion coefficients on the state of the quantum subsystem as well as complex diffusion coefficients are well described in a diffusive approximation [Eqs. (97) and (98)]. In this way, the present results establish the possibility of describing hybrid dynamics with equations whose structure goes beyond quantum Fokker-Planck master equations.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks financial support from Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET), Argentina.

Appendix: Diffusive approximation of the fourth case

In the continuous limit, the time-evolution corresponding to the fourth coupling mechanism [Eq. (19) with $\lambda_{cc'}^{\mu\nu} = \delta_{\mu\nu}\lambda_{cc'}^\mu$], from the equivalent expression (21), can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\rho_t(q)}{dt} &= \Lambda_0^\mu(q)(V_\mu\rho_t(q)V_\mu^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\{V_\mu^\dagger V_\mu, \rho_t(q)\}_+) \\ &\quad + (F_\mu + F_I)[\rho_t(q)] \\ &\quad - i[H_0(q), \rho_t(q)] + (F_{\mu I} + F_{I\mu})[\rho_t(q)]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The rates are defined in Eq. (50) and (51). For shortening the expression we introduced the superoperator

$$F_\mu[\rho_t(q)] = V_\mu \left\{ \int dr \lambda^\mu(r|q-r) \rho_t(q-r) - \Lambda_0^\mu(q) \rho_t(q) \right\} V_\mu^\dagger. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Furthermore,

$$F_I[\rho_t(q)] = \int dr \lambda^I(r|q-r) \rho_t(q-r) - \Lambda_0^I(q) \rho_t(q). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

The Hamiltonian is $H_0(q) = (i/2) \sum_\mu (\Lambda_0^{\mu I}(q) V_\mu - \Lambda_0^{I\mu}(q) V_\mu^\dagger)$, while the “non-diagonal” contributions read

$$F_{\mu I}[\rho_t(q)] = \int dr \lambda^{\mu I}(r|q-r) V_\mu \rho_t(q-r) - \Lambda_0^{\mu I}(q) V_\mu \rho_t(q), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

and similarly

$$F_{I\mu}[\rho_t(q)] = \int dr \lambda^{I\mu}(r|q-r) \rho_t(q-r) V_\mu^\dagger - \Lambda_0^{I\mu}(q) V_\mu^\dagger \rho_t(q). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

For simplifying the expressions, an addition \sum_μ was not written explicitly in the above equalities.

Assuming that the evolution (A.1) is dominated by $F_I[\rho_t(q)]$, this term as well as $F_\mu[\rho_t(q)]$, $F_{\mu I}[\rho_t(q)]$ and $F_{I\mu}[\rho_t(q)] = (F_{\mu I}[\rho_t(q)])^\dagger$ can be expanded in a second order Taylor expansion [similar to Eq. (33)], which leads to Eq. (48).

