



This is an electronic reprint of the original article. This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Teittinen, J.; Lyyra, H.; Maniscalco, S.

There is no general connection between the quantum speed limit and non-Markovianity

Published in: New Journal of Physics

DOI: 10.1088/1367-2630/ab59fe

Published: 01/12/2019

Document Version Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Published under the following license: CC BY

Please cite the original version:

Teittinen, J., Lyyra, H., & Maniscalco, S. (2019). There is no general connection between the quantum speed limit and non-Markovianity. *New Journal of Physics*, *21*(12), Article 123041. https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/ab59fe

This material is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of the repository collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone who is not an authorised user.

PAPER • OPEN ACCESS

There is no general connection between the quantum speed limit and non-Markovianity

To cite this article: J Teittinen et al 2019 New J. Phys. 21 123041

View the article online for updates and enhancements.

New Journal of Physics

The open access journal at the forefront of physics

Deutsche Physikalische Gesellschaft DPG

Published in partnership with: Deutsche Physikalische Gesellschaft and the Institute of Physics

PAPER

OPEN ACCESS

CrossMark

RECEIVED 30 July 2019

REVISED

23 October 2019
ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION

21 November 2019

PUBLISHED 17 December 2019

Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 licence.

Any further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the title of the work, journal citation and DOI.



There is no general connection between the quantum speed limit and non-Markovianity

J Teittinen^{1,2}, H Lyyra^{1,2} and S Maniscalco^{1,2,3}

¹ Turku Centre for Quantum Physics, Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Turku, FI-20014, Turun Yliopisto, Finland

² QTF Centre of Excellence, Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Turku, FI-20014 Turun Yliopisto, Finland

QTF Centre of Excellence, Department of Applied Physics, Aalto University, FI-00076 Aalto, Finland

E-mail: jostei@utu.fi

Keywords: quantum speed limit, non-Markovian, open quantum systems, master equation

Abstract

The quantum speed limit (QSL) sets a bound on the minimum time required for a quantum system to evolve between two states. For open quantum systems this quantity depends on the dynamical map describing the time evolution in presence of the environment, on the evolution time τ , and on the initial state of the system. We consider a general single qubit open dynamics and show that there is no simple relationship between memory effects and the tightness of the QSL bound. We prove that only for specific classes of dynamical evolutions and initial states, there exists a link between non-Markovianity and the QSL. Our results shed light on the connection between information back-flow between system and environment and the speed of quantum evolution.

1. Introduction

The idea of the possible existence of a fundamental limit, dictated by the principles of quantum mechanics, for the speed of evolution of quantum states was firstly discussed in [1]. In that paper, Mandelstam and Tamm derived a quantum speed limit (QSL) from the Heisenberg energy-time uncertainty relation. Specifically, they showed that the evolution time is bounded by the variance of energy as $\tau_{MT} \ge h/4\Delta E$. More recently, Margolus and Levitin studied the QSL in connection to the maximal rate of computation possible for a computer [2]. In this case, the QSL was calculated as the minimum time for a quantum system to evolve from a pure initial state to some orthogonal pure state, using a one dimensional harmonic oscillator as an example. The authors showed that the minimum time is related to the total energy of the system as $\tau_{ML} \ge h/4E$. These two bounds are unordered, and therefore in the literature the QSL is defined as the maximum between these two quantities.

The results of [1, 2] were extended to include cases where the evolved state is not orthogonal to the initial state in [3]. Moreover, in addition to the previous definitions valid for closed quantum systems, several authors proposed different generalizations to open quantum systems applicable for both Markovian and non-Markovian dynamics [4–9]. Nowadays, QSLs are investigated in connection to a number of topics, from quantum metrology to quantum computation, from quantum control to quantum thermodynamics, as reviewed, e.g. in [10]. Contrarily to what was initially believed, speed limits are not an exclusive property of quantum systems, namely they do not arise uniquely because of quantum features. Indeed, they can be derived also for classical systems, without assuming any quantum properties, such as commutation relations, as shown recently in [11, 12].

In this paper we focus on the geometric formulation of the QSL given in [4]. We are specifically interested in clarifying the connection between the QSL bound and the presence or absence of memory effects, described in terms of information backflow [13]. Following [4], this aspect has been further investigated, elaborating on the claim that the QSL is smaller when the dynamics is non-Markovian, potentially speeding up the evolution [14, 15]. These authors showed analytically that, for a specific model of open quantum system dynamics, the ratio between the QSL and the actual evolution time, τ_{QSL}/τ , is 1 when the system is Markovian, and is smaller

than 1 when it is non-Markovian. Their result suggests that in the Markovian case the dynamics saturates the bound, giving the most efficient evolution, whereas in the non-Markovian case the actual limit can still be lower than the evolution time. The explicitly derived dependency between QSL and non-Markovianity has proven useful in several applications [10, 15–28].

Our main goal is to tackle the question of the connection between non-Markovianity and the QSL not starting from a specific model but in full generality, looking in detail at the role played by the dynamical map, the evolution time τ , and the initial state, in the achievement of the QSL bound. We show that, for the most general cases, there is no simple connection between the Markovian to non-Markovian crossover and the QSL. Under certain more restrictive assumptions, however, we can characterize families of one-qubit dynamical maps for which the QSL speed-up coincides with the onset of non-Markovianity, as indicated by the Breuer–Laine–Piilo (BLP) non-Markovianity measure [13]. For these families we derive analytical formulas for the QSL as a function of the BLP measure. Our results also show that, for a given open quantum system model, both the evolution time τ and the initial state play a key role and cannot be overlooked when making claims on the QSL. As an example, we generalize results in [4] to a broader set of pure initial states, and show that the QSL bound is saturated only for very few initial states even in the fully Markovian case.

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2 we briefly present the formalism of open quantum systems and recall the common mathematical definitions of QSL. In section 3 we present the Jaynes–Cummings (JC) model used in [4] and discuss briefly their results concerning non-Markovianity and quantum speed-up. In section 4 we study how the actual evolution time affects the QSL for the same JC system. In section 5, we calculate the general conditions for the QSL optimal dynamics, and study the connection between BLP non-Markovianity and QSL. In section 6 we study the initial state dependence of the QSL for the Markovian dynamics arising from Pauli and phase-covariant master equations. In section 7 we study the effects of Markovian to non-Markovian transition to QSL using a specific phase-covariant system as an example. In section 8 we summarize the results and discuss their implications.

