

The Jaynes Cummings model as an autonomous Maxwell demon

Yashovardhan Jha,^{1,*} Dragi Karevski,¹ and Cyril Elouard^{1,†}

¹*Université de Lorraine, CNRS, LPCT, F-54000 Nancy, France*

We revisit the Jaynes Cummings model as an autonomous thermodynamic machine, where a qubit is coupled to a cavity with a very large initial coherent field. Our analysis reveals different behaviors of this model including the expected unitary behavior of qubit at short times, which fails at longer times when the cavity starts measuring the qubit. The subsequent dynamics feature feedback from the cavity on the qubit, which appears to purify the qubit irrespective of its initial state. Upon analyzing these dynamics from a thermodynamic standpoint, we found that the cavity behaves as an autonomous Maxwell demon.

Autonomous machines, performing tasks without external control, are an important concept in thermodynamics [1, 2]. Their time-dependent evolution derive solely from their initial non-equilibrium condition, akin to automaton. This concept is particularly important in the case of quantum machines [3–9], where the coherence of microscopic constituents is crucial, as avoiding classical controllers empirically mitigates decoherence. This motivates research into autonomous (or coherent) feedback [10–15], where a quantum system is able to drive a target system conditionally on the values of a few of its observables, e.g. applied to quantum error correction [16–18]. When these controllers perform thermodynamic tasks, such as work extraction or cooling, they are called autonomous Maxwell demons [19–25]. A thorough characterization of these machines is of major fundamental interest, as it is linked to the long-standing question of how the dynamics induced by quantum measurements [26–28] and the laws of thermodynamics [29–31] emerge in an entirely quantum framework.

Here, we analyze an autonomous machine composed of a qubit interacting with a cavity initialized in a coherently displaced thermal state, focusing on the classical limit. Over time, we identify three successive regimes exhibiting very different thermodynamic behaviors. At short times, the cavity behaves as a quasi-ideal source of work, namely, a classical drive inducing unitary Rabi oscillations of the qubit. We quantify the deviations from ideality, which take the form of residual heat exchange and entropy production. This regime breaks down over a time-scale set by the qubit-cavity coupling constant, where Rabi oscillations decohere. This decoherence is related to an autonomous measurement of the qubit by the cavity in a basis set by the initial phase of the field. The result of this measurement is stored in a conditional field amplitude. Finally, we identify a third regime where the cavity unitarily drives the qubit depending on these measurement outcomes. This autonomous feedback is able to purify the qubit starting from any mixed initial state. Our thermodynamic analysis shows that the cavity behaves as an autonomous Maxwell demon, trading mutual information for cooling power.

Model – We consider qubit Q (e.g. a two-level atom)

interacting with a harmonic oscillator (hereafter dubbed the cavity C) according to the Jaynes-Cummings interaction $\hat{V}_{QC} = i\hbar g(a\sigma_+ - a^\dagger\sigma_-)$, where a denotes the bosonic annihilation operator of the cavity, and $\sigma_- = |g\rangle\langle e| = \sigma_+^\dagger$ the lowering operator of the atom. We focus on resonant conditions, where the qubit and cavity Hamiltonians are $\hat{H}_Q = \hbar\omega_0\sigma_+\sigma_-$ and $\hat{H}_C = \hbar\omega_0 a^\dagger a$, respectively. We assume that the cavity is initially prepared in a coherently-displaced thermal state $\hat{\rho}_C(0) = D(\alpha_0)\hat{w}_{\beta(0)}D^\dagger(\alpha_0)$, where $\hat{w}_{\beta(0)} = \frac{e^{-\beta(0)\hbar\omega_0 a^\dagger a}}{Z_C(0)}$ is a thermal equilibrium state at inverse temperature $\beta(0)$, with $Z_C(0) = \text{Tr}\{e^{-\beta(0)\hbar\omega_0 a^\dagger a}\}$. $D(\alpha_0) = e^{\alpha_0 a^\dagger - \alpha_0^* a}$ denotes the phase-space displacement operator with amplitude $\alpha_0 = \sqrt{\bar{n}_0}e^{i\phi_0}$. We are interested in the limit $n_0 \gg \bar{n}, 1$, with $\bar{n} = (e^{\beta(0)\hbar\omega_0} - 1)^{-1}$ the initial thermal occupation of the cavity, in which the cavity is expected to induce a classical drive for the qubit. Due to the resonance condition, the evolution of the total system in the interaction picture is governed by Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_I(t) = V_{QC}$ [32].

Thermodynamics of autonomous quantum machines – To interpret the energy exchanges between the cavity and the qubit in terms of work and heat, we rely on the framework introduced by some of us [30]. This framework distinguishes isoentropic contributions to the energy exchanges from those proportional to the entropy variations. More precisely, the framework applies to an arbitrary set of quantum systems whose evolution is ruled by a total time-independent Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \sum_j \hat{H}_j + \hat{V}$, where H_j stands for the bare Hamiltonian of system j , and \hat{V} an arbitrary interaction Hamiltonian. The internal energy of system j is defined as $E_j(t) = \text{Tr}\{\hat{H}_j \hat{\rho}_j(t)\}$, computed from its reduced density operator $\hat{\rho}_j(t)$. Then, the heat provided by system j to the others between times $t = 0$ and t is defined as the variation $Q_j(t) = -\Delta E_j^{\text{th}}$ of the thermal energy, defined by $E_j^{\text{th}}(t) = \text{Tr}\{\hat{w}_j(t)\hat{H}_j\}$. The latter is the internal energy of the thermal state $\hat{w}_j(t) = e^{-\beta_j(t)\hat{H}_j}/Z_j(t)$ of system j , which has the same von Neumann entropy $S_j(t) = -\text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_j(t)\log \hat{\rho}_j(t)\}$ as the actual reduced state $\hat{\rho}_j(t)$. As thermal states achieve minimal energy at fixed von Neumann entropy, the thermal energy $E_j^{\text{th}}(t) \leq E_j(t)$ represents the part of the internal energy of system j




FIG. 1. (a) Entropy variation ΔS_Q of the qubit over a long time scale for different initial qubit states $|\psi_1\rangle = |e\rangle\langle e|$, $|\psi_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|e\rangle + e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}}|g\rangle)$, and $|\psi_3\rangle = |+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|e\rangle + i|g\rangle)$. (b) zoom in the early times of (a), in semilog scale. (c) Excited state population $P_e = \langle e|\hat{\rho}_Q(t)|e\rangle$ (in blue) and coherence $C_{eg} = \langle e|\hat{\rho}_Q(t)|g\rangle$ (in orange and red) of the atom when it is initialized in $\hat{\rho}_Q(0) = |e\rangle\langle e|$. The dots correspond to expansions up to second order in $1/n_0$ and the solid lines are obtained from exact expressions, truncating the cavity Hilbert space to $N_{\text{ph}} = 500$. Parameters: $n_0 = 100$, $\bar{n} = 1$.

which carries entropy exchange. For an infinitesimal evolution, it verifies $dQ_j(t) = -\beta_j^{-1}(t)dS_j(t)$. Conversely, the work $W_j(t) = \Delta E_j - Q_j(t)$ provided by system j corresponds to the isentropic part of the evolution of system j . $\beta_j^{-1}(t)$ represents a time-dependent effective nonequilibrium temperature putting constraints on the energy exchanges. For instance, for an uncorrelated total initial state of the systems $\hat{\rho}_{\text{tot}}(0) = \otimes_j \hat{\rho}_j(0)$, one can express the Second law for the transformation of system j under the form $\Delta S_j - \sum_{j' \neq j} \int_0^t dt \beta_{j'}^{-1}(t') \dot{Q}_{j'}(t') \geq 0$ [30]. From these definitions, a pure source of work, verifying $\Delta E_j = W_j(t)$, can be identified as a quantum system never building correlations with the others, that is, fulfilling $\hat{\rho}_{\text{tot}}(t) \simeq \hat{\rho}_j(t) \otimes \text{Tr}_j\{\hat{\rho}_{\text{tot}}(t)\}$. The evolution of system j is then isentropic, and it effectively behaves as a classical drive on the remaining systems. Such behavior

is expected for a cavity in the classical limit $n_0 \gg 1, \bar{n}$. Conversely, this framework allows us to quantitatively evaluate deviations from this ideal picture, e.g. residual exchanges of heat, due to the quantumness of the cavity and the correlations generated by the cavity-qubit dynamics.

