

Quantum catalysis in cavity QED

A. de Oliveira Junior,¹ Martí Perarnau-Llobet,² Nicolas Brunner,² and Patryk Lipka-Bartosik²

¹Faculty of Physics, Astronomy and Applied Computer Science, Jagiellonian University, 30-348 Kraków, Poland.

²Department of Applied Physics, University of Geneva, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland

(Dated: June 1, 2023)

Catalysis plays a key role in many scientific areas, most notably in chemistry and biology. Here we present a catalytic process in a paradigmatic quantum optics setup, namely the Jaynes-Cummings model, where an atom interacts with an optical cavity. The atom plays the role of the catalyst, and allows for the deterministic generation of non-classical light in the cavity. Considering a cavity prepared in a “classical” coherent state, and choosing appropriately the atomic state and the interaction time, we obtain an evolution with the following properties. First, the state of the cavity has been modified, and now features non-classicality, as witnessed by sub-Poissonian statistics or Wigner negativity. Second, the process is catalytic, in the sense that the atom is deterministically returned to its initial state exactly, and could then in principle be re-used multiple times. We investigate the mechanism of this catalytic process, in particular highlighting the key role of correlations and quantum coherence.

I. INTRODUCTION

The effect of catalysis involves using an auxiliary system (a catalyst) to enable a process that would either not occur spontaneously or would occur very slowly. Catalysis manifests across a variety of fields (see e.g. [1]), including biological processes activated by enzymes, the speed-up of chemical reactions, and the synthesis of nanomaterials.

More recently, the phenomenon of catalysis has also become relevant in the context of quantum information; see recent reviews [2, 3]. First examples focused on entanglement manipulation [4–12], and then spread to other areas, including quantum thermodynamics [13–26], coherence theory [27–32] and others [33–38]. These results are typically formulated within the framework of quantum resource theories [39]. This abstract approach is particularly useful for characterizing the fundamental limits of manipulating quantum resources, including scenarios involving catalytic systems of arbitrary complexity.

An interesting direction is whether quantum catalysis is also relevant and useful in a more practical context, potentially even in experiments. Here we investigate quantum catalysis in a paradigmatic setup of quantum optics, namely the Jaynes-Cummings model [40–42], where a two-level atom interacts with a single-mode optical cavity. We uncover a catalytic process enabling the generation of a non-classical state of light in the cavity, using the atom as a catalyst. Specifically, we consider the cavity to be initially prepared in a “classical” coherent state, and uncorrelated to the atom. By carefully setting the initial state of the atom and the interaction time, we obtain a final state such that (i) the atom is back in its initial state exactly, and (ii) the state of the cavity is now non-classical, i.e. featuring Wigner negativity or sub-Poissonian statistics. Hence, non-classicality of the cavity has been generated without perturbing the state of the atom (see Fig. 1). The process is catalytic and the atom could be re-used, for example by coupling it to another cavity.

We investigate the mechanism of this catalytic process, and identify two crucial ingredients. First, the final state of the atom and cavity must feature correlations. Second, the evo-




FIG. 1. **Quantum catalysis in the Jaynes-Cummings model.** (a) An atom (the catalyst C) interacts with a single-mode optical cavity (the system S), initially prepared in a “classical” coherent state. (b) We consider the evolution U over a well-chosen time interval (from $t = 0$ to $t = \tau$) such that (i) the final state of the cavity is non-classical, and (ii) the atom is returned to its initial state exactly. Hence, non-classicality has been generated via catalysis.

lution of the state of the catalyst must involve quantum coherence (i.e. superpositions of the energy basis states). The latter is an interesting aspect, as typical instances of quantum catalysis in resource theories involve only diagonal states (i.e. without coherence), so that they can be understood as a stochastic process involving the probability distributions of the system and catalysis. Instead here, the system and catalyst experience a genuinely quantum evolution. This is a novel instance of the effect of *coherent quantum catalysis*, recently investigated in quantum thermodynamics [25].

Before proceeding, it is worth discussing previous works in quantum optics that relate to the concept of catalysis. Notably, the pioneering proposal for quantum computing in ion traps [43] (see also [44, 45]) considers two spin qubits that become entangled via an interaction with a cavity that can be considered catalytic [3]. Another relevant direction is that of “multi-photon catalysis” (see e.g. [46–49]) which is a heralded catalytic process, where the catalyst is returned only with some probability. In contrast, our catalytic protocol is deterministic.

II. CATALYSIS IN THE JAYNES-CUMMINGS MODEL

Let us first define the concept of quantum catalysis. Consider a quantum setup comprising a system (S) initially prepared in a state ρ_S and a catalyst (C) in an initial state χ_C . The total system SC is assumed to be closed and evolves via an energy-conserving process for some time τ . This evolution is represented by the unitary $U = \exp(-iH_{SC}\tau)$, where H_{SC} denotes the Hamiltonian. Consequently, the final state of the total system is given by $\sigma_{SC} := U(\rho_S \otimes \chi_C)U^\dagger$.

