We discuss compatibility between various quantum aspects of bosonic fields, relevant for quantum optics and quantum thermodynamics, and the mesoscopic formalism of reduced state of the field (RSF). In particular, we derive exact conditions under which Gaussian and Bogoliubov-type evolutions can be cast into the RSF framework. In that regard, special emphasis is put on Gaussian thermal operations. To strengthen the link between the RSF formalism and the notion of classicality for bosonic quantum fields, we prove that RSF contains no information about entanglement in two-mode Gaussian states. For the same purpose, we show that the entropic characterisation of RSF by means of the von Neumann entropy is qualitatively the same as its description based on the Wehrl entropy. Our findings help bridge the conceptual gap between quantum and classical mechanics.

Between the physics of a single particle, given by the wave function, and the high particle number regime, successfully described by (often classical) statistical methods, is the intermediate world of few-to-many-body systems. Today, the current technological advancements allow for experiments with trapped ions [1, 2], cold atoms [3–5] and photons [6, 7] that lie precisely in this intersection between micro- and macroscopic ensembles (or in its vicinity).

In such situations, standard description in terms of the wave function or its second-quantized counterpart is often too complex, leading to the necessity of resorting to numerical simulations relying on the Hartree-Fock method or the density functional theory [8]. On the other hand, statistical description breaks down for such, relatively small, particle numbers. A proper treatment requires a mesoscopic theory that takes into account only the relevant features of the system, simplifying the theory without damaging its accuracy.

Recently, one such theory in the form of the reduced state of the field (RSF) has been proposed [9]. Relying solely on the first two moments of the creation and annihilation operators of the N-mode continuous variable system at hand, the description reduces the infinite-dimensional density operator to an N-dimensional matrix defining the aforementioned RSF. Importantly, RSF comes equipped with a definition of entropy and an evolution equation derived from the von Neumann entropy and the GKLS (Lindblad) equation, respectively.

Originally, RSF was designed as a description of macroscopic fields of a single particle type, e.g. photons. The main aim was [9] to capture the potential quantum features of fields that are most often treated classically, e.g. gravitational or hydrodynamic waves. In particular, the formalism was successfully applied to thermal sources and polarization optics.

Here, we adopt an opposite perspective. The main purpose of this article is to analyze the applicability of the formalism with respect to quantum phenomena, with the aim of capturing their classical features. To this end, we derive the exact conditions under which the reduced kinetic equation driving the evolution of RSF coincide with Gaussian evolution with (non-Gaussian) scattering [10–12] and Bogoliubov transformations [13–16], two evolution families of exceptional importance in quantum optics and particle physics, among others. Our results indeed show that the RSF formalism applies only to phenomena treatable from the classical perspective. For instance, the only allowed Bogoliubov transformations preserve the vacuum state of the theory, while the only allowed Gaussian thermal operations corre-
spond to classical operations such as beam splitters and phase shifters (forbidding, e.g. squeezing).

To further strengthen the interpretation of RSF as a classical description of quantum fields, we investigate the issues of entropy and entanglement. In the case of entropy, we derive a competing measure of entropy of RSF, based on the Wehrl entropy [17], which we link to the original entropy of RSF, based on the von Neumann entropy, in both qualitative and quantitative fashion. We find that, despite significant differences between the original entropies, the two corresponding entropies of RSF differ little. In fact, we show that in the case of many-particle states, the two entropies coincide. This is reminiscent of the classical case, where only a single measure of entropy exists.

In the case of entanglement, we prove that, despite being built upon two-point (i.e. non-local) correlation functions, RSF contains no information about entanglement in two-mode Gaussian states.

The article is organized as follows. In Section 1, we define and briefly summarize the relevant characteristics of RSF, including its entropy and time evolution. Here, we correct minor mistakes in the evolution equation from [9]. In Sections 2 and 3, we compare the reduced kinetic equations for RSF with Gaussian and Bogoliubov evolution, respectively. In Sections 4 and 5, we investigate the entropy and entanglement properties of RSF. Each of the Sections 1-5 contains a single proposition labeled by the section’s number, summarizing its major findings. Finally, we conclude in Section 6, where we assess the limitations of our work and propose directions for related future research.

For reader’s convenience, every section dedicated to our original findings begins with Preliminaries, where we briefly summarize the required theoretical framework, as well as fix notation (however, standard notation is used wherever possible). Additionally, we remark that each of these sections concerns a separate topic and, as such, can be understood without reading the previous material. The only exception is Section 5, which relies on the theory established in Section 2.

1 Reduced state of the field

In this section, we summarize the relevant information about the reduced state of the field (RSF), including its evolution and entropy. To this end, it is beneficial to briefly recall the notions of first and second quantizations.

In the first quantization, the $N$-dimensional single particle Hilbert space is spanned by a set of complex modes $f_k$, $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$. Here, it is assumed that $N$ is finite, mainly for notational convenience. Each mode corresponds to an eigenstate of the system Hamiltonian and is, in turn, associated with a possible energy level of the particle.

An extension of this scenario to an arbitrary number of identical particles is given by the second quantization. The single-particle $N$-level Hilbert space is promoted to a tensor product of $N$ multi-particle Hilbert spaces, each associated with a different energy level (mode) of the original single-particle space. In the case of bosons, which are in the focus of this article, the new Hilbert space is conveniently described using a set of $N$ annihilation and creation operators $\hat{a}_k, \hat{a}^\dagger_{k'}$, respectively, fulfilling the canonical commutation relations

$$[\hat{a}_k, \hat{a}^\dagger_{k'}] = \delta_{kk'}, \quad [\hat{a}_k, \hat{a}_{k'}] = [\hat{a}^\dagger_k, \hat{a}^\dagger_{k'}] = 0. \quad (1)$$

An arbitrary $n$-particle state in the many-body Hilbert space can be constructed by acting on the vacuum state with $n$ appropriate creation operators.

While elegant, second quantization can prove to be a significant challenge in calculations. One of the problems has its origin in the fact that each bosonic energy level can be in principle occupied by an infinite number of particles. Even a trivial case of a single mode, one-dimensional first-quantized Hilbert space gives rise to infinite-dimensional Hilbert space in the second quantization. This makes standard problems such as Hamiltonian diagonalization or ground state determination highly non-trivial to solve, even when the system Hamiltonian is at most quadratic in creation and annihilation operators [15, 16].

In the formalism of RSF, the infinite-dimensional many-particle Hilbert space is reduced back to $N$ dimensions, like in the first quantization, but is concerned with multi-particle systems, like in the second quantization. RSF of
any density operator of the second-quantized field consists of two components [9]: the single-particle density matrix

\[ r := \sum_{k,k'=1}^N \text{Tr} \left[ \hat{\rho} \hat{a}_{k'}^\dagger \hat{a}_k \right] |k\rangle \langle k'|, \]

and the averaged field

\[ |\alpha\rangle := \sum_{k=1}^N \text{Tr} \left[ \hat{\rho} \hat{a}_k \right] |k\rangle. \]

The single-particle density matrix contains information about mode occupation and coherence in the state. In particular, its diagonal elements equal the mean particle numbers: \( r_{kk} = \langle \hat{a}^\dagger_k \hat{a}_k \rangle = \langle \hat{n}_k \rangle \) and, consequently, the matrix is normalized to the mean total particle number: \( \text{tr} r = \langle \hat{n} \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^N \langle \hat{n}_k \rangle \). The averaged field contains additional information about local phases of the field.

### 1.1 Time evolution

The time evolution of quantum open systems is typically modeled by the GKLS (Lindblad) equation [18, 19], describing the most general Markovian evolution [20]:

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \hat{\rho} = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}] + \sum_k \left( \hat{L}_k \hat{\rho} \hat{L}_k^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{\hat{L}_k^\dagger \hat{L}_k, \hat{\rho}\} \right),
\]

where \( \hat{H} \) denotes the system Hamiltonian and \( \hat{L}_k \) are the Lindblad operators.