The autonomous dynamics of the machine features three successive regimes with very different thermodynamic interpretations, that can be identified from the time-evolution of the qubit's von Neumann entropy as shown in Fig. 1(a) and b). We analyze them in the following.

Unitary regime – For times $t \ll g^{-1}$, the cavity and the qubit density operators remain approximately factorized, such that the cavity behaves as a quasi-ideal source of work inducing a classical drive on the qubit. As a consequence, the qubit follows a unitary evolution ruled by the effective Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_Q^{\text{eff}}(t) = \text{Tr}_C\{\hat{V}_{QC}\hat{\rho}_C(t)\} = i\hbar g(\langle a(t)\rangle\sigma_+ - \langle a^\dagger(t)\rangle\sigma_-)$, featuring Rabi oscillations with frequency $\Omega \simeq g|\langle a(0)\rangle| = g\sqrt{n_0}$ (see Fig. 1(c) and [32]). To identify thermodynamic evidence of the work source behavior of the cavity, and deviations from it, we plot in Fig. 2 the work W_C and the heat Q_C provided by the cavity to the qubit, together with the variation of the cavity's internal energy ΔE_C . We see that for large enough values of n_0 , the cavity mostly provides work and almost no entropy is produced during a single Rabi oscillation. We formalize this result by expanding the exact cavity and qubit state $\hat{\rho}(t) = \hat{U}(t)(\hat{\rho}_Q(0) \otimes \hat{\rho}_C(0))\hat{U}^\dagger(t)$ as power series of $1/n_0$. For $\hat{\rho}_Q(0) = |e\rangle\langle e|$, the qubit population $P_e(t) = \langle e|\hat{\rho}_Q(t)|e\rangle$ and coherence $C_{eg}(t) = \langle e|\hat{\rho}_Q(t)|g\rangle$ read:

$$P_e(t) = \cos^2 \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{\delta P_e(\theta, \bar{n})}{n_0} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n_0^2}\right)$$

$$C_{eg}(t) = -e^{i\phi_0} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sin \theta + \frac{\delta C_{eg}(\theta, \bar{n})}{n_0} \right] + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n_0^2}\right), \quad (1)$$

where $\theta = 2\Omega t = 2gt\sqrt{n_0}$ stands for the rotation angle in the Bloch sphere. The complete expression of first order corrections $\delta P_e(\theta, \bar{n})/n_0$ and $\delta C_{eg}(\theta, \bar{n})/n_0$ to an ideal Rabi oscillation are given in the Supp. Mat., and decay as $1/n_0$ in the classical limit. These first-order truncations show good agreement with exact numerical results over short time-scales of the order of Ω^{-1} , as shown in Fig. 1(c). In addition, our expansion shows that the amount of exchanged heat Q_C and the entropy production scale as $1/n_0$ (see inset of Fig. 2), confirming that the cavity can be considered as an ideal work source in this regime.

Measurement-induced decoherence – It is known from previous calculations [33], as well as measurements on Rydberg atoms in cavities [34], that the qubit decoheres, and Rabi oscillations collapse, over a time scale $t_c \sim g^{-1}$ (see Fig. 1c). This decoherence is due to the evolution of the field towards two orthogonal states, with macro-




FIG. 2. Heat Q_C (red), work W_C (green) and internal energy variation of the cavity ΔE_C (blue) as a function of $\theta = 2gt\sqrt{n_0}$ for $n_0 = 500$ and $\bar{n} = 1$, obtained from the second order in $1/n_0$. Exact expressions with truncated cavity Hilbert space are displayed in black (not distinguishable). Inset: Heat provided by the cavity during a single Rabi oscillation ($\theta = 2\pi$), obtained from the expansion, as a function of n_0 , in semilog scale.

scopically different values of the complex field amplitudes $\langle a(t) \rangle$ conditioned on the state of the qubit. This evolution can be interpreted as a measurement of the qubit by the cavity¹[36].

The measurement basis is set by the eigenbasis of $\hat{H}_Q^{\text{eff}}(0)$, and therefore by the initial phase of the field. Explicitly, it reads $\{\cos(\frac{\phi_0}{2})|+_y\rangle - i\sin(\frac{\phi_0}{2})|-_y\rangle, -i\sin(\frac{\phi_0}{2})|+_y\rangle + \cos(\frac{\phi_0}{2})|-_y\rangle\}$, where $|\pm_y\rangle$ are the eigenstates of $\sigma_y = i(\sigma_- - \sigma_+)$, and corresponds to an axis in the equator of the Bloch sphere. In the case $\phi_0 = 0$, which we consider hereafter, the qubit is measured along the y -axis. The total state verifies for $t \lesssim t_c = \mathcal{O}(g^{-1})$ [36]:

$$\hat{\rho}(t) = \sum_{\nu, \mu = \pm} \rho_{\nu\mu} |\nu_y\rangle \langle \mu_y| \otimes \hat{\rho}_C^{\nu\mu}(t) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n_0}\right), \quad (2)$$

where $\rho_{\nu\mu} = \langle \nu_y | \rho_Q(0) | \mu_y \rangle$ are the coefficients of the qubit density operator in the measurement basis and

$$\hat{\rho}_C^{\nu\mu}(t) = e^{\nu i \chi \delta_{\nu\mu}} D(\sqrt{n_0} e^{\nu \frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}) w_{\beta(0)} D^\dagger(\sqrt{n_0} e^{\mu \frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}), \quad (3)$$

are conditional operators in the cavity space with $\chi = gt(\sqrt{n_0} + 1/\sqrt{n_0})$ and $\delta_{\nu\mu}$ the Kronecker delta. The diagonal terms $\hat{\rho}_C^{\nu\nu}$ are conditional cavity states associated with measurement results ν , and are characterized by

field amplitudes

$$\alpha_\nu(t) = \sqrt{n_0} e^{\nu \frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}. \quad (4)$$

For $t \in [0, t_c]$, they fulfill $\alpha_\nu(t) = \sqrt{n_0} + i\nu \frac{gt}{2} + \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n_0})$. The trace of the cross terms $\text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_C^{+-}(t_c)\}$ vanishes for $n_0 \gg \bar{n}, 1$, which implies maximal qubit-cavity correlations, and hence a complete measurement [37]. In particular, the reduced qubit state verifies $\hat{\rho}_Q(t_c) = \rho_{++}|+_y\rangle\langle+_y| + \rho_{--}|-_y\rangle\langle-_y| + \mathcal{O}(1/n_0)$, achieving complete dephasing of the Rabi oscillations in the classical limit.

Autonomous feedback and qubit purification. Remarkably, the behavior of the machine presents a third regime on an even longer timescale $t \sim \sqrt{n_0}g^{-1}$, in which the cavity performs an effective drive depending on the result of the measurement in the $\{|\pm_y\rangle\}$ basis, thereby performing an autonomous feedback. We show below that this feedback is able to purify any initial qubit state when n_0 is sufficiently large. We first note that at $t \sim t_c$, the cavity field $\text{Tr}\{a\hat{\rho}_C^{\nu\nu}\} = \alpha_\nu(t)$ depends on the measurement result ν . It is instructive to analyze the joint qubit-cavity dynamics along the two independent branches associated with the qubit found in $|\pm_y\rangle$. As, *inside each branch*, the qubit-cavity state is factorized up to $\mathcal{O}(1/n_0)$ corrections, one can again consider the cavity as an ideal work source, inducing a classical drive on the qubit of the form $\hat{H}_Q^{\text{eff}(\nu)}(t) = i\hbar g(\alpha_\nu(t)\sigma_+ - \alpha_\nu^*(t)\sigma_-)$ [32], where, unlike early times ($t < t_c$), the effective driving Hamiltonian depends on the measurement result. At t_c , the two Hamiltonians almost coincide with $\hat{H}_Q^{\text{eff}}(0)$, and the qubit measured state is aligned with the field, whatever ν . Then, two different field axes emerge. From Eq. (4), we see that they both lie in the equator and rotate in opposite directions with angular velocities $\pm \frac{g}{2\sqrt{n_0}}$ much smaller, by a factor of $1/n_0$, than the energy splitting of $\hat{H}_Q^{\text{eff}(\nu)}(t)$, still given by the Rabi frequency Ω . As a consequence, the qubit follows adiabatically the rotation axis inside each measurement branch (see Fig. 3). The two field axes meet again at $t = t_{\min} = \sqrt{n_0}\pi g^{-1}$ where they overlap with the x -axis of the Bloch sphere, driving in both branches the qubit to state $|+_x\rangle$. As a consequence of this autonomous feedback, an arbitrary initial qubit state $\hat{\rho}_Q(0)$ is deterministically purified and brought to $|+_x\rangle$ (or generally for a phase ϕ_0 to state $(1/\sqrt{2})(|g\rangle + e^{i\phi_0}|e\rangle)$) at time t_{\min} .