The evolution is said to be catalytic when the catalyst is returned in exactly the same state as it was initially prepared. Formally, we demand that

$$\sigma_C := \text{Tr}_S[U(\rho_S \otimes \chi_C)U^\dagger] = \chi_C, \quad (1)$$

which we refer to as the *catalytic constraint*. Satisfying this constraint typically requires to carefully choose the initial states of the system ρ_S and the catalyst χ_C , as well as the interaction time τ .

The main goal of a catalytic evolution is to induce an interesting local dynamics on the system S, i.e.

$$\rho_S \rightarrow \sigma_S := \text{Tr}_C[U(\rho_S \otimes \chi_C)U^\dagger], \quad (2)$$

while leaving the state of the catalyst unchanged. Notably, it is possible to induce an evolution on S [as in Eq. (2)] that would not be possible without the presence of the catalyst.

In this work, we discuss the phenomenon of catalysis in the Jaynes-Cummings (JC) model, describing the interaction between a single-mode optical cavity and a two-level atom [40] (see Fig. 1a). Here we choose the cavity to represent the system S, while the atom will play the role of the catalyst C. The cavity is characterized by the bosonic creation and annihilation operators a^\dagger and a with the photon number operator $n_S := a^\dagger a$. The atom has energy levels $|g\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$ and its energy is captured by the operator $\sigma_z = |e\rangle\langle e| - |g\rangle\langle g|$. We work in the resonant regime, where the atom and cavity have the same frequency ω . The evolution is governed by the JC Hamiltonian, which in the rotating-wave approximation reads

$$H_{SC} = \omega a^\dagger a + \frac{\omega}{2} \sigma_z + g(\sigma_+ a + \sigma_- a^\dagger), \quad (3)$$

where g is the coupling constant and $\sigma_+ = |e\rangle\langle g|$ and $\sigma_- = |g\rangle\langle e|$. Note that, as we focus on the resonant regime, the evolution specified by Eq. (3) is energy preserving.

The task we would like to achieve in a catalytic way is the generation of non-classical light in the cavity. We consider an initial state of the cavity that is classical, namely a coherent state

$$|\alpha\rangle = e^{-|\alpha|^2/2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha^n}{n!} |n\rangle. \quad (4)$$

This state has Poissonian statistics with the mean number of photons $\langle n_S \rangle_{|\alpha\rangle} = |\alpha|^2$.

Our goal is to find an initial state of the atom χ_C and an interaction time τ such that the evolution is catalytic [i.e. satisfying Eq. (1)], while at the same time leading to a final state




FIG. 2. **First illustrative example.** Catalytic process for generating non-classicality in the cavity, as captured by the second-order auto-correlation function. Its time evolution, $g^{(2)}(t) := g^{(2)}(\sigma_S(t))$, is shown in the top panel, while the bottom panel shows the modification of the atomic state, via the distance $\Delta(t) := \|\chi_C - \sigma_C(t)\|_1$ with respect to the initial state. The orange stars indicate the final time ($\tau \approx 40$) for which the evolution is catalytic. The atom returns to its initial state ($\Delta(\tau) = 0$), while non-classicality has been activated $g^{(2)}(\tau) \approx 0.5 < g^{(2)}(0) = 1$. The value of the parameters are: $\alpha = 1/\sqrt{2}$, $\omega = 2\pi$, $g = \pi$.

of the cavity σ_S that is non-classical. Below we present two illustrative examples of such a process, using two complementary figures of merit to witness non-classicality. Note that the detailed analysis of these examples will be discussed in the next section.

For our first example, we quantify non-classicality via the second-order auto correlation function of the final state of the cavity [50], i.e.

$$g^{(2)}(\sigma_S) = \frac{\langle n_S^2 \rangle_\sigma - \langle n_S \rangle_\sigma^2}{\langle n_S \rangle_\sigma^2}, \quad (5)$$

where $\langle n_S \rangle_\rho := \text{Tr}[\rho_S n_S]$. Our goal is to obtain $g^{(2)}(\sigma_S) < 1$, which certifies a non-classical state of light.

In Fig. 2, we show such a catalytic activation of non-classicality. The upper plot depicts the time evolution of $g^{(2)}$. Catalysis occurs at time $\tau \approx 40$, which is represented by the orange stars. Starting from the initial state of the cavity $\rho_S = |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|_S$ (with $\alpha = 1/\sqrt{2}$), which has $g^{(2)}(\rho_S) = 1$ as any coherent state, we obtain a final state σ_S for which $g^{(2)}(\sigma_S) \approx 0.5$, hence non-classical. In parallel, we monitor the time evolution of the atomic state by calculating the trace distance to its initial state, i.e.

$$\Delta(t) := \|\chi_C - \sigma_C(t)\|_1. \quad (6)$$

We see that at the final time $\tau \approx 40$ we get $\Delta(\tau) = 0$. Hence the atom returned to its initial state exactly, as required for catalysis.