In the formalism of RSF, the field is treated as a set of individual particles subject to spontaneous decay and production, as well as interaction with coherent classical sources and random scattering by the environment. The GKLS evolution driven by such phenomena is given by [9]

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \hat{\rho} = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}] + \sum_{k=1}^N \left[ \zeta_k \hat{a}_k - \zeta_k^* \hat{a}_k^\dagger, \hat{\rho} \right]
+ \sum_{k,k'=1}^N \Gamma_{kk'}^\downarrow \left( \hat{a}_k \hat{\rho} \hat{a}_{k'}^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{\hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_{k'}, \hat{\rho}\} \right)
+ \sum_{k,k'=1}^N \Gamma_{kk'}^\uparrow \left( \hat{a}_{k'}^\dagger \hat{\rho} \hat{a}_{k} - \frac{1}{2} \{\hat{a}_k \hat{a}_{k'}^\dagger, \hat{\rho}\} \right)
+ \int \mu(du) \left( \hat{U} \hat{\rho} \hat{U}^\dagger - \hat{\rho} \right).
\]

Here, the complex vector \( \vec{\zeta} \) describes the coherent source of the field and the positive matrices \( \Gamma_{\downarrow}, \Gamma_{\uparrow} \) contain particle annihilation and creation rates for random sources. The Hamiltonian has the form \( \hat{H} := h \sum_k \omega_k \hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_k \), where \( \omega_k > 0 \) determine the energy levels. The last term describes random scattering parametrized by the positive measure \( \mu(du) \) on the unitary group acting on the Hilbert space.

Tracing both sides of eq. (5) with \( \hat{a}_l^\dagger \hat{a}_l \) and \( \hat{a}_l \) yields the reduced kinetic equations for RSF. As the resulting equations slightly differ from the ones derived originally in [9], where minor errors appear\(^1\) we provide them in full in the following proposition.

**Proposition 1.** The time evolution of RSF is given by the reduced kinetic equations:

\[
\frac{d}{dt} r = \frac{i}{\hbar} [h, r] + |\zeta\rangle \langle \alpha| + |\alpha\rangle \langle \zeta|
+ \frac{1}{2} \{\gamma^\uparrow - \gamma^\downarrow, r\} + \gamma^\uparrow
+ \int \mu(du) (uru^\dagger - r),
\]

\[
\frac{d}{dt} |\alpha\rangle = -\frac{i}{\hbar} h|\alpha\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \{\gamma^\uparrow - \gamma^\downarrow, |\alpha\rangle + |\zeta\rangle\}
+ \int \mu(du) (u - 1)|\alpha\rangle.
\]

Here, \( h := h \sum_k \omega_k |k\rangle \langle k| \), \( |\zeta\rangle := \sum_{k=1}^N \zeta_k |k\rangle \), \( \gamma^\downarrow := \sum_{k,k'=1}^N \Gamma_{kk'}^\downarrow |k\rangle \langle k'| \) are the single-particle counterparts to \( \hat{H}, \vec{\zeta} \) and \( \Gamma_{\uparrow} \), respectively. The unitary matrices \( u \) are fixed by demanding the RSF of \( \hat{U} \hat{\rho} \hat{U}^\dagger \) to be equal to \( uru^\dagger \).

It is clear from construction that every evolution equation of the form (5) has an equivalent set of reduced kinetic equations. However, in principle, other quantum evolution equations can also be represented by simpler RSF alternatives. We advance on this problem in Sections 2-3.

#### 1.2 Entropy

The canonical choice for quantum (information) entropy is given by the von Neumann entropy

\[
S_V(\hat{\rho}) := -k_B \text{Tr} \hat{\rho} \log \hat{\rho},
\]

\(^1\)In comparison with the original derivation [9], we divide the commutator term by \( \hbar \), divide the anticommutator term by 2 and define the matrix \( \Gamma_{\uparrow} \) as a transposition of the matrix defined therein.
where $k_B$ is the Boltzmann’s constant. Among all the quantum states with the same RSF, the von Neumann entropy is maximal for the thermal-like state [9], for which it equals

$$k_B \text{tr}[(r_\alpha + \mathbb{I}_N) \log(r_\alpha + \mathbb{I}_N) - r_\alpha \log r_\alpha]. \quad (8)$$

Here and throughout the rest of this work, $\mathbb{I}_N$ denotes the identity matrix of size $N \times N$, while $r_\alpha := r - |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha| \geq 0$, defines the correlation matrix associated with the RSF. In other words, the von Neumann entropy of an arbitrary state $\rho$ with the reduced state of the field $(r, |\alpha\rangle)$ is upper bounded by eq. (8). According to the maximum entropy principle [21], in the absence of any knowledge about the field other than its RSF, this upper bound is a meaningful measure of the state’s entropy. Thus, the entropy of RSF is defined by the reduced (von Neumann) entropy

$$s_v(\rho) := k_B \text{tr}[(r_\alpha + \mathbb{I}_N) \log(r_\alpha + \mathbb{I}_N) - r_\alpha \log r_\alpha]. \quad (10)$$

The reduced entropy satisfies the natural condition $s_v(\rho) \geq 0$, with equality if and only if the correlation matrix is equal to zero, which happens only when the density operator of the field is given by a coherent state.

In contrast, the von Neumann entropy vanishes for any pure state. In the original work [9], this departure is interpreted as a dependence of the reduced entropy on the complexity of description, which is determined by the assumed level of control over the system. For example, from the point of view of joint measurement of mean photon number and phase, the $n$-photon state, which has no definite phase, contains less information (more entropy) with respect to the selected measurement scheme than a coherent state with the same mean photon number. We return to the discussion of the reduced entropy in Section 4.

1.3 Conjugate and generalized RSF

For our considerations, it is convenient to introduce two other types of reduced fields. We define the conjugate RSF by

$$c := \sum_{kk'}^{N} \text{Tr} [\rho \hat{A}_{k'}\hat{A}_k |k\rangle\langle k'|], \quad (11)$$

and the generalized RSF by

$$g := \sum_{kk' = 1}^{2N} \text{Tr} [\rho \hat{A}_{k'}\hat{A}_k |k\rangle\langle k'|], \quad (12)$$

where the generalized particle operators are defined as

$$\hat{A}_k := \begin{cases} \hat{a}_k & k \in \{1, \ldots, N\} \\ \hat{a}_{k-N}^\dagger & k \in \{N + 1, \ldots, 2N\}. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

It is easy to see that the three reduced fields are related to each other as follows

$$g = \begin{bmatrix} r & c \\ c^T & r^T + \mathbb{I}_N \end{bmatrix}, \quad |\alpha\rangle = |\alpha\rangle \oplus |\alpha^*\rangle, \quad (14)$$

where we add that, by definition, $r = r^T$, $c = c^T$ and $|\alpha\rangle = |\alpha^*\rangle$.

2 Gaussian evolution with (non-Gaussian) scattering

As outlined before, one of the main goals of our work is to investigate under what circumstances second-quantized evolution can be replaced by the reduced kinetic equations for RSF. In this section, we are concerned with Gaussian evolution, defined here as the most general Markovian evolution that preserves the Gaussian property of states. Since it plays a significant role in the reduced kinetic equations, we extend this evolution to include an additional scattering term beyond Gaussian dynamics.

The section is organized as follows: firstly, we summarize the relevant information about Gaussian states and Gaussian evolution with (non-Gaussian) scattering. Then, we derive the conditions under which such evolution is equivalent to reduced kinetic equations and illustrate our findings on concrete examples. Finally, we discuss the classicality of the derived reduced kinetic equations.