2. QSL, non-Markovianity, and open quantum systems

An open quantum system is a system (*S*) interacting with another system, the environment (*E*). Commonly the dynamics of *E* is not interesting, and one concentrates only on how *S* changes in time. In our case the system of interest is a single qubit. According to the theory of open quantum systems, the reduced dynamics of the qubit is given by $\rho_S(t) = \Phi_t(\rho_S(0)) = \text{tr}_E[U_{SE}^{\dagger}(t)\rho_S(0) \otimes \rho_E(0)U_{SE}(t)]$, where $\rho_S(t)$ is the reduced state of the system, Φ_t the dynamical map, $\rho_S(0) \otimes \rho_E(0)$ the initial combined system-environment state, $U_{SE}(t)$ the unitary time evolution of the combined system, and $\text{tr}_E[\cdot]$ the partial trace over the environment.

We call a map *k*-positive, if the composite map $\Phi_t \otimes \mathbb{I}_k$, where \mathbb{I}_k is the identity map of a *k*-dimensional ancillary Hilbert space, is positive for all $t \ge 0$. If a map is 1-positive, that is k = 1, we call it a positive (P) map. If the map is *k*-positive for all $k \ge 0$, then we call the map completely positive (CP). Furthermore, a map is called CP-divisible (P-divisible), if, for any two time instants *s* and *t*, with $s \ge t \ge 0$, the map can be written as

$$\Phi_s = V_{s,t} \circ \Phi_t, \tag{1}$$

where the propagator $V_{s,t}$ is CP (positive).

The explicit models of dynamics in this paper are generated by a time-local master equation:

$$\frac{d\rho_{S}(t)}{dt} = L_{t}(\rho_{S}(t)) = \frac{i}{\hbar}[\rho_{S}(t), H(t)] + \sum_{i}\gamma_{i}(t) \left(A_{i}\rho_{s}(t)A_{i}^{\dagger} - \frac{1}{2}\{A_{i}^{\dagger}A_{i}, \rho_{S}(t)\}\right),$$
(2)

where *H* is the system Hamiltonian, $\gamma_i(t)$ the time-dependent decay rates, and A_i the Lindblad operators. The solution for the master equation gives the time evolution of the state in the form of a dynamical map, $\Phi_t(\rho(0)) = \rho(t)$. The GKSL theorem implies, that for non-negative decay rates, that is $\gamma_i(t) \ge 0$, the resulting map is always completely positive and trace preserving (CPTP) [29–31]. CPTP is an important property, since it guarantees the physicality of the dynamical map.

The example dynamics considered in this paper arise from two very general families of master equations, namely the phase-covariant master equation [32–36]:

$$L_{t}\rho_{t} = i\omega(t)[\rho_{t}, \sigma_{3}] + \frac{\gamma_{1}(t)}{2} \left(\sigma_{+}\rho_{t}\sigma_{-} - \frac{1}{2} \{\sigma_{-}\sigma_{+}, \rho_{t}\} \right) + \frac{\gamma_{2}(t)}{2} \left(\sigma_{-}\rho_{t}\sigma_{+} - \frac{1}{2} \{\sigma_{+}\sigma_{-}, \rho_{t}\} \right) + \frac{\gamma_{3}(t)}{2} (\sigma_{3}\rho_{t}\sigma_{3} - \rho_{t}),$$
(3)

and the Pauli master equation [37, 38]:

$$L_t \rho_t = \sum_{i=1}^3 \gamma_i(t) (\sigma_i \rho_t \sigma_i - \rho_t), \tag{4}$$

where σ_1, σ_2 and σ_3 are the Pauli *x*, *y*, and *z* matrices respectively and $\sigma_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_1 \pm i\sigma_2)$.

To study the effects of non-Markovianity, we employ the well-known BLP measure [13], defined as

$$\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau}) = \max_{\rho_1(0), \rho_2(0)} \int_{\sigma > 0} \sigma(\rho_{1,2}, \Phi_t) dt,$$
(5)

with $\sigma(\rho_{1,2}, \Phi_t) = \frac{d}{dt} D(\Phi_t(\rho_1(0)), \Phi_t(\rho_2(0)))$, where $D(\rho_1(t), \rho_2(t)) = \frac{1}{2} tr |\rho_1(t) - \rho_2(t)|$ is the trace distance between $\rho_1(t)$ and $\rho_2(t)$ and the maximum is taken over all possible initial states, and the integral is calculated over $t \in (0, \tau)$. In this case, for $\mathcal{N} > 0$, the non-Markovianity is related to the amount of information flowing black to the system, quantified by the increase in distinguishability between the states. In terms of the dynamical map, this implies violation of P-divisibility [13].

The generalized QSL is defined as [4]

$$\tau_{\text{QSL}} = \max\left\{\frac{1}{\Lambda_{\tau}^{\text{op}}}, \frac{1}{\Lambda_{\tau}^{\text{tr}}}, \frac{1}{\Lambda_{\tau}^{\text{hs}}}\right\} \sin^2(\mathcal{L}(\rho_0, \rho_{\tau})),$$
(6)

with $\mathcal{L}(\rho_0, \rho_{\tau})$ the Bures angle between the pure initial state ρ_0 and the evolved state ρ_{τ} , defined as

$$\mathcal{L}(\rho_0, \rho_\tau) \coloneqq \arccos[\sqrt{F(\rho_0, \rho_\tau)}],\tag{7}$$

where $F(\rho_0, \rho_\tau) = (\text{tr}[\sqrt{\sqrt{\rho_0}\rho_\tau\sqrt{\rho_0}}])^2$ is the fidelity between the two states, which for pure initial state $\rho_0 = |\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|$ simplifies to

$$\mathcal{L}(\rho_0, \rho_\tau) = \arccos(\sqrt{\langle \psi_0 | \rho_\tau | \psi_0 \rangle}).$$
(8)

We have denoted

$$\Lambda_{\tau}^{xx} = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{0}^{\tau} ||L_{t}(\rho_{t})||_{xx} \, \mathrm{d}t, \tag{9}$$

where *xx* is either op, tr or HS for operator, trace, and Hilbert–Schmidt norm respectively. It can easily be shown, using the definitions

$$||L_t \rho_t||_{\text{op}} = \max_i \{s_i\}, \quad ||L_t \rho_t||_{\text{tr}} = \sum_i s_i, \quad ||L_t \rho_t||_{\text{HS}} = \sqrt{\sum_i s_i^2},$$
(10)

where s_i are the singular values of $L_t \rho_t$, that the operator norm always maximizes equation (6), and thus the QSL can be written as

$$\tau_{\text{QSL}} = \frac{\sin^2(\mathcal{L}(\rho_0, \rho_\tau))}{\Lambda_\tau^{\text{op}}}.$$
(11)

3. Damped JC model

For the sake of concreteness we begin our investigation with a simple paradigmatic open quantum system model, extensively studied in the literature, which is a special case of the phase-covariant master equation given in (3). This allows us to recall the results previously obtained in [4]. We will then proceed to generalize these results along different lines, using this model for benchmarking.