As a second example, we demonstrate how Wigner negativity can be catalytically generated. We focus on the Wigner




FIG. 3. **Second illustrative example.** Catalytic generation of Wigner negativity. Panel (a) shows the time evolution of the Wigner logarithmic negativity W , as well as the Wigner function at initial and final time τ . Non-classicality is clearly generated, while the process is catalytic. Panel (b) shows the trajectory of the atomic state, i.e. the catalyst C , on the Bloch sphere. The initial and final state coincide (red dot). The values of the parameters are: $\alpha = 1/\sqrt{2}$, $\omega = 2\pi$ and $g = \pi$.

logarithmic negativity [51] (WLN), defined as

$$W(\rho) := \log \left(\int dx dp |W_\rho(x, p)| \right), \quad (7)$$

where $W_\rho(x, p)$ is the Wigner function

$$W_\rho(x, p) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int e^{2ipx'} \langle x - x' | \rho | x + x' \rangle dx'. \quad (8)$$

Starting from a coherent state $\rho_S = |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|_S$ which has a positive Wigner function, hence $W(\rho_S) = 0$, we aim to obtain a final state of the cavity σ_S with $W(\sigma_S) > 0$, therefore certifying its non-classicality. In Fig. 3, we present an example of such an evolution. First, we plot WLN as a function of time t . At the final time $\tau \approx 5$, we obtain a state σ_S that has $W(\sigma_S) \approx 0.1$, and we plot its Wigner function. To verify the catalytic nature of the evolution, we display the evolution of the atomic state via its trajectory in the Bloch sphere. Crucially, the trajectory is closed, as the initial and final state of the atom exactly coincide (red dot).

Before moving to the next section, we notice that the two examples we analysed are complementary. The first one shows the generation of non-classicality as witnessed by the $g^{(2)}$ function, while the final state σ_S has a positive Wigner function. In the second example, the opposite happens. Namely, we observe that the final state σ_S has a negative Wigner function, even though $g^{(2)}(\sigma) > 1$.

III. MECHANISM OF CATALYSIS

Here we start by providing a more intuitive understanding of quantum catalysis, by identifying a mechanism which allows for the activation of non-classicality. In turn, this allows us to characterize analytically the catalytic regime.

In the Jaynes-Cummings model, the energies of the cavity S and the atom C are specified by local number operators n_S and n_C respectively. Hence, the total energy of both systems is proportional to the number of excitations, and described by a joint operator $n_{SC} := n_S + n_C$. Since the JC evolution $U(t)$ that takes $\rho_S \otimes \chi_C$ into σ_{SC} conserves the total energy, we have that $[U(t), n_S + n_C] = 0$ for all t . When the evolution is catalytic, all moments of n_C must remain unchanged, in particular $\langle n_C \rangle_\chi = \langle n_C \rangle_\sigma$. Consequently, the first moment of n_S is also preserved, that is $\langle n_S \rangle_\rho = \langle n_S \rangle_\sigma$. Importantly, this is not the case for higher moments of n_S . Particularly, in Appendix B we show that the second moment satisfies

$$\langle n_S^2 \rangle_\sigma = \langle n_S^2 \rangle_\rho + 2 \left(\langle n_S \rangle_\sigma \langle n_C \rangle_\sigma - \langle n_S \otimes n_C \rangle_\sigma \right), \quad (9)$$

Hence, the second moment in the final state of the cavity, $\langle n_S^2 \rangle_\sigma$, can become smaller (or larger) than the second moment in the initial state $\langle n_S^2 \rangle_\rho$. This means that using a catalyst allows for modifying the distribution of the local observable n_S of the system S : while its average must remain the same, the higher moments can change. Importantly, this can only happen if the system becomes correlated with the catalyst, i.e. $\langle n_S^2 \rangle_\sigma \neq \langle n_S^2 \rangle_\rho$ only if $\sigma \neq \sigma_S \otimes \sigma_C$ [as seen from Eq. (9)]. Thus, these correlations are essential for observing quantum catalysis. Finally, we note that the above analysis also applies beyond the JC model, see Appendix B-1a for a generalization of Eq. (9) to arbitrary observables and moments. This can help to discover and understand new instances of quantum catalysis.

The above analysis will also serve as a basis for the characterisation of the parameter regime leading to catalysis. In particular we derive a necessary and sufficient condition for satisfying the catalytic constraint of Eq. (1). Moreover, we obtain an analytic expression for the auto-correlation function g^2 , which is based on the second moment $\langle n_S^2 \rangle_\sigma$.