2.1 Preliminaries: Gaussian states and evolution

Given the set of $N$ pairs of mode
The covariance matrix of a quantum state is just has to fulfill the Heisenberg uncertainty principle: quadratures

\[ \hat{\xi} := (\hat{x}_1, \hat{p}_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_N, \hat{p}_N)^T, \]  

where \( \hat{x}_k := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\hat{a}_k + \hat{a}_k^\dagger) \) and \( \hat{p}_k := -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} (\hat{a}_k - \hat{a}_k^\dagger) \). Since the mode quadratures form a basis of operators acting in the \( N \)-mode Hilbert space, the state of the system is fully described by the complete collection of the values of correlation functions of the form

\[ \langle \hat{\xi}_{i_1} \cdots \hat{\xi}_{i_n} \rangle := \text{Tr} [\hat{\rho} \hat{\xi}_{i_1} \cdots \hat{\xi}_{i_n}]. \]  

In the case of Gaussian states, defined as states with normal (Gaussian) characteristic functions and quasiprobability distributions \([10–12]\), the state is fully described by one- and two-point correlation functions, i.e. with \( n = 1, 2 \) in the equation above. The information about the former is contained in the vector

\[ |\xi\rangle := \sum_{k=1}^{2N} \langle \hat{\xi}_k \rangle |k\rangle, \]

while the latter is encoded in the matrix of second moments

\[ V := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,k'=1}^{2N} \langle \{\hat{\xi}_k, \hat{\xi}_{k'}\} \rangle |k\rangle \langle k'|. \]

The covariance matrix of a quantum state is just \( V_{\text{cov}} = V - |\xi\rangle \langle \xi| \). Any valid covariance matrix has to fulfill the Heisenberg uncertainty principle:

\[ \sqrt{\langle \hat{x}_k^2 \rangle - \langle \hat{x}_k \rangle^2} \sqrt{\langle \hat{p}_k^2 \rangle - \langle \hat{p}_k \rangle^2} \geq \hbar / 2, \]

where \( k \in \{1, \ldots, N\} \), equivalent to \([10]\)

\[ V + \frac{i}{2} J \geq 0, \quad \text{or} \quad V_{\text{cov}} + \frac{i}{2} J \geq 0. \]

Here, \( J \) is the symplectic form, defined as

\[ J := -\sum_{k,k'=1}^{2N} \frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{\xi}_k, \hat{\xi}_{k'}] |k\rangle \langle k'|, \]

and explicitly equal to

\[ J = \bigoplus_{k=1}^{N} J_2, \quad J_2 := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \]

The symplectic form defines the symplectic group \( Sp(2N, \mathbb{R}) \) consisting of matrices \( S \) of size \( 2N \times 2N \), such that \( SJS_T = J \).

As a matter of fact, the pair \( (V, |\xi\rangle) \) contains the same information as \( (V_{\text{cov}}, |\xi\rangle) \), and both in the same way define the symplectic picture of quantum states (sometimes referred to as covariance matrix picture). In this work, we choose to use the pair \( (V, |\xi\rangle) \), since by construction it is closer to \((r, |\alpha\rangle)\) than the pair \( (V_{\text{cov}}, |\xi\rangle) \). We stress that while the symplectic picture is complete (i.e. equivalent to the density operator description) only in the case of Gaussian states, it is a valid description of all quantum states.

One of the main sources of motivation for studying the symplectic picture is that, due to technical limitations, in practice we are often restricted to Hamiltonians that are at most second-order in the mode quadratures:

\[ \hat{H} = \frac{1}{2} \hat{\xi}^T G \hat{\xi}, \]

where \( G \) is a \( 2N \times 2N \), real, symmetric matrix. In particular, the structure-preserving evolution of Gaussian states is driven by such quadratic Hamiltonians.

Similarly, to preserve Gaussianity of an initial state along the course of time evolution, the Lindblad operators need to be linear in mode quadratures \([22]\):

\[ \hat{L}_k = \vec{c}_k \cdot \hat{\xi}, \quad \vec{c}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{2N}, \]

so that the resulting dissipator is quadratic, like the Hamiltonian. However, this requirement immediately removes random scattering processes present in eq. (5), as unitary Lindblad operators are necessarily of infinite order\(^3\). Therefore, for the sake of comprehensiveness of the comparison we consider an extension beyond Gaussian evolution that includes such scattering \([23, 24]\). While this extension does not preserve Gaussian states, it results in a self-contained equation in the symplectic picture. It can be thus used to describe the evolution of the first two moments of any quantum state. Indeed, it is known to model various stochastic phenomena, such as e.g. Brownian motion or Poisson process \([24]\). From the perspective of standard Gaussian evolution, it may also be used to introduce non-Gaussian noise in evolution of (approximately) Gaussian states.

\(^3\)Every unitary operation can be written as \( \hat{U} = e^{iX} \), where \( X \) is hermitian. Thus, excluding the case where \( X \) is of order zero (for which \( \hat{U} \) reduces to a number), \( \hat{U} \) is of infinite order in mode quadratures.
Below we make a clear distinction between evolution terms that preserve Gaussianity and terms that do not. Representing the standard quadratic component relevant for evolution of Gaussian states by functions $F_2$ and $f_2$, and the unitary Lindblad operators responsible for Gaussianity-breaking scattering by functions $F_\infty$ and $f_\infty$, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} V = F_2(V) + F_\infty(V),$$
$$\frac{d}{dt} |\xi\rangle = f_2(|\xi\rangle) + f_\infty(|\xi\rangle).$$

(25)

The functions $F_2$, $f_2$ are responsible for the most general quadratic evolution of Gaussian states [25, 26]:

$$F_2(V) := AV + VA^T + JR_C J^T,$$
$$f_2(|\xi\rangle) := A|\xi\rangle.$$

(26)

Here

$$A := J[G + I_C],$$

(27)

where $R_C \equiv \text{re} C^\dagger C$, $I_C \equiv \text{im} C^\dagger C$ and $C_{kl} := \langle \hat{c}_k | \hat{c}_l \rangle$.

The functions $F_\infty$, $f_\infty$ describe the Gaussianity-breaking evolution of infinite order and read [24]

$$F_\infty(V) := \int \mu(dk) \left( KK^T - V \right),$$
$$f_\infty(|\xi\rangle) := \int \mu(dk) \left( K|\xi\rangle - |\xi\rangle \right),$$

(28)

where the measure $\mu(dk)$ is restricted to the space of symplectic matrices (so that $K$ are symplectic).

2.2 Reduced kinetic equations for Gaussian evolution with scattering

Our results regarding the connection between the evolution in eq. (25) and reduced kinetic equations are summarized in the following proposition, which is proved in Appendix A.

**Proposition 2.** Let $(V, |\xi\rangle)$ denote the symplectic description of a system undergoing evolution given by eq. (25). The corresponding RSF evolves according to the reduced kinetic equations (6) if and only if

$$0 = [J, G] = [J, I_C]$$

(29)

and for all $K$ entering the integral (28)

$$0 = TKT^T \quad \text{and} \quad TKT^\dagger \text{is unitary,}$$

(30)

where

$$T := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{k=1}^{N} |k\rangle \langle 2k - 1| + i \langle 2k|,$$

(31)

denotes the transfer matrix. The reduced kinetic equations are characterized by:

$$h = i\hbar TGJT^\dagger,$$
$$\gamma_\uparrow = \pm T(I_C J \mp J R_C J^T) T^\dagger,$$
$$\gamma_\downarrow = TK T^\dagger, \quad \mu(du) = \mu(dk),$$

(32)

$$|\xi\rangle = 0.$$

We are in position to make a couple of observations. Firstly, our results let us assign a clear physical interpretation to the matrices $R_C$, $I_C$, which play a rather ambiguous role from the point of view of Gaussian part of the evolution in (25). We find that the two matrices are responsible for the particle creation and annihilation rates as quantitatively described by eq. (32).

Secondly, while the coherent source vanishes in eq. (32), it is only a consequence of Gaussian Hamiltonian (23) being defined without terms linear in the mode quadratures. In general, such terms can be present in Gaussian evolution and would contribute to a non-zero coherent source in the reduced kinetic equations.