It is worth noting that this ideal purification occurs in the limit $n_0 \rightarrow \infty$, such as t_{\min} also diverges. Nevertheless, our expansion at first order in $\mathcal{O}(1/n_0)$ allows us to identify corrections for finite n_0 . Mainly, the corrections are due to correlations between the cavity and the qubit inside each branch, which are responsible for a purity loss of the qubit state. As a result, the qubit achieves a non-zero minimum entropy (scaling as $\mathcal{O}(1/n_0)$), at a time t_{\min} which slightly differs from $\sqrt{n_0}\pi$ (See Fig. 1(a)). In

¹ A more correct terminology here would be a “pre-measurement”. The measurement would be complete only if the measurement outcome is copied in a large number of environmental degrees of freedom [35]. If the cavity and qubit continue to evolve in isolation, revivals of the Rabi oscillations would eventually be observed [33]. However, the measurement analogy remains fully consistent on the time interval considered in this letter.




FIG. 3. Autonomous feedback mechanism. (a) Trajectory of the qubit on the equator of the Bloch sphere starting from states $|+y\rangle$ (blue) and $|-y\rangle$ (green) and (b) of the average field amplitude. The red circle locates the qubit state reached at t_{\min} . The yellow circle locates the initial cavity displacement, for $\phi_0 = 0$.

summary, there is a trade-off between the purity of the attained qubit state and the time needed to purify the qubit.

As seen in Fig. 1(a), the entropy of the qubit goes through a series of minima with a decreasing purity at times $t_k \simeq (2k + 1)\sqrt{n_0}\pi$ (with $t_1 \equiv t_{\min}$), except when it starts already in one of the two pointer states $|\pm y\rangle$ (red curve). In this case, the cavity-qubit correlations associated with the measurement do not build up, and the qubit entropy increase is only due to intra-branch correlations associated with finite n_0 behavior. Between two consecutive minima, the qubit goes through entropy maxima of increasing value. After a few oscillations, as intra-branch qubit-cavity correlations keep growing, the qubit entropy saturates at $\log 2$, the maximum physical value for a qubit.

Thermodynamic signature of an autonomous Maxwell demon – We now use our thermodynamic framework to analyze the purification process, and show that it can be interpreted as an autonomous Maxwell demon. We assume that the qubit is initially prepared in the maximally mixed state $\rho_Q(0) = \mathbb{1}/2$. Fig. 4 shows the evolution of the qubit and cavity entropies, together with their quantum mutual information $I_{CQ}(t)$. We also plotted the work $W_C(t)$ and heat $Q_C(t)$ provided by the cavity, together with its internal energy variation ΔE_C . We first note that the machine is able to decrease the qubit entropy (initially equal to its maximal value $\log 2$) down to a minimum value reached at time t_{\min} , at the expense of work performed by the cavity, akin to a Szilard engine [38, 39].

We then build on the dynamical analysis above to interpret the evolution of the thermodynamic quantities associated with the purification process. As the




FIG. 4. (a) von Neumann entropy of the cavity S_C and of the qubit S_Q , and mutual information between the qubit and cavity I_{CQ} . (b) Cavity heat Q_C , work $W_C(t)$ and internal energy variation $\Delta E_C(t)$. For both (a) and (b), $n_0 = 50$, $\bar{n} = 1$. Plotted quantities are computed from exact calculation with truncated cavity Hilbert space.

qubit-cavity correlations associated with the measurement grow during time interval $[0, t_c]$, the mutual information increases from 0 (as expected for an initial factorized state) to almost its maximal value $\log 2$ reached around t_c . The reduced entropy of the cavity also increases by the same amount. This step corresponds to the transfer of information about the qubit into the demon's memory. Over the interval $[t_c, t_{\min}]$, the autonomous feedback of the cavity induces conditional rotations of the qubit state in the equator of the Bloch sphere based on the qubit state. This process is able to decrease the qubit entropy, but has no work cost (as seen on Fig. 4(b)) as the qubit's internal energy remains constant. This apparent violation of the second law of thermodynamics is enabled by the consumption of the mutual information built during the measurement stroke, as can be seen in Fig. 4(a). Consumption of mutual information for an effect analogous to work expenditure is precisely the signature of a Maxwell demon [39–41]. This behavior here emerges autonomously from the Jaynes-Cummings interaction, and is naturally captured by our thermodynamic framework. We finish by noting that the evolution over the time intervals $[t_k, t_{k+1}]$, correspond to a new measurement step followed by another feedback step, with degraded performances due to the building up of intra-branch correlations.

In conclusion, we have analyzed the dynamics of a qubit coupled to a cavity prepared in a displaced coherent state of very large displacement amplitude, a state commonly considered as guaranteeing a classical drive behavior of the cavity. Owing to our framework for the thermodynamics of autonomous machines, we have

shown that at short enough times, the cavity indeed behaves as an ideal work source inducing a time-dependent drive on the qubit. However, over a time-scale set by the qubit-cavity interaction strength, the cavity performs a measurement of the qubit state in a basis set by the initial cavity displacement phase, responsible for the collapse of the Rabi oscillations. We have shown that this measurement is followed by an autonomous feedback, a state-dependent drive able to purify the qubit. From the analysis of thermodynamic quantities, we relate this purification to the cavity behaving as an autonomous Maxwell demon, spending work to build mutual information with the qubit, and then consuming this mutual information decrease the qubit's entropy. Those results demonstrate the potential of consistent thermodynamic frameworks, like the one of Ref. [30], to shed new light on complex quantum dynamics. The parameters needed to implement our scheme are within state-of-the-art, e.g. in superconducting qubit-cavity systems, where strong couplings with respect to damping rates can be achieved. Natural extensions of this work include optimizing the initial cavity state to improve the purification process, e.g. by attaining purer states at a fixed feedback time, and testing the robustness of the purified qubit state to cavity preparation and residual qubit-cavity detunings.

Acknowledgements – C.E. acknowledges funding from French National Research Agency (ANR) under project ANR-22-CPJ1-0029-01. We thank Alexia Auffèves for fruitful discussions.