We consider an arbitrary initial state of the atom

$$\chi_C = q|g\rangle\langle g| + r|g\rangle\langle e| + r^*|e\rangle\langle g| + [1 - q]|e\rangle\langle e|, \quad (10)$$

as well as a general initial state of the cavity $\rho_S = \sum_{n,m} p_{n,m} |n\rangle\langle m|$ with $p_n := p_{n,n}$. Combining Eq. (9) with the fact that mean energy of the cavity is conserved, i.e. $\langle n_S \rangle_\sigma = \langle n_S \rangle_\rho$, we get

$$g^{(2)}(\sigma_S) = g^{(2)}(\rho_S) - \frac{2}{\langle n_S \rangle_\rho^2} [\langle n_S \otimes n_C \rangle_\sigma - (1 - q)\langle n_S \rangle_\rho], \quad (11)$$

where we have

$$\langle n_S \otimes n_C \rangle_\sigma = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n \left[(1 - q)p_n c_n^2 + y_n + qp_{n+1} s_n^2 \right], \quad (12)$$

with $s_n := \sin(gt\sqrt{n+1})$, $c_n := \cos(gt\sqrt{n+1})$, and $y_n := 2 \operatorname{Im}[rp_{n+1,n}]s_n c_n$. For details see Appendix A-3a.

In order to satisfy the catalytic constraint, we obtain a set of equations for the components of the atomic state. Decomposing the diagonal term as $q = q_{\text{inc}} + q_{\text{coh}}$, we get

$$q_{\text{inc}} = \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_n s_n^2, \quad q_{\text{coh}} = \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} y_n, \quad (13)$$

with $Q := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (p_n + p_{n+1})s_n^2$. Interestingly, q_{inc} is specified by the occupations of ρ_S , while q_{coh} depends on its coherence in the Fock basis. Moreover, the off-diagonal term r satisfies

$$r = \frac{i(a_3 a_4^* + a_1^* a_4)}{|a_1|^2 - |a_3|^2} - \frac{i(a_3 a_2^* + a_1^* a_2)}{|a_1|^2 - |a_3|^2} q, \quad (14)$$

with a_i being auxiliary functions defined as

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{n,n} c_{n-1} c_n - e^{-i\omega\tau}, & a_3 &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{n,n+2} s_n s_{n+1}, \\ a_2 &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{n,n+1} s_n [c_{n-1} + c_{n+1}], & a_4 &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{n,n+1} s_n c_{n+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

For a detailed derivation of Eqs. (15) see Appendix A-1.

Importantly, Eqs (13) and (14) are necessary and sufficient for ensuring the catalytic constraint of Eq. (1). In combination with Eq. (11), we can now characterize analytically the effect of non-classicality activation for the g^2 function in the catalytic regime. This is done for finding the parameters (initial states and interaction time) for the first illustrative example of a catalytic process (see Fig. 2). For the second example, we use again such analytic results to ensure the validity of the catalytic constraint, while the Wigner functions are computed numerically.

IV. HOW GENERAL IS CATALYSIS?

An interesting problem is to understand how typical the effect of catalysis is. Here we discuss different aspects of this question.




FIG. 4. **Which states lead to catalysis?** Panel (a) shows the minimal value of g^2 obtained as a function of the amplitude $|\alpha|$ of the initial coherent state of the cavity $\rho_S = |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|_S$. The orange star corresponds to our first illustrative example. Panel (b) displays the atomic states (in the $y - z$ plane of the Bloch sphere) that satisfy the catalytic constraint and generate non-classical states, for an initial coherent state $\alpha = 1/\sqrt{2}$. The colour represents different values of $g^{(2)} < 1$. We impose a limit on the interaction time $\tau \leq 100$ and take 10^6 samples. In both panels, parameters are $\omega = 2\pi$, $g = \pi$.

To begin with, note that it is not obvious a priori whether the catalytic constraint of Eq. (1) can be satisfied. However, due to the quantum version of the Perron-Frobenius theorem, every quantum channel has at least one positive semi-definite fixed point [52]. Now, for a fixed input state ρ_S and a fixed interaction time τ , the state of the atom C evolves according to an effective quantum channel $\chi_C \rightarrow \operatorname{Tr}_S[U(\tau)(\rho_S \otimes \chi_C)U^\dagger(\tau)]$. Consequently, there always exists an initial state χ_C which is left unchanged by this channel, hence providing at least one solution to Eq. (1).

Next, one might wonder how often a catalytic evolution leads to a non-classical state of the cavity. In particular, when preparing the cavity in a coherent state $|\alpha\rangle$, does there always exist a state of the catalyst χ_C which allows to generate non-classicality? To address this question, we investigate the minimum value of $g^{(2)}$ of the final state σ_S , as a function of $|\alpha|$ [see Fig. 4(a)]. This is done by combining Eqs. (11-12) and (13-14), and imposing a bound on the final time, i.e. $g\tau \leq 100$. For $\alpha \in (0, 2]$, we observe that $g^{(2)}(\sigma_S) < 1$, indicating that non-classicality generation via catalysis is generic here. Note that when the initial coherent state has low energy, the final state of the cavity is close to the initial one, but with a slightly reduced variance, leading to a value of $g^{(2)}$ approaching zero.