From eq. (30) we can see that also the scattering terms, which violate Gaussianity are restricted by the RSF formalism. Physical meaning of these constraints is explained in passing in Section 2.3, where major focus is put on quantum Gaussian evolution. While illustrating our results with two examples below we also restrict our attention to Gaussian dissipators.

**Example 1** (Gaussian thermal operations). Among the key ingredients in the resource-based approach to quantum thermodynamics are thermal operations, defined as energy-preserving operations on continuous variable systems coupled to a thermal environment. Due to the prevalence of quadratic Hamiltonians in experimental setups, special emphasis is put on Gaussian thermal operations (GTOs), which are thermal operations that preserve the set of Gaussian states.

Recently, a complete characterization of GTOs has been provided in [27]. Here, we focus...
on a natural subclass of GTOs generated by time-independent, non-degenerate Hamiltonians. Such GTOs are effectively reduced to single-time-independent, non-degenerate Hamiltonians.

In accordance with the adopted notation we get

\[ A = \frac{1}{2p} \frac{dp}{dt} + \frac{d\phi}{dt} SS^T J, \quad JR_CJ = -\frac{1}{p} \frac{dp}{dt} \nu SS^T. \tag{35} \]

According to Proposition 2 [using eq. (A5) from the Appendix], such operators can be reconciled with reduced kinetic equations if and only if

\[ 0 = \frac{d\phi}{dt} [J, SS^T]. \tag{36} \]

Discussion of this result is postponed to the next subsection.

**Example 2** (Stabilizability in two-mode entangled Gaussian systems). In quantum open systems, it is sometimes desirable to counteract the effects of dissipation by using an appropriate Hamiltonian. In the framework of stabilizability, once can check whether this is possible by solving a finite set of conditions rather than checking every Hamiltonian separately [28, 29].

Recently, stabilizability was used to investigate the robustness of two-mode Gaussian states against three classes of dissipation [30]. The maximum amount of entanglement was stabilized in the system when subject to evolution described by:

- in the case of local damping: \( \hat{L}_k := \hat{a}_k \) and

\[ \hat{H} = \hat{H}_{sq} := -i\hbar \omega (\hat{a}_1 \hat{a}_2 - \hat{a}_1^\dagger \hat{a}_2^\dagger), \tag{37} \]

where \( \omega \) defines the energy levels of the system;

- in the case of dissipative squeezed-state preparation: \( \hat{H} = \hat{H}_{sq} \) and

\[ \hat{L}_1 := \cosh \alpha \hat{a}_1 - \sinh \alpha \hat{a}_1^\dagger, \quad \hat{L}_2 := \cosh \alpha \hat{a}_2 - \sinh \alpha \hat{a}_2^\dagger, \tag{38} \]

where \( \alpha \gg 0 \) denotes the amount of squeezing;

- in the case of cascaded oscillators coupled to the vacuum: \( \hat{L} := (\hat{a}_1 + \hat{a}_2) \) and

\[ \hat{H} = \hat{H}_{\text{cas}} := -\frac{i\hbar \omega}{2} \left[ (\hat{a}_1 + \hat{a}_2)^2 - (\hat{a}_1^\dagger + \hat{a}_2^\dagger)^2 \right]. \tag{39} \]

It is straightforward to check that while all the dissipators fulfill eq. (29), neither Hamiltonian does, making neither evolution compatible with the reduced kinetic equations.

### 2.3 Classicality of Gaussian reduced kinetic equations

The conditions (29-30) under which the reduced kinetic equations and Gaussian evolution with scattering coincide, put restrictions on the Hamiltonian, the scattering/integral term and the remaining quadratic dissipator. Here, we view each condition from the perspective of classicality of RSF.

In the case of the Hamiltonian, using the explicit representation of the symplectic form (22) in eq. (29), we compute that the allowed Hamiltonians consist of \( 2 \times 2 \) block matrices of the form

\[ G_{kk'} = G_{kk'}^T = a_{kk'} \mathbb{I}_2 + (1 - \delta_{kk'})b_{kk'}J_2, \tag{40} \]

where \( k, k' \) enumerate the blocks and \( a_{kk'}, b_{kk'} \in \mathbb{R} \). Making use of eq. (23) we check that condition (40) allows only for particle number-preserving, or passive interactions. In standard optical implementations, passive transformations do not require any source of energy and correspond to experimental operations which treat light as a classical wave, such as beam splitters and phase shifters. The remaining active transformations, such as squeezing, which require quantum theory to comprehend and which are often a source of quantum advantage, e.g. in metrology [31, 32], are forbidden.

This forbids the use of entanglement-maximizing Hamiltonians, as seen from Example
2, where we found that due to this restriction neither of the three evolution types maximizing the amount of entanglement in stabilized states can be written as reduced kinetic equations.

Similar results concern the integral term, where the condition (30) is fulfilled only when the integration is over operations $K$, which are orthogonal in addition to being symplectic. From the physical point of view, they again correspond to passive transformations [27].

If the volume of integration is sufficiently high, the integral term can be interpreted as random scattering of particles due to contact with particles of the bath. When the matrices $K$ are passive, the scattering is energy-preserving and changes only the trajectory/momentum of the particles.

Unfortunately, condition (29) for the quadratic dissipation part of evolution is difficult to interpret in general. However, in this case we can make use of Example 1. There, we found that this condition takes the form of eq. (36), which can be fulfilled in two cases. The first possibility is that, like above, the symplectic transformation $S$ is passive. The second possibility is that

$$\phi(t) = \phi(0) = 0, \quad (41)$$

where the rightmost equality is required by the initial condition on $V$. To understand this case, we come back to eq. (33), which now reads

$$V(t) = pV(0) + (1 - p)\nu SS^T. \quad (42)$$

For one mode, $SS^T \propto G$ [27], so the above equation simply tells us that the quantum state at hand evolves into a classical mixture of the initial state and the thermal state of the Hamiltonian.

In summary, we find that Gaussian evolution of RSF can be written as reduced kinetic equations if non-classical transformations, such as squeezing, are forbidden or if the evolution drives the state into the thermal state of the Hamiltonian. Furthermore, entanglement-maximizing Hamiltonians are disallowed. These findings suggest that the reduced kinetic equations for Gaussian evolution with scattering have a classical character.

3 Bogoliubov evolution

The second and final model of quantum evolution that we want to consider in relation to the reduced kinetic equations for RSF concerns Bogoliubov transformations.

The section is organized as follows. Firstly, we define Bogoliubov transformations and fix notation. Then, we derive the conditions under which the corresponding evolution coincides with the reduced kinetic equations and test our results on a concrete example of Bogoliubov evolution. Finally, we discuss the classicality of the derived Bogoliubov reduced kinetic equations.

3.1 Preliminaries: Bogoliubov transformations

Introduced in [13, 14] in 1958 as a tool in the theoretical treatment of superconductivity, Bogoliubov transformations are any linear transformations $(\hat{a}_n, \hat{a}^\dagger_n) \rightarrow (\hat{a}'_n, \hat{a}^\dagger_n')$ that preserve the canonical commutation relations (1) [33]. Today, Bogoliubov transformations are used in many branches of quantum physics, from quantum optics to theories of magnetism, to quantum field theory in curved spacetime [33–36].

Here, we are concerned with Bogoliubov evolution of a general open system. In such a case, the state of the system is given by a partial trace of the total state $\hat{\rho}_T$ of the system and the environment over the degrees of freedom of the environment $E$: $\hat{\rho} = Tr_E \hat{\rho}_T$. We assume that the total Hilbert space spans $2N$ modes, with the first $N$ modes associated with the system and the remaining $N$ modes associated with the environment. Then, the total state evolves as

$$\hat{\rho}_T(t) = \hat{U} \hat{\rho}_T(t_0) \hat{U}^\dagger, \quad (43)$$

where $\hat{\rho}_T(t_0)$ is the initial total state and $\hat{U}$ is a unitary transformation such that, for some complex coefficients $\chi_{nm}$,

$$\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{A}_n \hat{U} = \sum_{m=1}^{4N} \chi_{nm} \hat{A}_m. \quad (44)$$

Here, the $4N$ generalized particle operators entering the summation are: $N$ annihilation operators of the system, $N$ annihilation operators of the environment, $N$ creation operators of the system and $N$ creation operators of the environment, in that order.