The model considered is the resonant damped JC model, which can be obtained through an exact microscopic derivation from a total Hamiltonian describing a two-level system interacting with an infinite bosonic environment, e.g. the quantized field inside a leaky cavity. The dynamics of the two-level system is given by the master equation [39]

$$L_t^{\rm JC}(\rho_t) = \gamma(t) \bigg(\sigma_- \rho_t \sigma_+ - \frac{1}{2} \{ \sigma_+ \sigma_-, \rho_t \} \bigg), \tag{12}$$

with

$$\gamma(t) = \frac{2\gamma_0 \lambda \sinh(dt/2)}{d \cosh(dt/2) + \lambda \sinh(dt/2)},$$
(13)

where $d = \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 2\gamma_0 \lambda}$, λ is the spectral width of the reservoir (hereafter assumed to be Lorentzian), and γ_0 is the coupling strength between the qubit and the cavity field. The solution to this system can be given in the



following form

$$\Phi_t^{\rm JC}(\rho_0) = \rho_t = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{11}|b_t|^2 & \rho_{10}b_t\\ \rho_{01}b_t^* & 1 - \rho_{11}|b_t|^2 \end{pmatrix},\tag{14}$$

where ρ_{11} corresponds to the excited state, and

$$b_t = e^{-\lambda t/2} \bigg(\cosh(dt/2) + \frac{\lambda}{d} \sinh(dt/2) \bigg).$$
(15)

In [14] it was numerically shown that for the map of equation (14) the eigenstates $|0\rangle \langle 0|$ and $|1\rangle \langle 1|$ of σ_3 , are the optimal pair of states for the BLP measure. The trace distance for this pair is $D(\Phi_t(|0\rangle \langle 0|), \Phi_t(|1\rangle \langle 1|)) = |b_t|^2$, and so the BLP measure takes the form

$$\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau}^{\mathrm{JC}}) = \int_{\partial_t |b_t|^2 > 0} \partial_t |b_t|^2 \mathrm{d}t.$$
(16)

Following the calculations of [14], we can isolate the positive part of the integral by writing the integrand as $\partial |b_t|^2 = \frac{1}{2}(|\partial_t|b_t|^2| + \partial_t|b_t|^2)$. Now the BLP measure can be written as an integral of the interval $[0, \tau]$ as

$$\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau}^{\rm JC}) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\tau} |\partial_t |b_t|^2 |\, \mathrm{d}t + \frac{1}{2} (|b_t|^2 - 1). \tag{17}$$

Choosing the initial state as $|1\rangle\langle 1|$, the operator norm for the JC model becomes

$$||L_t \rho_t||_{\text{op}} = |\partial_t |b_t|^2|. \tag{18}$$

Using equations (17) and (18), and the identity $\sin^2(\arccos(f(t))) = 1 - f(t)^2$, we can write the QSL time as:

$$\tau_{\rm QSL} = \frac{\tau}{\frac{2N(\Phi_{\tau}^{(C)})}{1 - |b_{\tau}|^2} + 1}.$$
(19)

This equation suggests that the saturation of the QSL bound is strictly a feature of Markovian dynamics, since any dynamics with $\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau}^{\text{JC}}) > 0$ results in lower than optimal QSL. However, as we will show in the following, this consideration is valid only for dynamics described by equation (14) and it cannot be used to describe QSL for other initial states. In what follows, we will generalize equation (19), firstly derived in [14], to a larger class of qubit dynamics and show that it does not hold in general. We also consider the QSL optimality of pure initial states which do not maximize the BLP measure.

4. Evolution time dependence of $au_{ m QSL}/ au$

In this short section we show the dependence of the τ_{QSL} on the choice of the evolution time. More specifically we will see that τ_{QSL} is not monotonically dependent on τ in the non-Markovian region.

In figure 1 we show the bound τ_{QSL}/τ in equation (19) as a function of the coupling constant γ_0 , for different choices of τ . It is immediate to see that the QSL depends noticeably on the chosen evolution time on short intervals and that the QSL as a function of τ is not monotonic. The plateau of $\tau_{QSL}/\tau = 1$ in the non-Markovian

regime of $\gamma_0 > \gamma_0^{\text{crit}}$ space is explained by the dynamics and the direct dependence of the BLP-measure and the τ_{QSL}/τ in equation (19): if the time interval is chosen so short that the dynamics exhibit no recoherence, the BLP-measure is zero, and thus $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau = 1$.

5. Connection between BLP non-Markovianity and QSL

As seen in section 3, there exists a connection between the values of the BLP non-Markovianity and QSL for the JC model: τ_{QSL}/τ is a simple function of the BLP measure and $\tau_{QSL}/\tau = 1$ if and only if the dynamics is BLP Markovian. To generalize this result to other dynamical maps, we first solve the general requirements for an optimal QSL evolution.

We can analytically solve the optimal initial states, leading to $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau = 1$. Trivially, for a pure initial state $\rho_0 = |\psi_0\rangle \langle \psi_0|$, we have $\langle \psi_0|\rho_0|\psi_0\rangle = 1$, and thus $1 - \langle \psi_0|\rho_{\tau=0}|\psi_0\rangle = 0$. The QSL is reached for all $\tau' \in [0, \tau)$ if and only if

$$\frac{\tau_{\text{QSL}}}{\tau'} = \frac{1 - \langle \psi_0 | \rho_{\tau'} | \psi_0 \rangle}{\int_0^{\tau'} ||L_t(\rho_t)||_{\text{op}} dt} = 1 \qquad \forall \tau' \in [0, \tau)$$
(20)

$$\Rightarrow 1 - \langle \psi_0 | \rho_{\tau'} | \psi_0 \rangle = \int_0^{\tau'} ||L_t(\rho_t)||_{\text{op}} \, \mathrm{d}t \quad \forall \, \tau' \in [0, \, \tau)$$
(21)

$$\Rightarrow -\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\tau'} \langle \psi_0 | \rho_{\tau'} | \psi_0 \rangle = || L_{\tau'}(\rho_{\tau'}) ||_{\mathrm{op}} \quad \forall \, \tau' \in [0, \, \tau)$$
⁽²²⁾

$$\Rightarrow 1 - \langle \psi_0 | \rho_{\tau'} | \psi_0 \rangle = \int_0^{\tau'} || L_t(\rho_t) ||_{\text{op}} \, \mathrm{d}t \quad \forall \, \tau' \in [0, \, \tau)$$
(23)

Since these equations form an equivalent chain, it suffices to study when the simpler condition (22) is satisfied.