Let us now ask the converse question, i.e. whether every atomic state can lead to a catalytic evolution. A first observation is that pure states cannot act as useful catalysts in general, and in particular cannot catalytically generate non-classicality. Indeed, a key ingredient for catalysis is the fact that the system and catalyst become correlated [see Eq. (9)], which is impossible when the state of the catalyst is pure.

To further explore this question, we also investigated which states of the atom can catalytically generate sub-Poissonian statistics (i.e. $g^{(2)} < 1$), given an initial coherent state of the cavity and a limited interaction time $g\tau \leq 100$. In Fig. 4(b), we display an example of such a set of catalytic states. Interestingly, this set appears to contain states that are almost pure.

The structure of the catalytic set is further discussed in the Appendix A-1, in particular we observe a strong dependence with the initial state of the cavity.

Finally, we also investigated the case where the initial state of the cavity is not a coherent one. Interestingly, we find that catalysis can boost non-classicality. Specifically, starting with an initial state ρ_S that has some level of non-classicality, one can get a final state σ_S that features more non-classicality, as quantified by the auto-correlation function, i.e. $g^{(2)}(\sigma_S) < g^{(2)}(\rho_S)$ (see Appendix C-2 for details). Conversely, there also exist initial states of the cavity (e.g. Fock states) for which non-classicality cannot be increased catalytically (see Appendix C-1). This is intuitive, as Fock states are the most non-classical (i.e. with minimal value of $g^{(2)}$) among all states with a fixed average energy. As a catalytic protocol must preserve the mean energy, the value of $g^{(2)}$ cannot be increased.

V. DISCUSSION

We presented a catalytic process for generating non-classical states of light in an optical cavity. Our work shows that quantum catalysis, a concept so far explored in the abstract framework of resource theories, is relevant in a practical context. Furthermore, our protocol could potentially be implemented in state-of-the-art experimental setups [53–55], e.g. in cavity QED [56, 57] or trapped ions [58, 59]. Beyond proof-of-principle experiments, it would also be interesting to investigate whether such a catalytic protocol offers a practi-

cal advantage. Indeed, the key point of catalysis is that the catalyst (here the atom) is returned exactly in the same state as it was initially prepared. Hence the same atom could in principle be used repeatedly for activating non-classicality in different cavities, or in the same cavity, but at different times. In the future, it would be interesting to uncover further instances of quantum catalysis in realistic setups, e.g. exploring various platforms and models in quantum optics, as well as for applications in quantum information and metrology.

Another relevant aspect of our work is the fact that the catalyst (atom) is, in general, a coherent quantum system. Specifically, the activation of non-classicality requires a state of the atom that, during its evolution, features coherence with respect to the energy basis. In this sense, it is an instance of coherent quantum catalysis [25]. This contrasts with most previous examples of quantum catalysis, and a deeper understanding of the role of coherence in catalysis is an exciting future direction.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Henrik Wilming and Nelly H.Y. Ng for valuable discussions. AOJ acknowledge financial support from the Foundation for Polish Science through the TEAM-NET project (contract no. POIR.04.04.00-00-17C1/18-00); MPL, NB and PLB acknowledge the Swiss National Science Foundation for financial support through the Ambizione grant PZ00P2-186067 and the NCCR SwissMAP.