-
- [1] C. W. Gardiner, *Handbook of Stochastic Methods*, (Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1985).
 - [2] H. Risken, *The Fokker-Planck Equation*, (Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 1989).
 - [3] N. G. van Kampen, in *Stochastic Processes in Physics and Chemistry*, 2nd ed. (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1992).
 - [4] H.P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002).
 - [5] R. Alicki and K. Lendi, *Quantum Dynamical Semigroups and Applications*, Lecture Notes in Physics **286** (Springer, Berlin, 1987).
 - [6] H. J. Carmichael, *An Open Systems Approach to Quantum Optics*, Lecture Notes in Physics Vol. M18 (Springer, Berlin, 1993).
 - [7] H. Wiseman and G. J. Milburn, *Quantum measurement and control*, (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
 - [8] A. Barchielli and M. Gregoratti, *Quantum Trajectories and Measurements in Continuous Time: The Diffusive Case*, Lecture Notes in Physics Vol. **782** (Springer, Berlin Heidelberg 2009).
 - [9] Ph. Blanchard and A. Jadczyk, Events and piecewise deterministic dynamics in event-enhanced quantum theory, Phys. Lett. A **203**, 260 (1995); Ph. Blanchard and A. Jadczyk, On the interaction between classical and quantum systems, Phys. Lett. A **175**, 157 (1993).
 - [10] R. Alicki and S. Kryszewski, Completely positive Bloch-Boltzmann equations, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 013809 (2003); B. Vacchini and K. Hornberger, Quantum linear Boltzmann equation, Phys. Rep. **478**, 71 (2009).
 - [11] I. de Vega and D. Alonso, Dynamics of non-Markovian open quantum systems, Rev. Mod. Phys. **89**, 015001 (2017).
 - [12] M. Esposito and P. Gaspard, Quantum master equation for a system influencing its environment, Phys. Rev. E **68**, 066112 (2003).
 - [13] A. A. Budini, Random Lindblad equations from complex environments, Phys. Rev. E **72**, 056106 (2005); A. A. Budini and Henning Schomerus, Non-Markovian master equations from entanglement with stationary unobserved degrees of freedom, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **38**, 9251 (2005).
 - [14] Heinz-Peter Breuer, Jochen Gemmer, and Mathias Michel, Non-Markovian quantum dynamics: Correlated projection superoperators and Hilbert space averaging, Phys. Rev. E **73**, 016139 (2006).
 - [15] A. A. Budini, Lindblad rate equations, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 053815 (2006).
 - [16] H. P. Breuer, Non-Markovian generalization of the Lindblad theory of open quantum systems, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 022103 (2007).
 - [17] D. Chruscinski, A. Kossakowski, G. Marmo, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, Dynamics of Interacting Classical and Quantum Systems, Open Syst. Inf. Dynam. **18**, 339 (2011).
 - [18] J. Fischer and H. P. Breuer, Correlated projection oper-