To preserve the canonical commutation relations, the matrix $\chi$ has to fulfill the so-called symplectic property [15, 16]:

$$\chi S \chi^\dagger = S, \quad (45)$$
where $\mathcal{S} = \text{diag} \left[ I_{2N}, -I_{2N} \right]$. As a consequence of the symplectic property,

$$
\mathcal{X} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X}^S & \mathcal{X}^c \end{bmatrix},
$$

where $\mathcal{X}_i$ are $2N \times 2N$ complex matrices. It is convenient to additionally split each of the $\mathcal{X}_i$ matrices in the following way:

$$
\mathcal{X}_i = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X}_i^S & \mathcal{X}_i^C \end{bmatrix},
$$

where $\mathcal{X}_i^S$, $\mathcal{X}_i^C$, $\mathcal{X}_i^{CC'}$, $\mathcal{X}_i^{EE}$ are $N \times N$ complex matrices.

To derive our results, we make two assumptions about the initial total state entering eq. (43). Firstly, we assume that it is separable with respect to the bipartition between the system and the bath. This is a typical assumption in the theory of quantum open systems. In particular, the GKLS equation cannot be derived without it [37]. Since the reduced kinetic equations are derived from a GKLS equation, it is only natural to also make this assumption in the present case.

Secondly, since we are interested purely in the form of the evolution equation for the system, the initial state of the bath has no ultimate significance [38]. Indeed, it can be arbitrarily adjusted by a local unitary operation on the bath, which can be assimilated into the definition of the unitary operation generating the Bogoliubov transformation. Therefore, for simplicity, we choose the initial state of the bath to be the vacuum state.

### 3.2 Reduced kinetic equations for Bogoliubov evolution

Like in the case of Gaussian evolution, we summarize our results regarding the connection between the Bogoliubov evolution and reduced kinetic equations in one proposition.

**Proposition 3.** Let $\dot{\rho}$ be a quantum open system undergoing Bogoliubov evolution (as outlined above). The corresponding RSF evolves according to the reduced kinetic equations (6) if and only if

$$
0 = \mathcal{X}_i^S.
$$

The reduced kinetic equations are characterized by

$$
\hbar = -i \gamma_\zeta, \quad \gamma_\zeta = \mathcal{W} \pm \mathcal{Y}_r, \quad |\zeta\rangle = \mu(du) = 0,
$$

where

$$
\mathcal{Y}_i := \frac{1}{2i} \big( \mathcal{Y} - \mathcal{Y}^\dagger \big), \quad \mathcal{Y} := \frac{\mathcal{X}_i^S}{dt} \mathcal{X}_i^{-1},
$$

$$
\mathcal{Y}_r := \frac{1}{2} \big( \mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{Y}^\dagger \big), \quad D := \mathcal{X}_i^C \mathcal{X}_i^{C}\dagger,
$$

$$
\mathcal{W} := \frac{d}{dt} D - \mathcal{Y} \left( D + \frac{\mathcal{I}_N}{2} \right) - \left( D + \frac{\mathcal{I}_N}{2} \right) \mathcal{Y}^\dagger.
$$

Proposition 3 is proved in Appendix B. Here, we discuss its implications.

Firstly, there is a clear correspondence of Bogoliubov evolution for RSF to Gaussian evolution for RSF [this is most easily seen by comparing eqs (A6, B8) from the Appendix]. This is not a coincidence. Since Bogoliubov evolution is generated by a quadratic Hamiltonian, it has to fall under Gaussian evolution, whose component (26) defines the most general quadratic evolution of quantum open systems. The fact that we can make this correspondence also reassures us that our assumptions about the initial total state were sound.

As was to be expected, the scattering/integral term does not appear in the evolution of the RSF. This can again be explained by the fact that Bogoliubov transformations are generated by quadratic Hamiltonians. In contrast, the unitary matrices entering the integral in eq. (5) are, as already mentioned in Section 2.1, of infinite order and hence the scattering term has to be generated by infinite-order Hamiltonians.

Just like in the case of Gaussian evolution, the lack of the coherent source is not fundamental, but rather a consequence of the Bogoliubov transformations (44) being defined, for simplicity, without constant terms.

**Example 3** (Gaussian amplification process). As an example, we consider the Gaussian amplification process, in which an arbitrary initial state of the system

$$
\dot{\rho}(t_0) = \int \frac{d^N \beta_0}{\pi^N} P_0(\beta_0) |\beta_0\rangle \langle \beta_0|,
$$

is driven by a heat bath into the state [39]

$$
\dot{\rho}(t) = \int \frac{d^N \beta_0}{\pi^N} P_0(\beta_0) \bigotimes_{j=1}^N \int \frac{d^2 \beta_j}{\pi} \rho_j(t) |\beta_j\rangle \langle \beta_j|,
$$

$$
\rho_j(t) := \frac{1}{N_j(t)} e^{-|\beta_j - \beta_{0j}|^2 / N_j(t)}.
$$

(52)
Here, the integration is over the real and imaginary parts of the complex vectors $\vec{\beta}_0, \vec{\beta}$; $P_0(\vec{\beta}_0)$ denotes the Glauber–Sudarshan P representation [40, 41] of the initial state, $\kappa_j$ is the amplification rate of the $j$-th mode and

$$\mathcal{N}_j(t) := (1 + n_j) \left( e^{2\kappa_j t} - 1 \right), \quad (53)$$

where $n_j$ is the mean number of photons in the $j$-th mode of the bath, assumed to be effectively constant throughout the whole process (this is true as long as the bath is much bigger than the system).

The corresponding RSF reads:

$$r_{kk'}(t) = \int \frac{d^2N \vec{\beta}_0}{\pi^N} P_0(\vec{\beta}_0) \prod_{j=1}^{N} \int \frac{d^2\beta_j}{\pi} \rho_j(t) \beta_k \beta_k^\dagger, \quad (54)$$

The integrals over $\beta_j$ can be calculated using the standard result [42]:

$$\int \frac{d^2\beta_0}{\pi^N} e^{-\beta_0 \mu + \beta_0 \beta + \beta^\dagger \mu^\dagger} = \frac{1}{\det \mu} e^{\lambda \mu^{-1} \lambda^\dagger}, \quad (55)$$

where $\mu$ denotes an invertible matrix and $\vec{t}, \vec{s}$ vectors of size $N$. This yields

$$r(t) = \mathcal{N}(t) + \langle |\vec{\beta}_0(t)\rangle |\vec{\beta}_0(t)\rangle \rangle_0, \quad (56)$$

$$|\alpha(t)\rangle = \langle |\vec{\beta}_0(t)\rangle \rangle_0, \quad (57)$$

where $\mathcal{N}(t) := \text{diag}[\mathcal{N}_1(t), \ldots, \mathcal{N}_N(t)], \langle |\vec{\beta}_0(t)\rangle \rangle := \sum_{j=1}^{N} \beta_0^j e^{\lambda_j^\dagger \lambda_j} |j\rangle$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle_0 := \int \frac{d^2N \vec{\beta}_0}{\pi^N} P_0(\vec{\beta}_0)(\cdot)$. The formulae (56) induce the following differential evolution equations:

$$\frac{d}{dt} r = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ 2\kappa \left( \mathbb{1} + n \right) - 2\kappa n, r \right\} + 2\kappa \left( \mathbb{1} + n \right), \quad (58)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} |\alpha\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ 2\kappa \left( \mathbb{1} + n \right) - 2\kappa n |\alpha\rangle \right\},$$

where $\kappa := \sum_{j=1}^{N} \kappa_j |j\rangle \langle j|$, $n := \sum_{k=1}^{N} n_k |k\rangle \langle k|$. The equations have the form of reduced kinetic equations with $\gamma_\uparrow = 2\kappa \left( \mathbb{1} + n \right)$, $\gamma_\downarrow = 2\kappa n$ and $h = |\zeta\rangle = \mu(du) = 0$.