-
- [1] I. Chorkendorff and J. W. Niemantsverdriet, *Concepts of modern catalysis and kinetics* (John Wiley & Sons, 2017).
 - [2] C. Datta, T. V. Kondra, M. Miller, and A. Streltsov, [arXiv:2209.15213](#) (2022).
 - [3] P. Lipka-Bartosik, H. Wilming, and N. H. Y. Ng, Catalysis in quantum information theory, *in preparation* (2023).
 - [4] D. Jonathan and M. B. Plenio, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 3566–3569 (1999).
 - [5] W. van Dam and P. Hayden, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 060302 (2003).
 - [6] S. Turgut, *J. Phys. A Math. Theor.* **40**, 12185 (2007).
 - [7] S. Daftuar and M. Klimesh, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 042314 (2001).
 - [8] X. Sun, R. Duan, and M. Ying, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **51**, 75 (2005).
 - [9] Y. Feng, R. Duan, and M. Ying, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **51**, 1090 (2005).
 - [10] P. Lipka-Bartosik and P. Skrzypczyk, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 080502 (2021).
 - [11] T. V. Kondra, C. Datta, and A. Streltsov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 150503 (2021).
 - [12] C. Datta, T. V. Kondra, M. Miller, and A. Streltsov, [arXiv:2207.05694](#) (2022).
 - [13] F. Brandão, M. Horodecki, N. Ng, J. Oppenheim, and S. Wehner, *PNAS* **112**, 3275–3279 (2015).
 - [14] N. H. Y. Ng, L. Mancinska, C. Cirstoiu, J. Eisert, and S. Wehner, *New J. Phys.* **17**, 085004 (2015).
 - [15] H. Wilming and R. Gallego, *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 041033 (2017).
 - [16] M. P. Müller, *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 041051 (2018).
 - [17] P. Lipka-Bartosik and P. Skrzypczyk, *Phys. Rev. X* **11**, 011061 (2021).
 - [18] N. Shiraishi and T. Sagawa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 150502 (2021).
 - [19] R. Gallego, J. Eisert, and H. Wilming, *New J. Phys.* **18**, 103017 (2016).
 - [20] P. Boes, R. Gallego, N. H. Ng, J. Eisert, and H. Wilming, *Quantum* **4**, 231 (2020).
 - [21] I. Henao and R. Uzdin, *Quantum* **5**, 547 (2021).
 - [22] I. Henao and R. Uzdin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 020403 (2023).
 - [23] J. Son and N. H. Y. Ng, [arXiv:2209.15213](#) (2022).
 - [24] J. Son and N. H. Y. Ng, [arXiv:2303.13020](#) (2023).
 - [25] P. Lipka-Bartosik, M. Perarnau-Llobet, and N. Brunner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 040401 (2023).
 - [26] J. Czartowski, A. de Oliveira Junior, and K. Korzekwa, [arXiv:2303.12840](#) (2023).
 - [27] J. Åberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 150402 (2014).
 - [28] J. A. Vaccaro, S. Croke, and S. M. Barnett, *J. Phys. A Math. Theor.* **51**, 414008 (2018).
 - [29] M. Lostaglio and M. P. Müller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 020403 (2019).
 - [30] R. Takagi and N. Shiraishi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 240501 (2022).
 - [31] P. Char, D. Chakraborty, A. Bhar, I. Chattopadhyay, and D. Sarkar, *Phys. Rev. A* **107**, 012404 (2023).
 - [32] L. van Luijk, R. F. Werner, and H. Wilming, [arXiv:2301.09877](#) (2023).

- [33] I. Marvian and R. W. Spekkens, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 020404 (2019).
- [34] H. Wilming, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 260402 (2021).
- [35] H. Wilming, *Quantum* **6**, 858 (2022).
- [36] R. Rubboli and M. Tomamichel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 120506 (2022).
- [37] S. H. Lie and H. Jeong, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **3**, 043089 (2021).
- [38] P. Boes, J. Eisert, R. Gallego, M. P. Müller, and H. Wilming, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 210402 (2019).
- [39] E. Chitambar and G. Gour, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **91**, 025001 (2019).
- [40] E. T. Jaynes and F. W. Cummings, *Proc. IEEE* **51**, 89 (1963).
- [41] J. Larson and T. Mavrogordatos, *The Jaynes-Cummings Model and Its Descendants* (IOP Publishing, 2021).
- [42] A. D. Greentree, J. Koch, and J. Larson, *J. Phys. B* **46**, 220201 (2013).
- [43] J. I. Cirac and P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 4091 (1995).
- [44] S. J. Phoenix and S. M. Barnett, *Journal of Modern Optics* **40**, 979 (1993), <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500349314551051>.
- [45] E. Hagley, X. Maître, G. Nogues, C. Wunderlich, M. Brune, J. M. Raimond, and S. Haroche, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 1 (1997).
- [46] A. I. Lvovsky and J. Mlynek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 250401 (2002).
- [47] T. J. Bartley, G. Donati, J. B. Spring, X.-M. Jin, M. Barbieri, A. Datta, B. J. Smith, and I. A. Walmsley, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 043820 (2012).
- [48] L.-Y. Hu, J.-N. Wu, Z. Liao, and M. S. Zubairy, *Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics* **49**, 175504 (2016).
- [49] L. Hu, Z. Liao, and M. S. Zubairy, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 012310 (2017).
- [50] R. J. Glauber, *Phys. Rev.* **130**, 2529 (1963).
- [51] V. Veitch, S. H. Mousavian, D. Gottesman, and J. Emerson, *New J. Phys.* **16**, 013009 (2014).
- [52] M. Fannes, B. Nachtergaele, and R. F. Werner, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **144**, 443 (1992).
- [53] A. Frisk Kockum, A. Miranowicz, S. De Liberato, S. Savasta, and F. Nori, *Nat. Rev. Phys.* **1**, 19 (2019).
- [54] A. Periwai, E. S. Cooper, P. Kunkel, J. F. Wienand, E. J. Davis, and M. Schleier-Smith, *Nat.* **600**, 630 (2021).
- [55] I. M. de Buy Wenniger, S. E. Thomas, M. Maffei, S. C. Wein, M. Pont, A. Harouri, A. Lemaître, I. Sagnes, N. Somaschi, A. Auffèves, and P. Senellart, *arXiv:2202.01109* (2022).
- [56] D. Ballester, G. Romero, J. J. García-Ripoll, F. Deppe, and E. Solano, *Phys. Rev. X* **2**, 021007 (2012).
- [57] A. Blais, A. L. Grimsmo, S. M. Girvin, and A. Wallraff, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **93**, 025005 (2021).
- [58] D. Leibfried, R. Blatt, C. Monroe, and D. Wineland, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 281 (2003).
- [59] D. Lv, S. An, Z. Liu, J.-N. Zhang, J. S. Pedernales, L. Lamata, E. Solano, and K. Kim, *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 021027 (2018).
- [60] C. Gerry and P. Knight, *Introductory quantum optics* (Cambridge university press, 2005).
- [61] S. Haroche and J.-M. Raimond, *Exploring the quantum: atoms, cavities, and photons* (Oxford university press, 2006).