- ator approach to non-Markovian dynamics in spin baths, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 052119 (2007).
- [19] E. Barkai, Y. Jung, and R. Silbey, Theory of Single-Molecule Spectroscopy: Beyond the Ensemble Average, Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. **55**, 457 (2004); Y. Jung, E. Barkai, and R. J. Silbey, Current status of single-molecule spectroscopy: Theoretical aspects, J. Chem. Phys. **117**, 10980 (2002).
- [20] A. A. Budini, Open quantum system approach to single-molecule spectroscopy, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 043804 (2009).
- [21] A. A. Budini, Quantum jumps and photon statistics in fluorescent systems coupled to classically fluctuating reservoirs, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **43**, 115501 (2010).
- [22] A. A. Budini, Non-Poissonian intermittent fluorescence from complex structured environments, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 061802(R) (2006); A. A. Budini, Quantum jumps in non-Markovian single fluorescent systems, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **40**, 2671 (2007).
- [23] A. A. Budini, Light-assisted non-Poissonian fluorescence blinking from bosonic composite reservoirs, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 023825 (2007).
- [24] A. Barchielli and C. Pellegrini, Jump-diffusion unravelling of a non-Markovian generalized Lindblad master equation, J. Math. Phys. **51**, 112104 (2010).
- [25] V. Semin, I. Semina, and F. Petruccione, Stochastic wave-function unravelling of the generalized Lindblad equation, Phys. Rev. E **96**, 063313 (2017); M. Moodley and F. Petruccione, Stochastic wave-function unraveling of the generalized Lindblad master equation, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 042103 (2009).
- [26] A. A. Budini, Operator Correlations and Quantum Regression Theorem in Non-Markovian Lindblad Rate Equations, J. Stat. Phys. **131**, 51 (2008).
- [27] I. Guevara and H. Wiseman, Quantum State Smoothing, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 180407 (2015).
- [28] A. A. Budini, Smoothed quantum-classical states in time-irreversible hybrid dynamics, Phys. Rev. A **96**, 032118 (2017).
- [29] A. Riera-Campenya, A. Sanpera, and P. Strasberg, Quantum Systems Correlated with a Finite Bath: Nonequilibrium Dynamics and Thermodynamics, Phys. Rev. X Quantum **2**, 010340 (2021).
- [30] B. Donvil, P. Muratore-Ginanneschi, J. P. Pekola, Hybrid master equation for calorimetric measurements, Phys. Rev. A **99**, 042127 (2019).
- [31] R. Kapral, Progress in the theory of mixed quantum-classical dynamics, Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. **57**, 129 (2006).
- [32] Diósi and J. Halliwell, Coupling Classical and Quantum Variables using Continuous Quantum Measurement Theory, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 2846 (1998).
- [33] L. Diósi, N. Gisin, and W. T. Strunz, Quantum approach to coupling classical and quantum dynamics, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 022108 (2000).
- [34] L. Diósi, Hybrid quantum-classical master equations, Phys. Scr. **T163**, 014004 (2014).
- [35] F. Karolyhazy, Gravitation and Quantum Mechanics of Macroscopic Objects, Nuovo Cimento A **42**, 390 (1966).
- [36] R. Penrose, On Gravity's Role in Quantum State Reduction, Gen. Relativ. Gravit. **28**, 581 (1966).
- [37] L. Diósi, The gravity-related decoherence master equation from hybrid dynamics, Journal of Physics: Conference Series **306**, 012006 (2011).
- [38] M. Bahrani, A. Smirne, and A. Bassi, Role of gravity in the collapse of a wave function: A probe into the Diósi-Penrose model, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 062105 (2014); Angelo Bassi, K. Lochan, S. Satin, T. P. Singh, and H. Ulbricht, Models of wave-function collapse, underlying theories, and experimental tests, Rev. Mod. Phys. **85**, 471 (2013).
- [39] A. Tilloy and L. Diósi, Sourcing semiclassical gravity from spontaneously localized quantum matter, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 024026 (2016).
- [40] I. Layton, J. Oppenheim, A. Russo, and Z. Weller-Davies, The weak field limit of quantum matter back-reacting on classical spacetime, arXiv:2307.02557v1 [gr-qc] 5 Jul 2023.
- [41] J. Oppenheim, C. Sparaciari, B. Soda, and Z. Weller-Davies, Gravitationally induced decoherence vs spacetime diffusion: testing the quantum nature of gravity, arXiv:2203.01982v1 [quant-ph] 3 Mar 2022.
- [42] J. Oppenheim, C. Sparaciari, B. Soda, and Z. Weller-Davies, The two classes of hybrid classical-quantum dynamics, arXiv:2203.01332v1 [quant-ph] 2 Mar 2022.
- [43] J. Oppenheim, C. Sparaciari, B. Šoda, and Z. Weller-Davies, Objective trajectories in hybrid classical-quantum dynamics, arXiv:2011.06009v3 [quant-ph] 2 Jan 2023, Accepted in Quantum 2022-09-18.
- [44] L. Diósi, Hybrid completely positive Markovian quantum-classical dynamics, Phys. Rev. A **107**, 062206 (2023).
- [45] B. Annby-Andersson, F. Bakhshinezhad, D. Bhatlacharyya, G. De Sousa, C. Jarzynski, P. Samuelsson, and P. P. Potts, Quantum Fokker-Planck Master Equation for Continuous Feedback Control, Phys. Rev. Lett. **129**, 050401 (2022).
- [46] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985); C. D. Meyer, *Matrix Analysis and Applied Linear Algebra* (SIAM, 2000).
- [47] For simplicity we considered that $\phi(r|q) = \phi(r)$. The general case is covered by taking $\tau_0 = \tau_0(q)$, $\delta\tau_0 = \delta\tau_0(q)$, and $r_0 = r_0(q)$. On the other hand, the general expressions for the moments are $\Phi_m(q) = m!r_0^m/\tau_0$ for even m and $\Phi_m(q) = m!r_0^m/\delta\tau_0$ for odd m .
- [48] Defining $F(\mathfrak{z}, t) \equiv \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} \mathfrak{z}^n f_n(t)$, the functions of interest $\{f_n(t)\}_{-\infty}^{+\infty}$ read $f_n(t) = (2\pi i)^{-1} \oint \mathfrak{z}^{-n-1} F(\mathfrak{z}, t)$, where the integral is taken around a unit circle in the complex \mathfrak{z} -plane [3].