* yashoovardhanjha@gmail.com

† cyril.elouard@univ-lorraine.fr

- [1] Shoichi Toyabe and Yuki Izumida. Experimental characterization of autonomous heat engine based on minimal dynamical-system model. *Physical Review Research*, 2(3):033146, July 2020.
- [2] José Antonio Marín Guzmán, Paul Erker, Simone Gasparinetti, Marcus Huber, and Nicole Younger Halpern. Key issues review: useful autonomous quantum machines. *Reports on Progress in Physics*, 87(12):122001, November 2024.
- [3] Friedemann Tonner and Günter Mahler. Autonomous quantum thermodynamic machines. *Physical Review E*, 72(6):066118, December 2005.
- [4] Jonatan Bohr Brask, Géraldine Haack, Nicolas Brunner, and Marcus Huber. Autonomous quantum thermal machine for generating steady-state entanglement. *New Journal of Physics*, 17(11):113029, November 2015.
- [5] Alexandre Roulet, Stefan Nimmrichter, Juan Miguel Arzola, Stella Seah, and Valerio Scarani. Autonomous rotor heat engine. *Physical Review E*, 95(6):062131, June 2017.
- [6] Juliette Monsel, Cyril Elouard, and Alexia Auffèves. An autonomous quantum machine to measure the thermodynamic arrow of time. *npj Quantum Information*, 4(59):1–9, November 2018.
- [7] C. L. Latune, I. Sinayskiy, and F. Petruccione. Quantum coherence, many-body correlations, and non-thermal effects for autonomous thermal machines. *Scientific Reports*, 9(3191):1–13, February 2019.
- [8] Gonzalo Manzano, Ralph Silva, and Juan M. R. Parrondo. Autonomous thermal machine for amplification and control of energetic coherence. *Physical Review E*, 99(4):042135, April 2019.
- [9] Miika Rasola and Mikko Möttönen. Autonomous quantum heat engine based on non-Markovian dynamics of an optomechanical Hamiltonian. *Scientific Reports*, 14(9448):1–15, April 2024.
- [10] H. M. Wiseman and G. J. Milburn. All-optical versus electro-optical quantum-limited feedback. *Physical Review A*, 49(5):4110–4125, May 1994.
- [11] Richard J. Nelson, Yaakov Weinstein, David Cory, and Seth Lloyd. Experimental Demonstration of Fully Coherent Quantum Feedback. *Physical Review Letters*, 85(14):3045–3048, October 2000.
- [12] Seth Lloyd. Coherent quantum feedback. *Physical Review A*, 62(2):022108, July 2000.
- [13] Pierre Rouchon. Models and Feedback Stabilization of Open Quantum Systems. *ArXiv e-prints*, July 2014.
- [14] Yaoyao Zhou, Xiaojun Jia, Fang Li, Juan Yu, Changde Xie, and Kunchi Peng. Quantum Coherent Feedback Control for Generation System of Optical Entangled State. *Scientific Reports*, 5(11132):1–7, June 2015.
- [15] Julian Wolf, Olive H. Eilbott, Josh A. Isaacs, Kevin P. Mours, Jonathan Kohler, and Dan M. Stamper-Kurn. Autonomous feedback stabilization of a cavity-coupled spin oscillator. *ArXiv e-prints*, July 2023.
- [16] F. Reiter, A. S. Sørensen, P. Zoller, and C. A. Muschik. Dissipative quantum error correction and application to quantum sensing with trapped ions. *Nature Communications*, 8(1822):1–11, November 2017.
- [17] Qian Xu, Guo Zheng, Yu-Xin Wang, Peter Zoller, Aashish A. Clerk, and Liang Jiang. Autonomous quantum error correction and fault-tolerant quantum computation with squeezed cat qubits. *npj Quantum Information*, 9(78):1–11, August 2023.
- [18] Dany Lachance-Quirion, Marc-Antoine Lemonde, Jean Olivier Simoneau, Lucas St-Jean, Pascal Lemieux, Sara Turcotte, Wyatt Wright, Amélie Lacroix, Joëlle Fréchette-Viens, Ross Shillito, Florian Hopfmueller, Maxime Tremblay, Nicholas E. Frattini, Julien Camirand Lemyre, and Philippe St-Jean. Autonomous Quantum Error Correction of Gottesman-Kitaev-Preskill States. *Physical Review Letters*, 132(15):150607, April 2024.
- [19] A. C. Barato and U. Seifert. An autonomous and reversible Maxwell's demon. *Europhysics Letters*, 101(6):60001, March 2013.
- [20] Philipp Strasberg, Gernot Schaller, Thomas L. Schmidt, and Massimiliano Esposito. Fermionic reaction coordinates and their application to an autonomous Maxwell demon in the strong-coupling regime. *Physical Review B*, 97(20):205405, May 2018.
- [21] Baldo-Luis Najera-Santos, Patrice A. Camati, Valentin Métilion, Michel Brune, Jean-Michel Raimond, Alexia Auffèves, and Igor Dotsenko. Autonomous Maxwell's demon in a cavity QED system. *Physical Review Research*, 2(3):032025, July 2020.
- [22] Sergio Ciliberto. Autonomous out-of-equilibrium Maxwell's demon for controlling the energy fluxes pro-

- duced by thermal fluctuations. *Physical Review E*, 102(5):050103, November 2020.
- [23] Nahuel Freitas and Massimiliano Esposito. Characterizing autonomous Maxwell demons. *Physical Review E*, 103(3):032118, March 2021.
- [24] Björn Annby-Andersson, Debankur Bhattacharyya, Pharnam Bakhshinezhad, Daniel Holst, Guilherme De Sousa, Christopher Jarzynski, Peter Samuelsson, and Patrick P. Potts. Maxwell’s demon across the quantum-to-classical transition. *Physical Review Research*, 6(4):043216, November 2024.
- [25] Juliette Monsel, Matteo Acciai, Rafael Sánchez, and Janine Splettstoesser. Autonomous demon exploiting heat and information at the trajectory level. *Physical Review B*, 111(4):045419, January 2025.
- [26] Armen E. Allahverdyan, Roger Balian, and Theo M. Nieuwenhuizen. Understanding quantum measurement from the solution of dynamical models. *Physics Reports*, 525(1):1–166, April 2013.
- [27] Sophie Engineer, Tom Rivlin, Sabine Wollmann, Mehul Malik, and Maximilian P. E. Lock. Equilibration of objective observables in a dynamical model of quantum measurements. *ArXiv e-prints*, March 2024.
- [28] Camille L. Latune and Cyril Elouard. A thermodynamically consistent approach to the energy costs of quantum measurements. *Quantum*, 9:1614, January 2025.
- [29] Philipp Strasberg and Andreas Winter. First and Second Law of Quantum Thermodynamics: A Consistent Derivation Based on a Microscopic Definition of Entropy. *PRX Quantum*, 2(3):030202, August 2021.
- [30] Cyril Elouard and Camille Lombard Latune. Extending the Laws of Thermodynamics for Arbitrary Autonomous Quantum Systems. *PRX Quantum*, 4(2):020309, April 2023.
- [31] Florian Meier, Tom Rivlin, Tiago Debarba, Jake Xuereb, Marcus Huber, and Maximilian P. E. Lock. Emergence of a Second Law of Thermodynamics in Isolated Quantum Systems. *PRX Quantum*, 6(1):010309, January 2025.
- [32] Yashovadhan Jha, Cyril Elouard, and Dragi Karevski. Supplemental Material: The Jaynes Cummings model as an autonomous Maxwell demon.
- [33] Julio Gea-Banacloche. Collapse and revival of the state vector in the Jaynes-Cummings model: An example of state preparation by a quantum apparatus. *Physical Review Letters*, 65(27):3385–3388, December 1990.
- [34] A. Auffeves, P. Maioli, T. Meunier, S. Gleyzes, G. Nogues, M. Brune, J. M. Raimond, and S. Haroche. Entanglement of a Mesoscopic Field with an Atom Induced by Photon Graininess in a Cavity. *Physical Review Letters*, 91(23):230405, December 2003.
- [35] Wojciech Hubert Zurek. Quantum Darwinism. *Nature Physics*, 5:181–188, March 2009.
- [36] Julio Gea-Banacloche. Atom- and field-state evolution in the Jaynes-Cummings model for large initial fields. *Physical Review A*, 44(9):5913–5931, November 1991.
- [37] Howard M. Wiseman and Gerard J. Milburn. *Quantum Measurement and Control*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, UK, November 2009.
- [38] L. Szilard. über die Entropieverminderung in einem thermodynamischen System bei Eingriffen intelligenter Wesen. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 53(11):840–856, November 1929.
- [39] Juan M. R. Parrondo. Thermodynamics of Information. *ArXiv e-prints*, June 2023.
- [40] Takahiro Sagawa and Masahito Ueda. Erratum: Minimal Energy Cost for Thermodynamic Information Processing: Measurement and Information Erasure [Phys. Rev. Lett. 102, 250602 (2009)]. *Physical Review Letters*, 106(18):189901, May 2011.
- [41] Rafael Sánchez, Janine Splettstoesser, and Robert S. Whitney. Nonequilibrium System as a Demon. *Physical Review Letters*, 123(21):216801, November 2019.

Supplemental Material: The Jaynes Cummings model as an autonomous Maxwell demon

A. PHYSICAL MODEL

We consider a qubit (Q) interacting with a harmonic oscillator (C) through a resonant Jaynes-Cummings coupling. The total Hamiltonian is given by

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_C + \hat{H}_Q + \hat{V}_{QC} = \hbar\omega_0 a^\dagger a + \hbar\omega_0 \sigma_+ \sigma_- + i\hbar g (a\sigma_+ - a^\dagger \sigma_-) \quad (\text{S1})$$

with ω_0 the common transition frequency and g the coupling constant between the qubit and the cavity. The operators a and a^\dagger are the usual bosonic annihilation and creation operators and $\sigma_+ = |e\rangle\langle g| = \sigma_-^\dagger$ with $|e\rangle$ and $|g\rangle$ the excited and ground states of the two-level system, respectively. The total unitary evolution operator can be written as follows [33]:

$$\hat{U}(t) = \cos\left(gt\sqrt{a^\dagger a + 1}\right) |e\rangle\langle e| + \cos\left(gt\sqrt{a^\dagger a}\right) |g\rangle\langle g| + \frac{\sin\left(gt\sqrt{a^\dagger a + 1}\right)}{\sqrt{a^\dagger a + 1}} a\sigma_+ - \frac{\sin\left(gt\sqrt{a^\dagger a}\right)}{\sqrt{a^\dagger a}} a^\dagger \sigma_- \quad (\text{S2})$$