By calculating the singular values and using the non-negativity of the operator norm, we see that for a qubit system, equation (22) is equivalent to

$$\langle \psi_0 | \dot{\rho}_{\tau'} | \psi_0^\perp \rangle = 0 \tag{24}$$

$$\wedge \langle \psi_0 | \dot{\rho}_{\tau'} | \psi_0 \rangle \leqslant 0, \tag{25}$$

for all $\tau' \in [0, \tau)$, where ψ_0^{\perp} denotes the state orthogonal to ψ_0 .

To further study the qubit case, we write the general Bloch vector dynamics $\mathbf{r}(t)$ as

$$\mathbf{r}(t) = A(t)\mathbf{r}(0) + \mathbf{s}(t) \tag{26}$$

with

$$A(t) = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}(t) & a_{12}(t) & a_{13}(t) \\ a_{21}(t) & a_{22}(t) & a_{23}(t) \\ a_{31}(t) & a_{32}(t) & g(t) \end{pmatrix}$$
(deformation), (27)

$$\mathbf{r}(0) = \begin{pmatrix} x(0) \\ y(0) \\ z(0) \end{pmatrix}$$
 (initial state), (28)

$$\mathbf{s}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} s_1(t) \\ s_2(t) \\ h(t) \end{pmatrix} \text{(translation).}$$
(29)

We fix the basis, so that $\{|\psi_0^-\rangle, |\psi_0^+\rangle\}$, corresponding to $r(0) = (0, 0, \pm 1)^T$, is the optimal pair of initial states for the BLP-measure. The results of [40] guarantee that the optimal pair of initial qubit states maximizing the BLP measure can always be chosen as an orthogonal pair of pure states. Based on equations (24) and (25), we can study the relationship between BLP-measure and τ_{QSL}/τ more generally. In the following, we divide the set of all one-qubit dynamical maps into subsets illustrated in figure 2 and analyze the connection between BLP non-Markovianity and tightness of the QSL bound.

5.1. Coherence-increasing and coherence non-increasing maps

If the coherences between $|\psi_0^+\rangle$ and $|\psi_0^-\rangle$ increase for $t \in [0, \tau)$, as in figure 2A, equation (24) is violated. If the violation occurs at t = 0, we have $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau < 1$ for all times $\tau \ge 0$. Furthermore, positivity of the dynamical map requires that the BLP non-Markovian behavior does not begin at $\tau = 0$, so $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau < 1$ already in the Markovian region, and thus τ_{QSL}/τ does not critically depend on the BLP-measure. The same reasoning holds for all cases where the coherences increase at any time before the first non-Markovian effects take place.



model and the whole set of commutative phase-covariant dynamics, respectively. **D** is the set of all CPTP unital one-qubit-maps satisfying the condition of **B**. As in the case of **C**(iii) and (iv) we see that $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau = 1 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau}) = 0$ when $g(\tau) \ge 0$ and $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau = 1 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau}) = |g(\tau)| \text{ if } g(\tau) < 0.$

For the initial state given by the Bloch vector $r(0) = (0, 0, \pm 1)^T$, the dynamical map does not increase the coherences between $|\psi_0^+\rangle$ and $|\psi_0^-\rangle$, and equation (24) is satisfied if and only if x(t) = y(t) = 0 and z(t) = g(t)z(0) + h(t). This class of dynamics corresponds to figure 2**B**. For such dynamics, τ_{OSL}/τ can be written as

$$\frac{\tau_{\text{QSL}}}{\tau} = \frac{1 - g(\tau) \mp h(\tau)}{\int_0^\tau |\frac{d}{dt}(g(t) \pm h(t))| dt} = \left(\frac{\mathcal{F}_\tau}{1 - F(\rho_\tau, \psi_0^{\pm})} + 1\right)^{-1},\tag{30}$$

where $F(\rho_{\tau}, \psi_0^{\pm}) = \langle \psi_0^{\pm} | \rho_{\tau} | \psi_0^{\pm} \rangle$ is the fidelity between the initial state and the evolved state at time τ and $\mathcal{F}_{\tau} = \int_{\frac{d}{dt}[g(t)\pm h(t)]>0}^{t\in(0,\tau)} \frac{d}{dt}[g(t)\pm h(t)]dt$ is the sum of temporal revivals of $F(\rho_t, \psi_0^{\pm})$. We see directly from equation (30) that $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau = 1 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\tau} = 0$, so oscillations of the fidelity are necessary to decrease τ_{QSL}/τ and after the first oscillation τ_{QSL}/τ is always smaller than 1. When $\mathcal{F}_{\tau} > 0$, τ_{QSL}/τ is a monotonically decreasing function of $F(\rho_{\tau}, \psi_0^{\pm})$: When the fidelity between the initial and evolved states increases, τ_{QSL}/τ decreases and vice versa. Also, $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau = 0$ if and only if there has been increase of the fidelity and $\rho_{\tau} = \psi_0$. As we will see in the following, $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau = 1$ is not equivalent to $\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau}) = 0$, due to h(t) dependence of \mathcal{F}_{τ} , and in some cases, $\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau}) > 0$ does not lead to $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau < 1$.

In the following subsections, we will study some relevant subclasses of the coherence non-increasing maps and derive the explicit dependency between τ_{OSL}/τ and the BLP measure.

5.2. Pairwise oscillating translation and deformation

Let us concentrate here on figures 2C(i) (and (ii)), where the translation always increases (or decreases) exactly when the deformation increases and vice versa. First, assuming $\frac{d}{dt}g(t) \ge 0 \iff \frac{d}{dt}h(t) \ge 0 \quad \forall t \in [0, \tau)$ and choosing z(0) = +1 in figure 2C(i), equation (30) becomes

$$\frac{\tau_{\text{QSL}}}{\tau} = \left(\frac{2\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau})}{1 - g(\tau) - h(\tau)} + \frac{1 - |g(\tau)| + \int_{0}^{\tau} |\frac{d}{dt}h(t)|dt}{1 - g(\tau) - h(\tau)}\right)^{-1}.$$
(31)

Here

$$\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau}) = \int_{\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}|g(t)|>0} \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} |g(t)| \mathrm{d}t,\tag{32}$$

meaning that the BLP measure is independent of the translation h(t), unlike the QSL. When $\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau}) = 0$, we have $g(t) \ge 0$, $h(t) \le 0$, and $\frac{d}{dt}h(t) \le 0 \ \forall t \in (0, \tau)$. In the case of equation (31) this means $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau = 1$, even if $h(t) \ne 0$. Thus in this situation $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau < 1$ only if the non-Markovian effects have kicked in. If in addition $g(\tau) \ge 0$, we note that $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau = 1 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau}) = 0$.