Appendix A: Jaynes-Cummings model

The first part of this appendix provides a brief overview of the eigenproblem solution for the Jaynes-Cummings model (for further information, see references [60, 61]). In the following, we derive the final reduced states of the cavity S and the atom C , and explicitly determine the set of atomic states that satisfy the catalytic constraint [Eq. (1)].

1. Eigenproblem

The Jaynes-Cummings interaction Hamiltonian $H_{\text{int}} = g(a\sigma_+ + a^\dagger\sigma_-)$ couples pairs of atom-field states $\{|n+1, g\rangle, |n, e\rangle\}$. Consequently, the Hamiltonian H decouples into a direct product of 2×2 -matrix Hamiltonians, i.e., $H = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} H^{(n)}$, where

$$H^{(n)} \begin{bmatrix} |n+1, g\rangle \\ |n, e\rangle \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (n+1/2)\omega & g\sqrt{n+1} \\ g\sqrt{n+1} & (n+1/2)\omega \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} |n+1, g\rangle \\ |n, e\rangle \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

The eigenvalue problem for this Hamiltonian yields the eigenfrequencies

$$\omega_{\pm}^{(n)} = \left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right)\omega \pm \frac{1}{2}\mu_n, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where $\mu_n = 2g\sqrt{n+1}$ is the n -photon Rabi frequency. In the resonance regime, the corresponding eigenstates are:

$$|n, +\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|n+1, g\rangle + |n, e\rangle), \quad |n, -\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|n+1, g\rangle - |n, e\rangle). \quad (\text{A3})$$

The time evolution operator takes the form of

$$U(t) = e^{i\omega t} |0, g\rangle\langle 0, g| + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-i(n+\frac{1}{2})\omega t} \left\{ \cos \frac{\mu_n t}{2} (|n+1, g\rangle\langle n+1, g| + |n, e\rangle\langle n, e|) - i \sin \frac{\mu_n t}{2} (|n+1, g\rangle\langle n, e| + |n, e\rangle\langle n+1, g|) \right\}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

2. Reduced states of subsystems

The unitary operator given by equation (A4) describes the dynamics of the Jaynes-Cummings model in resonance and under the rotating-wave approximation. After the interaction, the joint system $\sigma_{SC}(t) = U(t)(\rho_S \otimes \chi_C)U^\dagger$ becomes correlated. Let the cavity and the atom be prepared in general mixed states, i.e. $\rho_S = \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} p_{n,m} |n\rangle\langle m|$ and $\chi_C = q|g\rangle\langle g| + r|g\rangle\langle e| + r^*|e\rangle\langle g| + (1-q)|e\rangle\langle e|$. Then, the reduced state of the cavity at time t is obtained by taking the partial trace over the atom's degrees of freedom, i.e. $\sigma_S(t) := \text{tr}_C[\sigma_{SC}(t)]$. More specifically,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_S(t) = & q p_{0,0} |0\rangle\langle 0| + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{i(n+1)\omega t} \left[q p_{0,n+1} \cos\left(\frac{\mu_n t}{2}\right) + i r p_{0,n} \sin\left(\frac{\mu_n t}{2}\right) \right] |0\rangle\langle n+1| + \text{h.c.} \\ & + \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} e^{-i(n-m)\omega t} q p_{n+1,m+1} \left[\sin\left(\frac{\mu_n t}{2}\right) \sin\left(\frac{\mu_m t}{2}\right) |n\rangle\langle m| + \cos\left(\frac{\mu_n t}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\mu_m t}{2}\right) |n+1\rangle\langle m+1| \right] \\ & + \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} e^{-i(n-m)\omega t} (1-q) p_{n,m} \left[\cos\left(\frac{\mu_n t}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\mu_m t}{2}\right) |n\rangle\langle m| + \sin\left(\frac{\mu_n t}{2}\right) \sin\left(\frac{\mu_m t}{2}\right) |n+1\rangle\langle m+1| \right] \\ & + \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} i e^{-i(n-m)\omega t} \cos\left(\frac{\mu_n t}{2}\right) \sin\left(\frac{\mu_m t}{2}\right) [p_{n+1,m} r |n+1\rangle\langle m+1| + p_{n,m+1} r^* |n\rangle\langle m|] + \text{h.c.} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