B. QUASI-IDEAL WORK SOURCE BEHAVIOR OF THE CAVITY

To verify the quasi-ideal work source behavior of the cavity, we consider the following initial factorized state for the qubit and cavity

$$\hat{\rho}(0) = |e\rangle\langle e| \otimes D(\alpha_0) \hat{w}_{\beta(0)} D^\dagger(\alpha_0), \quad \alpha_0 = \sqrt{n_0} e^{i\phi_0}. \quad (\text{S3})$$

Under the unitary evolution the state $\hat{\rho}(t) = \hat{U}(t)\hat{\rho}(0)\hat{U}^\dagger(t)$ takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\rho}(t) = & |e\rangle\langle e| \otimes \cos\left(gt\sqrt{a^\dagger a + 1}\right) D(\alpha_0) \hat{w}_{\beta(0)} D^\dagger(\alpha_0) \cos\left(gt\sqrt{a^\dagger a + 1}\right) \\ & - |e\rangle\langle g| \otimes \cos\left(gt\sqrt{a^\dagger a + 1}\right) D(\alpha_0) \hat{w}_{\beta(0)} D^\dagger(\alpha_0) a \frac{\sin\left(gt\sqrt{a^\dagger a}\right)}{\sqrt{a^\dagger a}} \\ & - |g\rangle\langle e| \otimes \frac{\sin\left(gt\sqrt{a^\dagger a}\right)}{\sqrt{a^\dagger a}} a^\dagger D(\alpha_0) \hat{w}_{\beta(0)} D^\dagger(\alpha_0) \cos\left(gt\sqrt{a^\dagger a + 1}\right) \\ & + |g\rangle\langle g| \otimes \frac{\sin\left(gt\sqrt{a^\dagger a}\right)}{\sqrt{a^\dagger a}} a^\dagger D(\alpha_0) \hat{w}_{\beta(0)} D^\dagger(\alpha_0) a \frac{\sin\left(gt\sqrt{a^\dagger a}\right)}{\sqrt{a^\dagger a}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S4})$$

Tracing over the cavity Hilbert space, the reduced qubit state is given by

$$\hat{\rho}_Q(t) = \begin{bmatrix} P_e(t) & C_{eg}(t) \\ C_{eg}(t) & 1 - P_e(t) \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{S5})$$

with population P_e and coherence C_{eg}

$$\begin{aligned} P_e(t) &= \sum_n \cos^2\left(gt\sqrt{n+1}\right) \langle n|D(\alpha_0) \hat{w}_{\beta(0)} D^\dagger(\alpha_0)|n\rangle \\ C_{eg}(t) &= - \sum_n \cos\left(gt\sqrt{n+2}\right) \sin\left(gt\sqrt{n+1}\right) \langle n+1|D(\alpha_0) \hat{w}_{\beta(0)} D^\dagger(\alpha_0)|n\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S6})$$

For $n_0 \gg 1$ the terms $\langle n|D(\alpha_0) \hat{w}_{\beta(0)} D^\dagger(\alpha_0)|n\rangle$ and $\langle n+1|D(\alpha) \hat{w}_{\beta(0)} D^\dagger(\alpha)|n\rangle$ as a function of n are close to Gaussian distributions peaked around n_0 with variance much smaller than the mean. This allows us to expand the trigonometric functions in $P_e(t)$ and $C_{eg}(t)$ around n_0 . In the following, we parameterize the population and coherence of qubit in terms of rotation angle $\theta = 2gt\sqrt{n_0}$ in the Bloch sphere.

For large n_0 :

$$\begin{aligned}
P_e(\theta) &= \sum_n \cos^2 \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \sqrt{1 + \frac{n - n_0 + 1}{n_0}} \right) \langle n | D(\alpha_0) \hat{w}_{\beta(0)} D^\dagger(\alpha_0) | n \rangle \\
&= \sum_n \left[\cos^2 \frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{\theta \sin \theta}{4} \left(\frac{n - n_0 + 1}{n_0} \right) - \frac{\theta (\theta \cos \theta - \sin \theta)}{16} \left(\frac{n - n_0 + 1}{n_0} \right)^2 + O \left(\frac{1}{n_0^3} \right) \right] \\
&\quad \times \langle n | D(\alpha_0) \hat{w}_{\beta(0)} D^\dagger(\alpha_0) | n \rangle \\
&= \cos^2 \frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{\theta ((1 + 2\bar{n}) \theta \cos \theta + (3 + 2\bar{n}) \sin \theta)}{16n_0} - \frac{\theta (1 + \bar{n}) (1 + 2\bar{n}) (\theta \cos \theta - \sin \theta)}{16n_0^2} + O \left(\frac{1}{n_0^3} \right) \\
&= \cos^2 \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{\delta P_e(\theta, \bar{n})}{n_0} + O \left(\frac{1}{n_0^2} \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{S7}$$

where

$$\delta P_e(\theta, \bar{n}) = -\frac{\theta}{16} ((1 + 2\bar{n}) \theta \cos \theta + (3 + 2\bar{n}) \sin \theta). \tag{S8}$$

In a similar way

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{eg}(\theta) &= -e^{i\phi_0} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sin \theta + \frac{-2\theta + (3 + 2\bar{n}) \theta \cos \theta - (1 + 2\bar{n}) (1 + \theta^2) \sin \theta}{16n_0} + \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{(5 + 8\bar{n}) 2\theta - (11 + 4\bar{n} (11 + 9\bar{n})) 2\theta \cos \theta + (12 + 72\bar{n} (1 + \bar{n}) - (9 + 8\bar{n} (4 + 3\bar{n})) \theta^2) \sin \theta}{64n_0^2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + O \left(\frac{1}{n_0^3} \right) \right] \\
&= e^{i\phi_0} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sin \theta + \frac{\delta C_{eg}(\theta, \bar{n})}{n_0} + O \left(\frac{1}{n_0^2} \right) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{S9}$$

where

$$\delta C_{eg}(\theta, \bar{n}) = \frac{-2\theta + (3 + 2\bar{n}) \theta \cos \theta - (1 + 2\bar{n}) (1 + \theta^2) \sin \theta}{n_0} \tag{S10}$$

We use the same methodology to calculate the expansion of the thermodynamic quantities of the cavity. To determine those thermodynamics quantities, we observe from the numerics that, in the unitary regime, the cavity remains approximately in a Gaussian state which is thus fully characterized by $\langle a \rangle$, $\langle a^\dagger \rangle$, $\langle a^\dagger a \rangle$ and $\langle a^2 \rangle$.

Starting with the exact reduced state of the cavity for $\phi_0 = 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\rho}_C(t) &= \cos \left(gt \sqrt{a^\dagger a + 1} \right) D(\alpha_0) \hat{w}_{\beta(0)} D^\dagger(\alpha_0) \cos \left(gt \sqrt{a^\dagger a + 1} \right) + \\
&\quad \frac{\sin \left(gt \sqrt{a^\dagger a} \right)}{\sqrt{a^\dagger a}} a^\dagger D(\alpha_0) \hat{w}_{\beta(0)} D^\dagger(\alpha_0) a \frac{\sin \left(gt \sqrt{a^\dagger a} \right)}{\sqrt{a^\dagger a}}
\end{aligned} \tag{S11}$$

the average $\langle a \rangle$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle a \rangle &= Tr[\hat{\rho}_C(t) a] \\
&= \sum_n \left[\cos(gt\sqrt{n+1}) \cos(gt\sqrt{n}) + \sin(gt\sqrt{n+1}) \sin(gt\sqrt{n}) \frac{\sqrt{n+1}}{\sqrt{n}} \right] \langle n | D(\alpha_0) \hat{w}_{\beta(0)} D^\dagger(\alpha_0) a | n \rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{S12}$$

which can be decomposed into

$$\langle a \rangle = \sum_n (\Lambda_0 + \Lambda_1 n + \Lambda_2 n^2) \langle n | D(\alpha_0) \hat{w}_{\beta(0)} D^\dagger(\alpha_0) a | n \rangle + O \left(\frac{1}{n_0^4} \right) \tag{S13}$$

with

$$\Lambda_0 = \frac{1 + \frac{\theta^2}{4} + 2n_0 (-3 + 4n_0 (3 + 4n_0) - \theta^2) + (-1 + 6n_0 - 24n_0^2 + (1 - 2n_0)^2 \frac{\theta^2}{4}) \cos(\theta) - (1 - 3n_0)^2 \theta \sin(\theta)}{32n_0^3} \tag{S14}$$

$$\Lambda_1 = \frac{1 - 6n_0 + \frac{\theta^2}{4} + \left(-1 + \frac{\theta^2}{4} - 2n_0 \left(-3 + \frac{\theta^2}{4}\right)\right) \cos(\theta) + (-2 + 7n_0) \frac{\theta}{2} \sin(\theta)}{8n_0^3}$$

$$\Lambda_2 = \frac{4 + 2 \left(\frac{\theta^2}{4} - 2\right) \cos(\theta) - \frac{5\theta}{2} \sin(\theta)}{16n_0^3}$$