In the special case figure 2**C**(iii), when $\frac{d}{dt}g(t) \le 0$, $\frac{d}{dt}h(t) \le 0 \quad \forall t \in [0, \tau)$, the BLP dependency can be broken into two cases based on the sign of $g(\tau)$: if $g(\tau) \ge 0$, the QSL can be written as

$$\frac{\tau_{\text{QSL}}}{\tau} = \left(\frac{2\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau})}{1 - g(\tau) - h(\tau)} + 1\right)^{-1},\tag{33}$$

and thus $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau = 1 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau}) = 0$. Let us now consider the situation where g(t) is a continuous function which decreases monotonically until t', so that g(t') = 0. Now $\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{t'}) = 0$ as |g(t)| is also monotonic in the interval [0, t']. As g(t) continues to decrease monotonically until τ , the QSL becomes

$$\frac{\tau_{\text{QSL}}}{\tau} = \left(\frac{2\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau})}{1 - g(\tau) - h(\tau)} + \frac{1 + g(\tau) - h(\tau)}{1 - g(\tau) - h(\tau)}\right)^{-1},\tag{34}$$

since $g(\tau) < 0$, and we see that $\tau_{QSL}/\tau = 1 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau}) = |g(\tau)|$. Thus, in this case we have optimal evolution even if the dynamics is non-Markovian.

Similarly, assuming $\frac{d}{dt}g(t) \ge 0 \iff \frac{d}{dt}h(t) \le 0, \forall t \in [0, \tau)$ and choosing z(0) = -1 in figure 2**C**(ii), equation (30) yields to

$$\frac{\tau_{\text{QSL}}}{\tau} = \left(\frac{2\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau})}{1 - g(\tau) + h(\tau)} + \frac{1 - |g(\tau)| + \int_{0}^{\tau} |\frac{d}{dt}h(t)|dt}{1 - g(\tau) + h(\tau)}\right)^{-1},\tag{35}$$

and we obtain the same dependency between tightness of the QSL bound and non-Markovianity (see figures 2C (ii) and (iv)).

5.3. Unital maps

The considerations made above hold for generic translations, including the non-unital cases $h(t) \neq 0$. Now, we restrict to the unital maps in figure 2**D**, characterized by $h(t) = 0 \quad \forall t \ge 0$, for which equation (30) becomes

$$\frac{\tau_{\text{QSL}}}{\tau} = \left(\frac{2\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau})}{1 - g(\tau)} + \frac{1 - |g(\tau)|}{1 - g(\tau)}\right)^{-1}.$$
(36)

We note that equation (36) can be written as

$$\frac{\tau_{\text{QSL}}}{\tau} = \left(\frac{2\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau})}{1 - g(\tau)} + 1\right)^{-1},\tag{37}$$

if and only if $g(\tau) \ge 0$. This means exactly the same dependence on the BLP-measure as in the case of equation (19) if $g(\tau) \ge 0$. If instead $g(\tau) < 0$, we can write the QSL as

$$\frac{\tau_{\text{QSL}}}{\tau} = \left(\frac{2\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau})}{1 - g(\tau)} + \frac{1 + g(\tau)}{1 - g(\tau)}\right)^{-1},\tag{38}$$

which leads to $\tau_{QSL}/\tau = 1 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau}) = |g(\tau)|$, implying optimal evolution for non-Markovian dynamics. This means that if $\mathcal{N}(\Phi_t) = 0$ still when g(t) becomes negative, τ_{QSL}/τ begins to decrease exactly when the non-Markovian behavior ends, which is the opposite of what happens in the JC model.

In the above considerations, we assumed that ψ_0^+ and ψ_0^- are the optimal initial states maximizing the BLP measure. But even if the initial states were not the optimal pair, all the above analysis would still hold. The only exception would be that $\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau})$ would just quantify information backflow in terms of increased distinguishability of these sub-optimal states, thus losing the exact interpretation of BLP measure of non-Markovianity. We will conclude this section with an example class of dynamics belonging to figure 2**C**(ii).

5.4. Example: phase-covariant commutative dynamics

As an example, we use the phase-covariant system of equation (3) which does not increase coherences between $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ [35]. For the commutative class of phase-covariant dynamics⁴, that is when $\gamma_1(t) = \gamma(t)$ and $\gamma_2(t) = \kappa \gamma(t)$, with $0 \le \kappa \le 1$, the functions g(t) and h(t) have the form

$$g(t) = e^{-\Gamma(t)}, \quad h(t) = \frac{1-\kappa}{1+\kappa} (1-e^{-\Gamma(t)}),$$
(39)

where $\Gamma(t) = \frac{\kappa+1}{2} \int_0^t \gamma(t') dt'$. Since $\frac{d}{dt}g(t) \ge 0 \Leftrightarrow \frac{d}{dt}h(t) \le 0$, we can write equation (35) for this system as

$$\frac{\tau_{\text{QSL}}}{\tau} = \left(\frac{2\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau}^{\text{PC}})}{\frac{2}{\kappa+1}(1-e^{-\Gamma(\tau)})} + \frac{1-e^{-\Gamma(\tau)}+\frac{1-\kappa}{2}\int_{0}^{\tau}|\gamma(t)|e^{-\Gamma(\tau)}dt}{\frac{2}{\kappa+1}(1-e^{-\Gamma(\tau)})}\right)^{-1},\tag{40}$$

with

$$\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau}^{\mathrm{PC}}) = \int_{\gamma(t)<0} -\frac{1+\kappa}{2} \gamma(t) \mathrm{e}^{-\Gamma(t)} \mathrm{d}t.$$
(41)

If $\gamma(t) \ge 0$, $\forall t \in [0, \tau)$, then $\mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau}^{\text{PC}}) = 0$ and $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau = 1$. We also notice, that in this case, $|\frac{d}{dt}g(t)| \ge |\frac{d}{dt}h(t)| \forall t \ge 0$, and thus $\frac{d}{dt}(g(t) + h(t))$ is dominated by $\frac{d}{dt}g(t)$. Since the derivatives of g(t) and h(t) change sign at the same time, the sign of $\frac{d}{dt}(g(t) + h(t))$ is always the sign of $\frac{d}{dt}g(t)$. As a consequence, $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau = 1 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{N}(\Phi_{\tau}) = 0$ for both choices of initial state ψ_0^+ and ψ_0^- .