According to Proposition 3, any Bogoliubov evolution that can be represented by reduced kinetic equations has to necessarily fulfill the condition (48). To see that this is indeed the case in the Gaussian amplification process, we observe that it is generated by a Bogoliubov transformation of the form [38]

$$X'_r(t) = \cosh \nu(t) \begin{bmatrix} I_N & 0 \\ 0 & I_N \end{bmatrix},$$

$$X'_\downarrow(t) = -\sinh \nu(t) \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_N \\ I_N & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (59)$$

where $\nu(t) := \arccosh e^{\nu t}$. Clearly, $X'_s$, being the upper left-hand side block component of $X'_r$, vanishes, as required by the aforementioned condition.

3.3 Classicality of Bogoliubov reduced kinetic equations

The classical character of the reduced kinetic equations for Bogoliubov evolution can be deduced directly from condition (48). Tracing back to eqs (44, 46, 47), we find that the matrix $X'_s$ is responsible for the mapping $\hat{a}_{Sk} \rightarrow \hat{a}_{sk}$, where we use the subscript $S$ ($E$) to indicate that the operators act on the system (environment). Therefore, Bogoliubov evolution corresponds to the reduced kinetic equations only if the time-evolved annihilation operators of the system $\hat{a}_{Sk}(t)$, in general functions of all the operators $(\hat{a}_{Sk}, \hat{a}_{sk}^\dagger, \hat{a}_{Ek}, \hat{a}_{ek}^\dagger)(t_0)$, do not depend on $\hat{a}_{sk}(t_0)$. As a direct consequence, the vacuum state of the theory must be a constant of motion:

$$\frac{d}{dt} |\text{vac}\rangle_S = 0. \quad (60)$$

From the perspective of particle physics, non-trivial time evolution of quantum vacuum is a staple effect at the cross-section of quantum field theory and general relativity, in phenomena such as the Unruh effect [35] or the Hawking radiation [36]. From the perspective of quantum optics, eq. (60) implies no quantum squeezing. Both views are in line with our interpretation of RSF as a classical description.

4 Properties of reduced entropy

To further reinforce the interpretation of RSF as a classical description of quantum fields, we investigate the formalism itself. In this section, we analyze the properties of the reduced entropy, especially in relation to the quantum von Neumann
and Wehrl entropies. After their brief summary, we derive an analogue of the reduced entropy based on the Wehrl entropy, which we link quantitatively to the original reduced (von Neumann) entropy. We conclude with brief discussion.

4.1 Preliminaries: von Neumann and Wehrl entropies.

Contrary to the thermodynamic entropy, which is uniquely defined up to an additive constant, there exist many competing measures of quantum (information) entropy. In this work, we are concerned with two of the most prominently used measures: the von Neumann and the Wehrl entropy. Wehrl entropy is invariant under all unitary transformations, whereas the von Neumann entropy is invariant under all unitary transformations of the state.

The von Neumann entropy (7) is a generalization of the Shannon entropy and is often considered the canonical quantum entropy [43]. Because of its information-theoretic origin, it is most easily interpreted as a measure of uncertainty about the state of the system. The von Neumann entropy is invariant under all unitary transformations and it attains its minimum value—zero—for all pure states.

The Wehrl entropy [17] is defined as the continuous Shannon entropy of the Husimi Q representation of the quantum state:

\[ S_W(\hat{\rho}) := -k_B \int \frac{d^2N}{\pi^N} Q(\vec{\beta}) \log Q(\vec{\beta}). \]  

(61)

Here, \( Q(\vec{\beta}) = \langle \vec{\beta} | \hat{\rho} | \vec{\beta} \rangle \) is the Husimi Q representation [44] of the state \( \hat{\rho} \), \( | \vec{\beta} \rangle \) is an \( N \)-mode coherent state and the integration is over the real and imaginary parts of every component of the complex vector \( \vec{\beta} \). The Wehrl entropy is often considered as a semi-classical alternative to the von Neumann entropy [45]. Indeed, it differs from the latter significantly. Unlike the von Neumann entropy, the Wehrl entropy never vanishes, and it attains its minimal value, \( k_B N \), only for coherent states [46]. Furthermore, it is not invariant under all unitary transformations of the state.

4.2 Comparison of reduced von Neumann and Wehrl entropies.

As said before, like the Wehrl entropy, and unlike the von Neumann entropy, the reduced entropy (10) does not vanish for all pure states, but rather only for the coherent states. Furthermore, the reduced entropy is not invariant under all unitary transformations.\(^3\) Finally, by construction, the reduced entropy provides an upper bound to the von Neumann entropy, another quality shared with the Wehrl entropy. The connection between the two entropies becomes more clear upon realization that RSF, and thus reduced entropy, can also be elegantly represented by the Husimi Q function:

\[ r_{kk'} = \int \frac{d^2N}{\pi^N} (\beta_k \beta_{k'}^* - \delta_{kk'}) Q(\vec{\beta}), \]  

\[ \alpha_k = \int \frac{d^2N}{\pi^N} \beta_k Q(\vec{\beta}). \]  

(62)

Given these shared qualities, it is natural to ask whether there exists a reduced entropy equivalent to the Wehrl entropy. The answer is positive and yields the reduced Wehrl entropy:

\[ s_w(\hat{\rho}) := k_B \text{tr} \log(\hat{\rho} + \mathds{1}) + k_B N. \]  

(63)

See Appendix C for derivation.

Just like the reduced von Neumann entropy maximizes the von Neumann entropy for a fixed RSF, the reduced Wehrl entropy maximizes the Wehrl entropy for a fixed RSF. Furthermore, in both cases the maximum is attained by the same thermal-like state. The two entropies share more qualities, e.g., both are invariant under the same unitary transformations and both share the additive property \( s(\hat{\rho}_1 \otimes \hat{\rho}_2) = s(\hat{\rho}_1) + s(\hat{\rho}_2) \) (interestingly, this quality is not shared by the actual Wehrl entropy). Both properties are direct consequences of the definition of RSF and the fact that the two entropies depend solely on traces of analytic functions of the correlation matrix.

In addition to qualitative similarities, the two entropies can be linked quantitatively.

**Proposition 4.** The following relation between the reduced von Neumann and Wehrl entropies holds:

\[ s_v \leq s_w \leq s_v + k_B N. \]  

(64)

**Proof.** We begin with the l.h.s. inequality. Rearranging eq. (8),

\[ s_v = k_B \text{tr} \{ r_\alpha \log(\hat{\rho} + \mathds{1}_N) - \log r_\alpha \} \]

\[ + k_B \text{tr} \log(\hat{\rho} + \mathds{1}_N). \]  

(65)

\(^3\) Consider, e.g., the Bogoliubov transformation \( U^\dagger \hat{a}_k U = \cosh \mu \hat{a}_k + \sin \mu \hat{a}_k^\dagger \) with \( \mu \neq 0 \). From the definitions (2, 3), \( r \) transforms to \( \cosh^2 \mu r + O(\mu) \neq r \).
By definition of the reduced Wehrl entropy, the second term is equal to $-k_B N + s_w$. In the first term, we apply the eigendecomposition $r_\alpha = \sum_{k=1}^N \lambda_k |k\rangle \langle k|$, where $\lambda_k \geq 0$. Using basic properties of the logarithm, we arrive at

$$s_v = k_B \sum_{k=1}^N \log \left(1 + 1/\lambda_k\right)^{\lambda_k} - k_B N + s_w. \quad (66)$$

Clearly, the first term is maximized in the limit $\lambda_i \to \infty$, in which, by definition of the Euler’s number, it approaches $k_B N$. Then, the first and second terms cancel, leaving $s_v \leq s_w$ as in the l.h.s. inequality.