Summing up these terms we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle a \rangle &= \sqrt{n_0} \left(1 + \frac{\sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2}}{2n_0} + \frac{-2 \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\theta^2}{2}\right) + \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \theta + \bar{n} \theta (\theta \cos \theta - \sin \theta)}{16n_0^2} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{13 + \frac{5\theta^2}{4} + 8\bar{n} \left(7 + 6\bar{n} + \frac{\theta^2}{4}\right) + \left(-13 + \frac{9\theta^2}{4} + 8\bar{n} \left(-7 - 6\bar{n} + (4 + 3\bar{n}) \frac{\theta^2}{4}\right)\right) \cos \theta - 2(5 + \bar{n}(19 + 15\bar{n})) \theta \sin \theta}{32n_0^3} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + O\left(\frac{1}{n_0^4}\right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S15})$$

Similarly, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \langle a^2 \rangle &= n_0 \left(1 + \frac{\sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2}}{n_0} + \frac{(1 + 2\bar{n}) \left[\left(1 + \frac{\theta^2}{4}\right) \cos \theta - 1\right] + (3 + 2\bar{n}) \frac{\theta}{4} \sin \theta - \frac{\theta^2}{2}}{4n_0^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{5 + \frac{3\theta^2}{4} + 6\bar{n} \left(4 + 4\bar{n} + \frac{\theta^2}{4}\right) + \left(-5 + \theta^2 + 3\bar{n} \left(-8(1 + \bar{n}) + (5 + 4\bar{n}) \frac{\theta^2}{4}\right)\right) \cos \theta - (17 + 69\bar{n} + 60\bar{n}^2) \frac{\theta}{4} \sin \theta}{4n_0^3} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + O\left(\frac{1}{n_0^4}\right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S16})$$

Owing to the resonance condition, the total Hamiltonian \hat{H} conserves the total number of excitations. Consequently, we have at any time:

$$\langle a^\dagger a \rangle = \bar{n} + n_0 + 1 - P_e(t) \quad (\text{S17})$$

Using the expansion of $P_e(t)$ up to second order Eq. (S7), we simplify the above term as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle a^\dagger a \rangle &= \bar{n} + n_0 + \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{\theta \left((1 + 2\bar{n}) \theta \cos \theta + (3 + 2\bar{n}) \sin \theta \right)}{16n_0} + \frac{\theta (1 + \bar{n}) (1 + 2\bar{n}) (\theta \cos \theta - \sin \theta)}{16n_0^2} \\ &\quad + O\left(\frac{1}{n_0^3}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S18})$$

The covariance matrix is defined as:

$$V = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_q^2 & \sigma_{qp} \\ \sigma_{pq} & \sigma_p^2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{S19})$$

with

$$\sigma_{xy} = \frac{1}{2} \langle \hat{x} \hat{y} + \hat{y} \hat{x} \rangle - \langle \hat{x} \rangle \langle \hat{y} \rangle, \quad (x, y) \in \{q, p\}, \quad \hat{q} = \frac{a + a^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \hat{p} = \frac{a - a^\dagger}{i\sqrt{2}}$$

Since $\phi_0 = 0$, the covariance matrix V takes the diagonal form

$$V = \begin{bmatrix} \langle a^2 \rangle + \langle a^\dagger a \rangle + \frac{1}{2} - 2\langle a \rangle^2 & 0 \\ 0 & -\langle a^2 \rangle + \langle a^\dagger a \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

For Gaussian states, the von Neumann entropy can be evaluated as

$$S_C(t) = h\left(\sqrt{\text{Det}[V]}\right), \quad h(x) = \left(x + \frac{1}{2}\right) \log\left(x + \frac{1}{2}\right) - \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right) \log\left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right). \quad (\text{S20})$$

Using the previous expansions the determinant is expressed as

$$\sqrt{\text{Det}[V]} = \left(\bar{n} + \frac{1}{2}\right) \sqrt{\left[1 + \frac{1}{4n_0(2\bar{n} + 1)} (\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta + 2(1 + 2\bar{n}) \theta \sin \theta)\right]} \quad (\text{S21})$$

Using the framework of [30] we can calculate the heat exchanges of the cavity. We must first find the thermal state $\hat{\rho}_C^{th}(t)$ with the same von Neumann entropy $S_C(t)$ to do so. The von Neumann entropy of a thermal state with photon numbers n_c is given by $\log[\frac{n_c^{n_c}}{(n_c+1)^{n_c+1}}]$. Comparing the entropies

$$\log[\frac{n_c^{n_c}}{(n_c+1)^{n_c+1}}] = S_C(t) \implies n_c + \frac{1}{2} = \sqrt{Det[V]}$$

To find the heat exchanges Q_C , we recall that the heat is defined as the negative of the variation in the thermal energy of the cavity, which takes the following form $Q_C(t) = -Tr[\hat{H}_C(\hat{\rho}_C^{th}(t) - \hat{\rho}_C^{th}(0))]$ and reads

$$Q_C(t) = \hbar\omega_0 \left(\bar{n} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \left[1 - \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{4n_0(2\bar{n}+1)} (\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta + 2(1+2\bar{n})\theta\sin\theta)} \right]. \quad (S22)$$

By using the expression for $\langle a^\dagger a \rangle$, we can also determine the change in the cavity's internal energy as follows

$$\Delta E_C(t) = \hbar\omega_0 (1 - P_e(t)) \quad (S23)$$

In the end, the work done by the cavity is given by

$$W_C(t) = -\Delta E_C(t) - Q_C(t). \quad (S24)$$

C. JOINT ATOM-CAVITY EVOLUTION ON LONGER TIMES

Measurement by the cavity

In this section, we provide the expressions for cavity and atom, evolution over the interval $[0, t_c]$, when the system starts in state:

$$\hat{\rho}(0) = \sum_{\nu, \mu=\pm} \rho_{\nu, \mu} |\nu_y\rangle\langle\mu_y| \otimes \hat{\rho}_C(0), \quad \hat{\rho}_C(0) = D(\alpha_0) \hat{w}_{\beta(0)} D^\dagger(\alpha_0), \quad \alpha_0 = \sqrt{n_0} \quad (S25)$$

where in $\{|e\rangle, |g\rangle\}$ basis:

$$|\pm_y\rangle\langle\pm_y| = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mp i \\ \pm i & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad |\pm_y\rangle\langle\mp_y| = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \pm i \\ \pm i & -1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (S26)$$

It is useful to recast the total evolution operator as

$$\hat{U}(t) = \hat{c}_1 |e\rangle\langle e| + \hat{c}_0 |g\rangle\langle g| + \hat{s}_1 |e\rangle\langle g| - \hat{s}_0 |g\rangle\langle e|, \quad (S27)$$

with $\hat{c}_1 = \cos(gt\sqrt{a^\dagger a + 1})$, $\hat{c}_0 = \cos(gt\sqrt{a^\dagger a})$, $\hat{s}_1 = \frac{\sin(gt\sqrt{a^\dagger a + 1})}{\sqrt{a^\dagger a + 1}} a$, $\hat{s}_0 = \frac{\sin(gt\sqrt{a^\dagger a})}{\sqrt{a^\dagger a}} a^\dagger$ and to introduce

$$\hat{s}'_1 = \frac{\sin(gt\sqrt{\hat{n} + 1})}{\sqrt{\hat{n} + 1}}, \quad \hat{s}'_0 = \frac{\sin(gt\sqrt{\hat{n}})}{\sqrt{\hat{n}}} \quad (S28)$$