6. Initial state dependence of QSL for Markovian master equations

To continue the generalization of our results, we now take a complementary perspective: instead of looking at the connection between the values of the BLP non-Markovianity measure and the QSL, we focus on the families of initial states leading to saturation of the QSL time in the Markovian case. The results of Deffner and Lutz suggest that Markovian dynamics results always in optimal time, that is $\tau_{\rm QSL}/\tau = 1$, for the JC system. For some pure initial states this is true, but not for all, when looking at more general Markovian master equations.

6.1. Phase-covariant

Here we study the dynamics described by the master equation of equation (3), with $\gamma_1(t) = \gamma_1, \gamma_2(t) = \gamma_2$, and $\gamma_3(t) = \gamma_3$, $\forall t$, where $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3 \ge 0$. We notice that the phase difference between $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ does not have any significant role, in the phase covariant master equation, with respect to the QSL. Thus we parametrize the initial state as $\rho_0 = |\psi_0\rangle \langle \psi_0|$, where $|\psi_0\rangle = \sqrt{a}|1\rangle + \sqrt{1-a}|0\rangle$. Now, we characterize the set of initial states leading to $\tau_{\text{OSL}}/\tau = 1$ for all $\tau \ge 0$ by using (22), which becomes:

$$\frac{1}{16}(a-1)ae^{-(\gamma_1+\gamma_2+2\gamma_3)t}[-4e^{\gamma_3 t}((a-1)\gamma_1+a\gamma_2)-(1-2a)e^{(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)t/4}(\gamma_1+\gamma_2+4\gamma_3)]=0.$$
(42)

We see, that now we have $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau = 1 \quad \forall \tau \ge 0$ if and only if a = 0 or a = 1. We emphasize, that these are not stationary states, but initial states that always evolve with the optimal QSL time. If we restrict to the unital case $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$ with $\omega = 0$, also the initial state a = 1/2 leads to $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau = 1 \quad \forall \tau \ge 0$. We note that $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau = 1$, $\forall a \in [0, 1]$ if and only if $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 2\gamma_3$. In this case, the dynamical map is of the depolarizing

⁴ To be precise, the commutative class contains also the cases where $\gamma_1(t) = \kappa \gamma(t)$ and $\gamma_2(t) = \gamma(t)$, which belong to **C**(i) in figure 2. If we choose $\kappa = 1$, that is when $\gamma_1(t) = \gamma_2(t)$, the dynamics is unital and belongs to **D** in figure 2.



Figure 3. τ_{QSL}/τ for the phase covariant channel with $\gamma_1 = 1$, $\gamma_2 = 2$, $\gamma_3 = 3$, and $\omega = 0$ as a function of the evolution time $\tau \in [0, 1]$ and the initial state parameter $a \in [0, 1]$. Optimal initial states at a = 0 and a = 1. The local maximum near a = 1/2 is affected by the balance between γ_1 and γ_2 , in this case, $\gamma_2 > \gamma_1$ placing the maximum closer to a = 1. If $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$, this coincides with the Pauli channel and the optimal states are found at a = 0, a = 1, and a = 1/2. Generally the value of τ_{QSL}/τ is not constant w.r.t. τ in regions where $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau < 1$. The red highlights represent the points where $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau = 1$.

form

$$\rho_t = (1 - p(t))\rho_0 + p(t)\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{I},$$
(43)

where $p(t) \in [0, 1]$, with p(0) = 0.

Figure 3 shows the initial state and τ dependence of the phase-covariant master equation for $\gamma_1 = 1$, $\gamma_2 = 2$, $\gamma_3 = 3$. Again, we see, that the optimal points are found at a = 0 and a = 1, that is diagonal pure states w.r.t. the { $|0\rangle$, $|1\rangle$ } basis, while all other states fail to reach the limit.

6.2. Pauli channel

Now, we consider the system described by the master equation of equation (4), with $\gamma_1(t) = \gamma_1, \gamma_2(t) = \gamma_2$, and $\gamma_3(t) = \gamma_3, \forall t$, where $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3 \ge 0$. The unital case of the phase-covariant master equation, that is when $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$, coincides with the Pauli channel, with the same decay rates. However, the general Pauli channel covers a larger set of dynamics than the unital phase-covariant, such as bit-flip and bit-phase-flip channels.

As for the phase-covariant model, we can analytically derive the optimal states using equation (22). The resulting condition is:

$$(1-2a)^2(a-1)ae^{-2t(\gamma_1+\gamma_2+\gamma_3)}[e^{\gamma_3 t}(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)-e^{\gamma_1 t}(\gamma_2+\gamma_3)]^2=0.$$
(44)

We see, that the QSL is reached $\forall t \ge 0$, with a = 0, a = 1, and a = 1/2. Similarly to the case of phase-covariant master equation, by choosing $\gamma_1 = \gamma_3$, $\tau_{QSL}/\tau = 1$, $\forall a \in [0, 1]$. By extending the initial states to cover all pure states, $|\psi_0\rangle = a|0\rangle + e^{i\theta}\sqrt{1-a}|0\rangle$, we get $\tau_{QSL}/\tau = 1$ for all $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$ and $a \in [0, 1]$, when $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \gamma_3$. Figure 4 shows the initial state dependence of QSL for Pauli channel with $\gamma_1 = 1$, $\gamma_2 = 2$, $\gamma_3 = 3$.

6.3. Eternal non-Markovianity

The eternal non-Markovianity model is interesting in this context since it is always CP and non-CP-divisible ($\gamma_3(t) < 0 \ \forall t > 0$), but at the same time BLP–Markovian. The eternally non-Markovian master equation has the form [41]:

$$L_t \rho_t = \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_1 \rho_t \sigma_1 - \rho) + \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_2 \rho_t \sigma_2 - \rho) - \frac{\tanh(t)}{2} (\sigma_3 \rho_t \sigma_3 - \rho).$$
(45)

The condition for reaching the QSL in this case is given by

$$(1-2a)^2(a-1)ae^{-4t} = 0, (46)$$

for which the solutions are a = 0, a = 1, and a = 1/2. Since the eternally non-Markovian model is a special case of the phase-covariant commutative master equation, with $\kappa = 1$ and translation h(t) = 0, we can compare the results of this analysis with the ones derived in section 5. We see, that the analytical results in section 5 are in full agreement with this approach. Figure 5 shows the initial state dependence of QSL for the eternal non-Markovianity model.