To prove the r.h.s. inequality we observe that, since $r_\alpha \geq 0$:

$$s_v \geq k_B \text{tr} \left[ (r_\alpha + 1_N) \log(r_\alpha + 1_N) - r_\alpha \log(r_\alpha + 1_N) \right] = s_w - k_B N,$$

which is equivalent to the r.h.s. inequality.

### 4.3 Classicality of the reduced entropy

Proposition 4 shows that, just as in the case of the usual von Neumann and Wehrl entropies, the reduced Wehrl entropy forms an upper bound to the reduced von Neumann entropy. However, unlike the original entropies, the reduced Wehrl entropy also forms a lower bound to the reduced von Neumann entropy. Indeed, the two entropies bound each other from both sides. In the particular case of many-particle states, such as macroscopic fields, for which the effective number of modes $N$ becomes negligible in comparison with the total particle number $\langle \hat{n} \rangle = \text{tr} r$, we get $s_v \approx s_w$. This is reminiscent of the classical case, where there is only one measure of entropy.

### 5 Entanglement and RSF

The final issue that we want to investigate concerns entanglement in the formalism of RSF. To this end, we go back to two-mode Gaussian states [see Preliminaries in Section 2 for a brief summary] and show that the RSF of such states contains no information about entanglement, further reinforcing our argument about the classical character of RSF.

**Proposition 5.** RSF contains no information about entanglement in two-mode Gaussian states.

**Proof.** To prove our statement, we show that for the RSF of any two-mode Gaussian state one can find a corresponding separable symplectic description $(V, |\xi\rangle)$.

We start by observing that the vector of the first moments $|\xi\rangle$ can be arbitrarily adjusted by means of local operations and as such contains no information about the entanglement in the state. In turn, the averaged field $|\alpha\rangle$, which depends solely on $|\xi\rangle$, must also contain no information about entanglement. Therefore, if such information is contained in RSF at all, it must be present in the correlation matrix $r_\alpha$, which, by virtue of eqs (9, A1) does not depend on the first moments $|\xi\rangle$.

Starting from eq. (9) and using the easy-to-check relation $TJT^\dagger = -iI$, we find that the positivity of the correlation matrix is equivalent to the Heisenberg uncertainty principle (20). Therefore, any valid correlation matrix corresponds to a valid covariance matrix $V$ and vice versa.

In the particular case of two modes, any covariance matrix possesses a simple, unique form, called the standard form [10]:

$$V_{sf} = \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 & c_+ & 0 \\ 0 & a & 0 & c_- \\ c_+ & 0 & b & 0 \\ 0 & c_- & 0 & b \end{bmatrix}, \quad (68)$$

where the parameters $a, b \geq 1/2$ are related to the average number of particles / excitations in the modes and the coefficients $c_\pm \in \mathbb{R}$ contain the information about the correlations between the modes. In particular, a necessary condition for the presence of entanglement in the state is given by [30]

$$c_+c_- < 0. \quad (69)$$

Crucially, any two-mode covariance matrix can be brought into its standard form by means of local symplectic operations, which, similarly to local unitary operations on density matrices, do not change global properties of the state, such as entanglement.

For this reason, for the purposes of this proof we can, with no loss of generality, consider only covariance matrices in the standard form. Then

$$r_\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 2a - 1 & c_+ + c_- \\ c_+ + c_- & 2b - 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (70)$$
Clearly, for a fixed matrix $r_\alpha$ the values of $a, b$ are also fixed. However, the other two parameters only need to be related by $c_+ + c_- = 2(r_\alpha)_{12}$. In particular, the relation is fulfilled by the choice $c_+ = c_- = (r_\alpha)_{12}$. By virtue of eq. (69), such covariance matrix corresponds to a separable state.

This completes the proof.

6 Concluding remarks

We studied the applicability of the reduced state of the field (RSF) with respect to a variety of quantum phenomena. We derived exact conditions under which the evolution of RSF coincides with Gaussian and Bogoliubov evolution. Furthermore, we derived a competing measure of entropy of RSF based on the Wehrl entropy, which we linked qualitatively and quantitatively to the original entropy of RSF. Finally, we showed that RSF contains no information about entanglement in two-mode Gaussian states. Based on these findings, we proposed an interpretation of RSF as a classical description of quantum fields.

Our work suggests the following directions for future research. Firstly, our results can be generalized or extended. For example, it would be interesting to see if RSF contains information about entanglement in arbitrary quantum states or whether the reduced kinetic equations can replace evolution families beyond Gaussian and Bogoliubov. Secondly, additional research could strengthen or challenge our interpretation of RSF as a classical description of quantum fields.
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A Proof of Proposition 2

In this Appendix we prove Proposition 2, i.e. we derive the conditions under which Gaussian evolution is equivalent to the reduced kinetic equations. The key observation is that RSF is related to the first two moments of the mode quadratures by

$$ r = TV^\dagger \hat{T}^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}, \quad |\alpha\rangle = T|\xi\rangle, \quad c = TVT^T, \quad |\alpha^*\rangle = T^*|\xi\rangle. $$

Furthermore, the transfer matrix fulfills

$$ T^\dagger T = \frac{1}{2} \left( \mathbb{1} + iJ \right) . $$

Notably, $T^\dagger T + T^TT^* = 1$. Making extensive use of this identity in eq. (25), along with relations (A1), we obtain the corresponding evolution equations for RSF:

$$ \frac{d}{dt} r = yr + ry^\dagger + ze^\dagger + cz^\dagger + \frac{1}{2} \left( y + y^\dagger \right) + w $$

$$ + \int \mu(\alpha) \left[ qrq^\dagger + s\nu^Ts^\dagger - r + qcs^\dagger + sc^\dagger q^\dagger + \frac{1}{2} \left( qq^\dagger + ss^\dagger - \mathbb{1}_N \right) \right] , $$

$$ \frac{d}{dt} |\alpha\rangle = y|\alpha\rangle + z|\alpha^*\rangle + \int \mu(\alpha) \left[ (q - 1)|\alpha\rangle + s|\alpha^*\rangle \right] . $$

Here,

$$ y := TAT^\dagger, \quad z := TAT^T, \quad q := TKT^\dagger, \quad s := TKT^T, \quad w := TJR_CJ^TT^\dagger . $$

Unlike the reduced kinetic equations, Gaussian evolution equation for RSF couples it to the conjugate field. Therefore, if the two equations are to coincide for arbitrary input states, $c$ cannot enter eq. (A3). This has two implications. Firstly, $z = 0$ and in turn $0 = T^\dagger zT^*$, which is equivalent to

$$ 0 = [J, A] . $$

Using transposition we immediately find this condition to identical to eq. (29). Secondly, $s = 0$, which is equivalent to the l.h.s. condition in eq. (30). The r.h.s. condition of eq. (30) follows immediately after upon comparison with the reduced kinetic equations.

It remains to show that the reduced kinetic equations are given by eq. (32). Provided eqs (29-30) are fulfilled, eq. (A3) becomes

$$ \frac{d}{dt} r = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [ -\hbar y_i, r ] + \frac{1}{2} \left\{ (w + y_r) - (w - y_r), r \right\} + (w + y_r) + \int \mu(\alpha) \left( qrq^\dagger - r \right) , $$

$$ \frac{d}{dt} |\alpha\rangle = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [ -\hbar y_i |\alpha\rangle + \frac{1}{2} [ (w + y_r) - (w - y_r)] |\alpha\rangle + \int \mu(\alpha) \left( q|\alpha\rangle - |\alpha\rangle \right) , $$

where we split $y = y_r + iy_i$ with $y_r$, $y_i$ hermitian (this can be done for any complex matrix). Equations (A6) have the same form as the reduced kinetic equations with

$$ \hbar = -\hbar y_i, \quad \gamma_i = w \pm y_r, \quad |\zeta\rangle = 0, \quad u = q, \quad \mu(du) = \mu(\alpha) . $$

Using eqs (A4, 29) we arrive at the desired result (32).