Below, we compute separately the evolution of the basis of qubit operators $\{|\nu_y\rangle\langle\mu_y|\}$, $\mu, \nu = \pm$.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{U}(t) |+_y\rangle\langle+_y| \otimes \hat{\rho}_C(0) \hat{U}^\dagger(t) &= \hat{U}(t) \frac{1}{2} [|e\rangle\langle e| - i|e\rangle\langle g| + i|g\rangle\langle e| + |g\rangle\langle g|] \otimes \hat{\rho}_C(0) \hat{U}^\dagger(t) \\ &= \sum_{p, q=e, g} |p\rangle\langle q| \otimes \langle p| \hat{U}(t) |+_y\rangle\langle+_y| \otimes \hat{\rho}_C(0) \hat{U}^\dagger(t) |q\rangle \\ &= \sum_{p, q=e, g} \hat{T}_{pq}, \end{aligned} \quad (S29)$$

where $\hat{T}_{pq} = |p\rangle\langle q| \otimes \langle p|\hat{U}(t)|_{+y}\rangle\langle_{+y}| \otimes \hat{\rho}_C(0)\hat{U}^\dagger(t)|q\rangle$. For $p = e$ and $q = e$:

$$\hat{T}_{ee} = \frac{1}{2}|e\rangle\langle e| \otimes [\hat{c}_1\hat{\rho}_C(0)\hat{c}_1 + \hat{s}_1\hat{\rho}_C(0)\hat{s}_1^\dagger - i\hat{c}_1\hat{\rho}_C(0)\hat{s}_1^\dagger + i\hat{s}_1\hat{\rho}_C(0)\hat{c}_1]. \quad (\text{S30})$$

We can use the definition of $\hat{s}'_{0,1}$ along with the relations $D^\dagger(\alpha_0)aD(\alpha_0) = a + \alpha$ and $D^\dagger(\alpha_0)a^\dagger D(\alpha_0) = a^\dagger + \alpha^*$ to transform the above into the following

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{T}_{ee} &= \frac{1}{2}|e\rangle\langle e| \otimes [\hat{c}_1\hat{\rho}_C(0)\hat{c}_1 + \hat{s}'_1a\hat{\rho}_C(0)a^\dagger\hat{s}'_1 - i\hat{c}_1\hat{\rho}_C(0)a^\dagger\hat{s}'_1 + i\hat{s}'_1a\hat{\rho}_C(0)\hat{c}_1] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}|e\rangle\langle e| \otimes \left[\hat{c}_1\hat{\rho}_C(0)\hat{c}_1 + \right. \\ &\quad \hat{s}'_1[n_0\hat{\rho}_C(0) + D(\alpha_0)\hat{w}_{\beta(0)}a^\dagger D^\dagger(\alpha_0)\alpha + D(\alpha_0)a\hat{w}_{\beta(0)}D^\dagger(\alpha_0)\alpha^* + D(\alpha_0)a\hat{w}_{\beta(0)}a^\dagger D^\dagger(\alpha_0)]\hat{s}'_1 \\ &\quad \left. - i\hat{c}_1[\alpha^*\hat{\rho}_C(0) + D(\alpha_0)\hat{w}_{\beta(0)}a^\dagger D^\dagger(\alpha_0)]\hat{s}'_1 + i\hat{s}'_1[\alpha\hat{\rho}_C(0) + D(\alpha_0)a\hat{w}_{\beta(0)}D^\dagger(\alpha_0)]\hat{c}_1 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S31})$$

The terms that include at least one bosonic operator acting on the thermal state, such as $D(\alpha_0)\hat{w}_{\beta(0)}a^\dagger D^\dagger(\alpha_0)\alpha$, $D(\alpha_0)a\hat{w}_{\beta(0)}D^\dagger(\alpha_0)\alpha^*$, and $D(\alpha_0)a\hat{w}_{\beta(0)}a^\dagger D^\dagger(\alpha_0)$, have a vanishing magnitude when tracing over the cavity, and are therefore neglected, leading to:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{T}_{ee} &= \frac{1}{2}|e\rangle\langle e| \otimes \left(\hat{c}_1 + i\alpha\hat{s}'_1 \right) \hat{\rho}_C(0) \left(\hat{c}_1 - i\alpha^*\hat{s}'_1 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}|e\rangle\langle e| \otimes \left(\hat{c}_1 + i\sqrt{n_0}\hat{s}'_1 \right) \hat{\rho}_C(0) \left(\hat{c}_1 - i\sqrt{n_0}\hat{s}'_1 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S32})$$

We can now use the following approximation, applicable for large n_0 to simplify the expression above:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{c}_1 + i\sqrt{n_0}\hat{s}'_1 &= \cos(gt\sqrt{\hat{n}+1}) + i\sqrt{n_0}\frac{\sin(gt\sqrt{\hat{n}+1})}{\sqrt{\hat{n}+1}} \\ &= \cos(gt\sqrt{\hat{n}+1}) + i\sin(gt\sqrt{\hat{n}+1}) \left[1 - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\hat{n}+1-n_0}{n_0} + \dots \right] \\ &= e^{igt\sqrt{\hat{n}+1}} + O\left(\frac{1}{n_0}\right) \\ &= e^{\frac{igt\sqrt{n_0}}{2}} e^{\frac{igt(\hat{n}+1)}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} + O\left(\frac{1}{n_0}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S33})$$

We obtain:

$$\hat{T}_{ee} = \frac{1}{2}|e\rangle\langle e| \otimes e^{\frac{igt\hat{n}}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\hat{\rho}_C(0)e^{-\frac{igt\hat{n}}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} + O\left(\frac{1}{n_0}\right). \quad (\text{S34})$$

We proceed similarly to simplify the other terms \hat{T}_{pq} . For $p = e$ and $q = g$:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{T}_{eg} &= \hat{T}_{ge}^\dagger = \frac{1}{2}|e\rangle\langle g| \otimes [-\hat{c}_1\hat{\rho}_C(0)\hat{s}_0^\dagger + \hat{s}_1\hat{\rho}_C(0)\hat{c}_0 - i\hat{c}_1\hat{\rho}_C(0)\hat{c}_0 - i\hat{s}_1\hat{\rho}_C(0)\hat{s}_0^\dagger] \\ &= \frac{-i}{2}|e\rangle\langle g| \otimes (\hat{c}_1 + i\hat{s}_1)\hat{\rho}_C(0)\left(\hat{c}_0 - i\hat{s}_0^\dagger\right) \\ &= \frac{-i}{2}|e\rangle\langle g| \otimes \left(\hat{c}_1 + i\sqrt{n_0}\hat{s}'_1\right)\hat{\rho}_C(0)\left(\hat{c}_0 - i\sqrt{n_0}\hat{s}'_0\right) \\ &= -\frac{ie^{\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}}{2}|e\rangle\langle g| \otimes e^{\frac{igt\hat{n}}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\hat{\rho}_C(0)e^{-\frac{igt\hat{n}}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} + O\left(\frac{1}{n_0}\right) \end{aligned}$$

We approximated term $\hat{c}_0 - i\sqrt{n_0}\hat{s}'_0$ using:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{c}_0 + i\sqrt{n_0}\hat{s}'_0 &= \cos(gt\sqrt{\hat{n}}) + i\sqrt{n_0}\frac{\sin(gt\sqrt{\hat{n}})}{\sqrt{\hat{n}}} \\
&= \cos(gt\sqrt{\hat{n}}) + i\sin(gt\sqrt{\hat{n}})\left[1 - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\hat{n} - n_0}{n_0} + \dots\right] \\
&= e^{igt\sqrt{\hat{n}}} + O\left(\frac{1}{n_0}\right) \\
&= e^{\frac{igt\sqrt{n_0}}{2}} e^{\frac{igt\hat{n}}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} + O\left(\frac{1}{n_0}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{S35}$$

Finally, for $p = g$ and $q = g$

$$\hat{T}_{gg} = \frac{1}{2}|g\rangle\langle g| \otimes e^{\frac{igt\hat{n}}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\hat{\rho}_C(0)e^{-\frac{igt\hat{n}}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n_0}\right) \tag{S36}$$

Collecting the four contributions:

$$\hat{U}(t)|+_y\rangle\langle+_y| \otimes \hat{\rho}_C(0)\hat{U}^\dagger(t) = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -ie^{\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} \\ ie^{-\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes D\left(\alpha_0 e^{\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\right)\hat{w}_{\beta(0)}D^\dagger\left(\alpha_0 e^{\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n_0}\right) \tag{S37}$$