Figure 4. τ_{QSL}/τ for the Pauli channel with $\gamma_1 = 1$, $\gamma_2 = 2$, and $\gamma_3 = 3$ as a function of the evolution time $\tau \in [0, 1]$ and the initial state parameter $a \in [0, 1]$. Optimal choices at a = 0, a = 1, and a = 1/2. Generally the value of τ_{QSL}/τ is not constant w.r.t. τ in regions where $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau < 1$. The red highlights represent the points where $\tau_{\text{QSL}}/\tau = 1$.



7. The effect of Markovian-to-non-Markovian transition in QSL time

We now study the Markovian to non-Markovian transition using the results reported in [35]. We choose $\gamma_1(t)$, $\gamma_2(t)$, and $\gamma_3(t)$ and pinpoint the times at which a transition happens in the { $\gamma_3(t)$, $\gamma'(t)$ }-space, where $\gamma'(t) \equiv \gamma_1(t) + \gamma_2(t)$, without calculating explicitly any non-Markovianity measures. Thus, we avoid the initial state optimization required for the BLP-measure.

As an example, we will use the phase-covariant master equation, with the following decay rates:

$$\gamma_1(t) = \gamma_2(t) = e^{-t/4}(1 + \sin(t)), \qquad \gamma_3(t) = 2e^{-t/4}\cos(t), \qquad \omega(t) = 0.$$
 (47)

Since the master equation is in the Lindblad form and $\gamma_3(t)$ can have negative values, we know that this dynamics is not CP-divisible, but is still CPTP according to the results of [32]. The condition for optimal evolution from equation (22) for this system is

$$\frac{e_1(t)}{2}\left[(1-2a)^2 f(t) - 2(a-1)ae^2 k(t) - \sqrt{(1-2a)^2 f(t)^2 - (a-1)ae^4 k(t)^2}\right] = 0,$$
(48)

where $e_1(t)$, f(t), and k(t) are non-zero time dependent, but not *a* dependent functions. Equation (48) has solutions at a = 0 and a = 1. For the case a = 1/2, the condition becomes

$$\frac{e_2(t)}{4} [1 + 4\cos(t) + \sin(t) - |1 + 4\cos(t) + \sin(t)|] = 0,$$
(49)







where $e_2(t)$ is a non-zero time-dependent, but not *a* dependent function. We notice, that the condition is satisfied, when $1 + 4\cos(t) + \sin(t) \ge 0$, but broken elsewhere. Thus, violation of $1 + 4\cos(t) + \sin(t) \ge 0$ implies $\tau_{QSL}/\tau < 1$. According to [35], this dynamical map is BLP non-Markovian if and only if $\gamma_1(t) + \gamma_2(t) + 4\gamma_3(t) < 0$ which in this case is equivalent to $1 + 4\cos(t) + \sin(t) < 0$. So, we see that for a = 1/2 BLP non-Markovianity begins exactly at the same time as τ_{QSL}/τ starts to decrease.

In figure 6 we see the initial state and evolution time dependence of τ_{QSL}/τ . We see that the initial state with a = 1/2 is an optimal state up to $\tau = 2 \arctan(5/3)$. We note, that while the system is BLP non-Markovian, the optimal states a = 0 and a = 1 remain optimal.

Figure 7 shows how the change of τ affects τ_{QSL}/τ for a = 1/2. We see that $\tau_{QSL}/\tau = 1$ until $\tau = 2 \arctan(5/3)$. We also notice, that at $\tau = 3\pi/2$, that is when $\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t) \gamma_3(t) \ge 0$ again, τ_{QSL}/τ starts to increase. This is in accordance with equation (30): when $\gamma_3(t)$ is positive, ρ_τ becomes less similar with ψ_0 as τ increases. Thus, $F(\rho_\tau, \psi_0)$ decreases and as a consequence τ_{QSL}/τ increases.

Figure 8 shows the case of figure 7 in $\{\gamma', \gamma_3\}$ -space, where we have defined $\gamma'(t) = \gamma_1(t) + \gamma_2(t)$. The red lines of figure 7 are represented by the red dots in figure 8. The colored lines represent the border between Markovian and non-Markovian dynamics, as defined by different indicators of non-Markovianity, for the phase-covariant qubit master equation. The colored region is where the dynamics is non-Markovian w.r.t. the corresponding indicator. The union of blue and green regions is related to the BLP non-Markovianity, as well as non-Markovianity defined using entropy production, eigenvalues and singular values of the map and purity. The orange region is related to the BLP



Figure 8. Plot of the evolution of $\gamma'(t) \equiv \gamma_1(t) + \gamma_2(t)$ and $\gamma_3(t)$ in the $\{\gamma', \gamma_3\}$ -space from $\tau = 0$ to $\tau = 6$. The times when the dynamics crosses a border are 2 arctan(5/3) ≈ 2.061 , 2 arctan(3) ≈ 2.498 , and $3\pi/2 \approx 4.712$. The lines represent the transition between Markovian and non-Markovian dynamics w.r.t. different definitions of non-Markovianity. The lines representing the non-Markovianity conditions are: $\gamma'(t) - 4\gamma_3(t) = 0$ (blue), $\gamma'(t) - 2\gamma_3(t) = 0$ (orange), and $\gamma'(t) = 0$ (green). The figure shows, that the measures of non-Markovianity connected to the blue line are critical for τ_{QSL}/τ in this model, but the ones described by the orange line are not. The non-Markovianity indicators connected to the borders are listed on the right side of the figure. Color indicates the non-Markovian region attached to that indicator. Multiple colors indicate that the non-Markovian region is represented by the union of these colors. For more details see [35].

measure. For more details see [35]. By comparing figures 7 and 8, we notice that the points where the τ_{QSL}/τ changes dramatically in figure 7 coincides with the transition between Markovian and non-Markovian dynamics in figure 8.

8. Conclusions

In this paper, we have studied the connection between the QSL, the evolution time, non-Markovianity, and the initial state for a qubit system undergoing generic and several large subclasses of dynamics. We have derived general conditions for the optimal QSL bound, that is when $\tau_{\rm QSL}/\tau = 1$, for a general qubit system, and studied some more special cases. Using these conditions, we studied the link between BLP non-Markovianity and QSL. We found, that in some cases, it is possible to generalize the results of [14] by showing that the QSL depends directly on the BLP measure. In general the connection becomes more complicated: We characterized classes of dynamics where the BLP Markovianity does not imply $\tau_{\rm QSL}/\tau = 1$, and even cases where the QSL bound is tight for non-Markovian dynamics.