B Proof of Proposition 3

In this Appendix we prove Proposition 3, i.e. we derive the conditions under which Bogoliubov evolution is equivalent to the reduced kinetic equations. To this end, it is most convenient to start with the generalized RSF $(g_T, |A_T\rangle)$ of the total state. Eqs. (12, 43, 44) imply

$$ g_T(t) = \mathcal{X} g_T(t_0) \mathcal{X}^\dagger, \quad |A_T(t)\rangle = \mathcal{X} |A_T(t_0)\rangle . $$

(B1)
To unravel the corresponding evolution equation for the RSF of the system, we observe that the reduced fields of the total state have the structure

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
r & r_C & r_E \\
r_C^\dagger & r_C & r_E \\
r_E^\dagger & r_C & r_E
\end{bmatrix}; \quad c_T = \begin{bmatrix} c & c_C & c_E \\ c_C^\dagger & c & c_E \end{bmatrix}, \quad |\alpha_T\rangle = |\alpha_T^*\rangle = |\alpha\rangle \oplus |\alpha_E\rangle, \tag{B2}
\]

where \((r, |\alpha\rangle), (c, |c^*\rangle)\) are the reduced fields of the system, \((r_E, |\alpha_E\rangle), (c_E, |c_E^*\rangle)\) are the reduced fields of the environment and \(r_C, c_C\) contain the system-bath correlations. This fact follows directly from the definitions of the fields. For example,

\[
(r)_{kk'} := \text{Tr} \left[ (r_E \hat{\rho}) \hat{a}_{k'}^\dagger \hat{a}_k \right] = \text{Tr} \left[ (r_E \hat{\rho} \hat{a}_{k'}^\dagger \hat{a}_k) \right] = \text{Tr} \left[ \hat{\rho} \hat{a}_{k'}^\dagger \hat{a}_k \right] =: (r)_{kk'}.
\tag{B3}
\]

The remaining relations are proved in a similar fashion.

In particular, under our assumptions about the initial total state, the initial reduced fields have the block-form

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
r(t_0) & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}; \quad c_T(t_0) = \begin{bmatrix} c(t_0) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad |\alpha_T(t_0)\rangle = |\alpha_T(t_0)^*\rangle = |\alpha(t_0)\rangle \oplus |\text{vac}\rangle, \tag{B4}
\]

where \(|\text{vac}\rangle\) denotes the vacuum state.

Plugging eqs \((14, 46, 47, B2, B4)\) into eq. \((B1)\) we obtain the Bogoliubov evolution for RSF:

\[
\begin{align*}
r(t) &= X_{TS} r(t_0) X_{TS}^\dagger + X_{SC}(t_0) X_{LS}^\dagger + X_{LS}^\dagger X_{SC}(t_0) + X_{LS}^\dagger \left[r^T(t_0) + 1\right] X_{LS}^\dagger + X_{LC}\mathcal{X}_{LC}^\dagger, \\
|\alpha(t)\rangle &= X_{TS} |\alpha(t_0)\rangle + X_{LS}^\dagger |\alpha^*(t_0)\rangle,
\end{align*}
\tag{B5}
\]

Such evolution of the RSF couples it to the conjugate field, which is not the case in the reduced kinetic equations. Clearly, for an arbitrary initial state the coupling vanishes only if eq. \((48)\) is fulfilled.

It remains to show that the corresponding reduced kinetic equations are given by eq. \((49)\). Provided eq. \((48)\) holds, eq. \((B5)\) reduces to

\[
r(t) = X_{TS} r(t_0) X_{TS}^\dagger + X_{LC}\mathcal{X}_{LC}^\dagger, \quad |\alpha(t)\rangle = X_{TS} |\alpha(t_0)\rangle. \tag{B6}
\]

These relations are reversible:

\[
r(t_0) = X_{TS}^{-1} \left[r(t) - X_{LC}\mathcal{X}_{LC}^\dagger \right] X_{TS}, \quad |\alpha(t_0)\rangle = X_{TS}^{-1} |\alpha(t)\rangle. \tag{B7}
\]

Taking the time derivative of eq. \((B6)\), making use of eq. \((B7)\) and rearranging the terms we arrive at the differential evolution equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d}{dt} r &= -\frac{i}{\hbar} [\mathcal{H}_r, r] + \frac{1}{2} \{ (\mathcal{W} + \mathcal{Y}_r) - (\mathcal{W} - \mathcal{Y}_r), r \} + (\mathcal{W} + \mathcal{Y}_r), \\
\frac{d}{dt} |\alpha\rangle &= -\frac{i}{\hbar} (\mathcal{H}_r) |\alpha\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \{ (\mathcal{W} + \mathcal{Y}_r) - (\mathcal{W} - \mathcal{Y}_r) \} |\alpha\rangle.
\end{align*}
\tag{B8}
\]

Here, the matrices \(\mathcal{Y}_r, \mathcal{Y}_i, \mathcal{W}\) are exactly as in eq. \((50)\). Clearly, the derived equations have the form of the reduced kinetic equations characterized by eq. \((49)\). This concludes the proof.

\section{C Derivation of reduced Wehrl entropy}

In this Appendix, we derive the reduced Wehrl entropy \((63)\), defined as the maximum Wehrl entropy among all the states with a fixed RSF. The solution to the problem is equivalent to finding the extremum of the following functional with respect to \(Q\):

\[
S_W[Q] - \lambda f[Q] = \sum_{k,k'=1}^{N} \mu_k k g_{kk'}[Q] + \sum_{k=1}^{N} t_k h_k^*[Q] + \sum_{k=1}^{N} s_k h_k^*[Q], \tag{C1}
\]
where \( S_W \) is the Wehrl entropy (61) and the three constraints

\[
\begin{align*}
    f[Q] &:= \int \frac{d^2N}{\pi^N} \tilde{\beta} Q(\tilde{\beta}) - 1 = 0, \\
g_{kk'}[Q] &:= \int \frac{d^2N}{\pi^N} (\beta_k \beta_{k'}^* - \delta_{kk'}) Q(\tilde{\beta}) - r_{kk'} = 0, \\
h_k[Q] &:= \int \frac{d^2N}{\pi^N} \beta_k Q(\tilde{\beta}) - \alpha_k = 0, \\
\end{align*}
\]

(C2)

fix the normalization and the RSF of the state to \((r, |\alpha\rangle)\) [cf. eq. (62)]. Finally, \( \lambda, \mu_k, t_k \) and \( s_k \) are the Lagrange multipliers. Note that the signs, as well as the notation (e.g. \( t_k^* \) instead of \( t_k \)) in eq. (C1) are completely arbitrary. Therefore, we made a choice that anticipates the final results best.

The solution to the variational problem is given by

\[
\tilde{Q}(\tilde{\beta}) := Ae^{\pm \tilde{\beta} \tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{t} \tilde{\beta} + \tilde{s} \tilde{r}},
\]

(C3)

where \( A \) is a normalization constant. Substituting the solution into the three constraints (C2) and making use of the integration formula (55) yields

\[
A = \det \mu e^{-\tilde{t} \tilde{\mu}^{-1} \tilde{s}}, \quad \mu^{-1} = r_{\alpha} + \mathbb{1}_N, \quad \vec{t} = \vec{\alpha}^\dagger \mu, \quad \vec{s} = \mu \vec{\alpha},
\]

(C4)

and in turn

\[
\tilde{Q}(\tilde{\beta}) = \frac{1}{\det(r_{\alpha} + \mathbb{1}_N)} e^{-(\tilde{\beta} - \vec{\alpha})^\dagger (r_{\alpha} + \mathbb{1}_N)^{-1}(\tilde{\beta} - \vec{\alpha})}.
\]

(C5)

Plugging this into the definition of Wehrl entropy (61) leads to eq. (63).