Using the same method, we compute the evolution of the three other basis elements:

$$\hat{U}(t)|-_y\rangle\langle-_y| \otimes \hat{\rho}_C(0)\hat{U}^\dagger(t) = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & ie^{-\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} \\ -ie^{\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes D\left(\alpha_0 e^{-\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\right)\hat{w}_{\beta(0)}D^\dagger\left(\alpha_0 e^{-\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\right) \tag{S38}$$

$$\hat{U}(t)|+_y\rangle\langle-_y| \otimes \hat{\rho}_C(0)\hat{U}^\dagger(t) = \frac{e^{igt\sqrt{n_0}}}{2}\begin{bmatrix} e^{\frac{igt}{\sqrt{n_0}}} & ie^{\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} \\ ie^{\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} & -1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes D\left(\alpha_0 e^{\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\right)\hat{w}_{\beta(0)}D^\dagger\left(\alpha_0 e^{-\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\right) \tag{S39}$$

$$\hat{U}(t)|-_y\rangle\langle+_y| \otimes \hat{\rho}_C(0)\hat{U}^\dagger(t) = \frac{e^{-igt\sqrt{n_0}}}{2}\begin{bmatrix} e^{-\frac{igt}{\sqrt{n_0}}} & -ie^{-\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} \\ -ie^{-\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} & -1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes D\left(\alpha_0 e^{-\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\right)\hat{w}_{\beta(0)}D^\dagger\left(\alpha_0 e^{\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\right) \tag{S40}$$

We deduce the evolution of the system starting from an arbitrary initial qubit state:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\rho}_{QC}(t) &= \hat{U}(t)\sum_{\nu,\mu=\pm}\rho_{\nu,\mu}|\nu_y\rangle\langle\mu_y| \otimes D(\sqrt{n_0})\hat{w}_{\beta(0)}D^\dagger(\sqrt{n_0})\hat{U}^\dagger(t) \\
&= \frac{\rho_{++}}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -ie^{\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} \\ ie^{-\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes D\left(\alpha_0 e^{\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\right)\hat{w}_{\beta(0)}D^\dagger\left(\alpha_0 e^{\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\rho_{--}}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & ie^{-\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} \\ -ie^{\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes D\left(\alpha_0 e^{-\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\right)\hat{w}_{\beta(0)}D^\dagger\left(\alpha_0 e^{-\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\right) + \\
&\quad + \frac{\rho_{+-}e^{igt\sqrt{n_0}}}{2}\begin{bmatrix} e^{\frac{igt}{\sqrt{n_0}}} & ie^{\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} \\ ie^{\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} & -1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes D\left(\alpha_0 e^{\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\right)\hat{w}_{\beta(0)}D^\dagger\left(\alpha_0 e^{-\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\rho_{-+}e^{-igt\sqrt{n_0}}}{2}\begin{bmatrix} e^{-\frac{igt}{\sqrt{n_0}}} & -ie^{-\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} \\ -ie^{-\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} & -1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes D\left(\alpha_0 e^{-\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\right)\hat{w}_{\beta(0)}D^\dagger\left(\alpha_0 e^{\frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{n_0}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{S41}$$

$$= \rho_{+++}|+_y(t)\rangle\langle+_y(t)| \otimes \hat{\rho}_C^{+++}(t) + \rho_{---}|-_y(t)\rangle\langle-_y(t)| \otimes \hat{\rho}_C^{---}(t) \tag{S41}$$

$$+ \rho_{+-}e^{igt\sqrt{n_0} + \frac{igt}{\sqrt{n_0}}}|+_y(t)\rangle\langle-_y(t)| \otimes \hat{\rho}_C^{+-}(t) + \rho_{-+}e^{-igt\sqrt{n_0} - \frac{igt}{\sqrt{n_0}}}|-_y(t)\rangle\langle+_y(t)| \otimes \hat{\rho}_C^{-+}(t) \tag{S42}$$

$$+ O\left(\frac{1}{n_0}\right), \tag{S43}$$

where $|\pm_y\rangle(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \pm i e^{\mp \frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} \end{pmatrix}$, and $\hat{\rho}_C^{\nu\mu}(t)$ is defined in Eq. (2) of main text.

We now show that the trace of the terms $\hat{\rho}_C^{\pm\mp}(t_c)$ becomes negligible at t_c . We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_C^{\pm\mp}(t)] &= e^{\pm igt(\sqrt{n_0+1}/\sqrt{n_0})} \text{Tr}\left[D\left(\sqrt{n_0}e^{\pm i\frac{gt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\right) w_{\beta(0)} D^\dagger\left(\sqrt{n_0}e^{\mp i\frac{gt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}\right)\right] \\ &= e^{\pm igt(\sqrt{n_0+1}/\sqrt{n_0})} e^{\pm in_0 \sin \frac{gt}{\sqrt{n_0}}} \text{Tr}\left[w_{\beta(0)} D\left(\pm 2i\sqrt{n_0} \sin\left(\frac{gt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}\right)\right)\right] \\ &= e^{\pm igt(\sqrt{n_0+1}/\sqrt{n_0})} \left(1 - e^{-\beta(0)}\right) e^{\pm in_0 \sin \frac{gt}{\sqrt{n_0}}} \frac{1}{\pi} \int d^{(2)}\alpha \langle \alpha | e^{-\beta(0)a^\dagger a} D\left(\pm 2i\sqrt{n_0} \sin\left(\frac{gt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}\right)\right) | \alpha \rangle \end{aligned}$$

On using the known properties of coherent states and displacement operator to simplify the integrand above and carrying out the Gaussian integrals, we obtain

$$\text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_C^{\pm\mp}(t)] = e^{\pm igt(\sqrt{n_0+1}/\sqrt{n_0})} e^{\pm in_0 \sin \frac{gt}{\sqrt{n_0}}} e^{-2n_0 \sin^2 \frac{gt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} e^{-\frac{4n_0\bar{n}}{(1+\bar{n})^2} \sin^2 \frac{gt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}} \quad (\text{S44})$$

As $n_0 \rightarrow \infty$

$$\text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_C^{\pm\mp}(t)] = e^{\pm 2igt\sqrt{n_0}} e^{-\frac{g^2 t^2}{2}} e^{-\frac{g^2 t^2 \bar{n}}{(1+\bar{n})^2} + \frac{\bar{n}}{(1+\bar{n})^2} \frac{g^4 t^4}{12n_0}}, \quad (\text{S45})$$

which tends to 0.

Consequently, we can express the reduced state of the atom at time t_c as:

$$\hat{\rho}_Q(t_c) = \rho_{++} |+_y(t_c)\rangle \langle +_y(t_c)| + \rho_{--} |-_y(t_c)\rangle \langle -_y(t_c)| + O\left(\frac{1}{n_0}\right) \quad (\text{S46})$$

We can see that for times $t \in [0, g^{-1}]$, the term $e^{\pm \frac{igt}{2\sqrt{n_0}}}$ approaches 1 as n_0 approaches infinity, which allows us to rewrite the state of the qubit at t_c as:

$$\hat{\rho}_Q(t_c) = \rho_{++} |+_y\rangle \langle +_y| + \rho_{--} |-_y\rangle \langle -_y| + O\left(\frac{1}{n_0}\right) \quad (\text{S47})$$

Autonomous feedback

On a longer timescale of order $t \sim \sqrt{n_0}\pi g^{-1}$, the cavity exerts an effective drive on the qubit that is dependent on the measurement result. Here we analyze the total dynamics along two branches associated with the qubit found in $|\pm_y\rangle$. As we are in the interaction picture, the total system evolves as follows:

$$i\hbar \frac{d\hat{\rho}_{QC}(t)}{dt} = [\hat{V}_{QC}, \hat{\rho}_{QC}(t)]. \quad (\text{S48})$$

Since the qubit-cavity state is factorized within each branch up to an order of $O\left(\frac{1}{n_0}\right)$, we can trace over the cavity space and get the effective evolution for qubit. Denoting $\hat{\rho}_Q^{\pm\pm}(t)$ the qubit states along each branch, with $\hat{\rho}_Q^{\pm\pm}(0) = |\pm_y\rangle \langle \pm_y|$, we have:

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} \hat{\rho}_Q^{\pm\pm}(t) = \left[i\hbar g(\alpha_\pm(t)\sigma_+ - \alpha_\pm^*(t)\sigma_-), \hat{\rho}_Q^{\pm\pm}(t) \right] \quad (\text{S49})$$

From Eq. (S49), we obtain the effective Hamiltonian acting on qubit

$$\hat{H}_Q^{\text{eff}(\nu)}(t) = i\hbar g(\alpha_\nu(t)\sigma_+ - \alpha_\nu^*(t)\sigma_-). \quad (\text{S50})$$