Despite concentrating on the BLP non-Markovianity, our analysis has implications to other definitions too: Our results show that in some cases the tightness of the QSL bound is not achieved even for BLP Markovian dynamics (figure 2A), while in other cases BLP non-Markovianity is required for reaching the QSL bound (figures 2C(iii), C(iv), and D). As a consequence, there cannot exist a general connection between QSL and any definition of non-Markovianity which is in hierarchical relation with the BLP non-Markovianity either, as that would require such definition to be simultaneously both stronger and weaker than the BLP measure. (For a review of hierarchies between different definitions of non-Markovianity, see [42].)

We have also shown that the QSL bound in an open qubit system is not tight for all pure initial states, even in purely Markovian systems. We analytically solved the optimal initial states leading to $\tau_{QSL}/\tau = 1 \quad \forall \quad \tau \ge 0$ in dynamical semigroups rising from phase-covariant and Pauli master equations. We also studied the initial state dependence for example dynamics violating CP-divisibility. For all of the dynamical maps considered, the bound can be reached for a very few initial pure states, except for depolarizing dynamics.

Finally, we have analyzed the behavior of the QSL across the Markovian to non-Markovian crossover, and found out that the tightness of the bound is clearly connected to the crossover in the example considered. In the non-Markovian region of the { γ' , γ_3 }-space, the QSL starts to decrease. Conversely, when the dynamics becomes Markovian again, the QSL starts to increase but does not return to the optimal value $\tau_{QSL}/\tau = 1$. These results are in full accordance with our results concerning the connection between BLP non-Markovianity and QSL bound.

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge financial support from the Academy of Finland Center of Excellence program (Project no. 312058) and the Academy of Finland (Project no. 287750). HL acknowledges also the financial support from the University of Turku Graduate School(UTUGS).

ORCID iDs

J Teittinen b https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9288-7531 H Lyyra b https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9218-4657

References

- [1] Mandelstam L and Tamm I 1945 J. Phys. USSR 9 249–54
- [2] Margolus N and Levitin L 1998 Physica D 120 188–95
- [3] Giovannetti V, Lloyd S and Maccone L 2003 Phys. Rev. A 67 052109
- [4] Deffner S and Lutz E 2013 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111** 010402
- [5] del Campo A, Egusquiza I L, Plenio M B and Huelga S F 2013 Phys. Rev. Lett. 110 050403
- [6] Taddei M M, Escher B M, Davidovich L and de Matos Filho R L 2013 Phys. Rev. Lett. 110 050402
- [7] Pires D P, Cianciaruso M, Céleri L C, Adesso G and Soares-Pinto D O 2016 Phys. Rev. X 6 021031
- [8] Deffner S 2017 New J. Phys. 19 103018
- [9] Campaioli Francesco, Pollock Felix A. and Modi Kavan 2019 Quantum 3 168
- [10] Deffner S and Campbell S 2017 J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 50 453001
- [11] Okuyama M and Ohzeki M 2018 Phys. Rev. Lett. 120 070402
- [12] Shanahan B, Chenu A, Margolus N and del Campo A 2018 Phys. Rev. Lett. 120 070401
- [13] Breuer H P, Laine E M and Piilo J 2009 Phys. Rev. Lett. 103 210401
- [14] Xu Z Y, Luo S, Yang W L, Liu C and Zhu S 2014 *Phys. Rev.* A **89** 012307
- [15] Wu SX, Zhang Y, Yu CS and Song H S 2015 J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 48 045301
- [16] Zhang Y J, Han W, Xia Y J, Cao J P and Fan H 2015 Phys. Rev. A 91 032112
- [17] Liu H B, Yang W L, An J H and Xu Z Y 2016 Phys. Rev. A 93 020105
- [18] Zhang Y J, Xia Y J and Fan H 2016 Europhys. Lett. 116 30001
- [19] Cai X and Zheng Y 2017 Phys. Rev. A 95 052104
- [20] Xu K, Han W, Zhang Y J, Xia Y J and Fan H 2018 Ann. Phys. 388 1-11
- [21] Xu K, Zhang Y J, Xia Y J, Wang Z D and Fan H 2018 Phys. Rev. A 98 022114
- [22] Liu C, Xu Z Y and Zhu S 2015 Phys. Rev. A 91 022102
- [23] Hou L, Shao B and Zou J 2016 Eur. Phys. J. D 70 35
- [24] Song Y J, Kuang L M and Tan Q S 2016 Quantum Inf. Process. 15 2325-42
- [25] Mo M, Wang J and Wu Y 2017 Ann. Phys. 529 1600221
- [26] Wu Y N, Wang J and Zhang H Z 2016 Quantum Inf. Process. 16 22
- [27] Wang J, Wu Y N and Zhang H Z 2016 Sci. Rep. 6 39110
- [28] Song Y J, Tan Q S and Kuang L M 2017 Sci. Rep. 7 43654
- [29] Gorini V, Kossakowski A and Sudarshan G 1976 J. Math. Phys. 17 821
- [30] Lindblad G 1976 Comm. Math. Phys. 48 119-30
- [31] Rivas A and Huelga S F 2012 Open Quantum Systems: An Introduction (Berlin: Springer) (https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-23354-8)
- [32] Lankinen J, Lyyra H, Sokolov B, Teittinen J, Ziaei B and Maniscalco S 2016 Phys. Rev. A 93 052103
- [33] Smirne A, Kołodyński J, Huelga S F and Demkowicz Dobrzański R 2016 Phys. Rev. Lett. 116 120801
- [34] Haase J, Smirne A, Kołodyński J, Demkowicz Dobrzański R and Huelga S F 2018 New J. Phys. 20 053009
- [35] Teittinen J, Lyyra H, Sokolov B and Maniscalco S 2018 New J. Phys. 20 073012
- [36] Filippov S N, Glinov A N and Leppäjärvi L 2019 arXiv:1911.09468
- [37] Andersson E, Cresser J D and Hall M J W 2007 J. Mod. Opt. 54 1695
- [38] Chruściński D and Wudarski F A 2013 Phys. Lett. A 377 1425-9
- [39] Breuer H P, Kappler B and Petruccione F 1999 Phys. Rev. A 59 1633-43
- [40] Wißmann S, Karlsson A, Laine E M, Piilo J and Breuer H P 2012 Phys. Rev. A 86 062108
- [41] Hall M J W, Cresser J D, Li L and Andersson E 2014 Phys. Rev. A 89 042120
- [42] Li L, Hall M J W and Wiseman H M 2018 Phys. Rep. 759 1–51