The atomic state is obtained by marginalizing over the photonic degrees of freedom, i.e. $\chi(t) := \text{tr}_S[\sigma_{SC}(t)]$, which leads to

$$\chi_C(t) = q(t)|g\rangle\langle g| + r(t)|g\rangle\langle e| + r^*(t)|e\rangle\langle g| + [1 - q(t)]|e\rangle\langle e|, \quad (\text{A6})$$

Note that we identify $r := r(0)$ and $q := q(0)$ in what follows. The coefficients $q(t)$ and $r(t)$ are given by

$$q(t) = q \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_n \cos^2\left(\frac{\mu_{n-1} t}{2}\right) + (1-q) p_n \sin^2\left(\frac{\mu_n t}{2}\right) + \text{Re}[i r p_{n+1,n}] \sin(\mu_n t), \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$\begin{aligned} r(t) = & -i e^{i\omega t} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{n,n+1} \sin\left(\frac{\mu_n t}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\mu_{n+1} t}{2}\right) + r e^{i\omega t} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_n \cos\left(\frac{\mu_{n-1} t}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\mu_n t}{2}\right) + r^* \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{n,n+2} \sin\left(\frac{\mu_n t}{2}\right) \sin\left(\frac{\mu_{n+1} t}{2}\right) \\ & + i e^{i\omega t} q \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{n,n+1} \sin\left(\frac{\mu_n t}{2}\right) \left[\cos\left(\frac{\mu_{n-1} t}{2}\right) + \cos\left(\frac{\mu_{n+1} t}{2}\right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A8})$$

3. Catalytic constraint

Here we determine the set of atomic states that evolve catalytically by explicitly solving the catalytic constraint from Eq. (1). More specifically, we are looking for the solution to the following operator equation:

$$\chi_C(\tau) = \text{Tr}_S\{U(\tau)[\rho_S \otimes \chi_C(\tau)]U(\tau)^\dagger\}, \quad (\text{A9})$$

for a fixed time τ . From this point forward, we will abbreviate the diagonal elements of the state ρ_S as $p_n := p_{n,n}$. To obtain the set of states that satisfy Eq.(A9), we first define the auxiliary functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a}_1(t) &= e^{i\omega t} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_n \cos(gt\sqrt{n}) \cos(gt\sqrt{n+1}) - 1, \\ \tilde{a}_2(t) &= i e^{i\omega t} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{n,n+1} \sin(gt\sqrt{n+1}) [\cos(gt\sqrt{n}) + \cos(gt\sqrt{n+2})], \\ \tilde{a}_3(t) &= e^{i\omega t} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{n,n+2} \sin(gt\sqrt{n+1}) \sin(gt\sqrt{n+2}), \\ \tilde{a}_4(t) &= -i e^{i\omega t} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{n,n+1} \sin(gt\sqrt{n+1}) \cos(gt\sqrt{n+2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A10})$$

Note that $\tilde{a}_i = e^{i\omega t} a_i$. Next, we observe that Eq. (A9) gives rise to a set of two equations with two variables. By considering the ground state occupation $q(t)$, we find that the states satisfying Eq. (A9) are given by:

$$q(t) = \frac{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_n \sin^2(gt \sqrt{n+1}) + \text{Re}[ir(t)p_{n+1,n}] \sin(2gt \sqrt{n+1})}{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (p_n + p_{n+1}) \sin^2(gt \sqrt{n+1})}, \quad (\text{A11})$$

whereas the coherence $r(t)$ obeys the equation

$$r(t)\tilde{a}_1(t) + q(t)\tilde{a}_2(t) + r^*(t)\tilde{a}_3(t) + \tilde{a}_4(t) = 0, \quad (\text{A12})$$

whose solution is given by

$$r(t) = \frac{\tilde{a}_3(t)\tilde{a}_4^*(t) - \tilde{a}_1^*(t)\tilde{a}_4(t)}{|\tilde{a}_1(t)|^2 - |\tilde{a}_3(t)|^2} + \frac{\tilde{a}_3(t)\tilde{a}_2^*(t) - \tilde{a}_1^*(t)\tilde{a}_2(t)}{|\tilde{a}_1(t)|^2 - |\tilde{a}_3(t)|^2} q(t). \quad (\text{A13})$$

Substituting Eq. (A13) into Eq. (A11), we find that

$$q(t) = \frac{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_n \sin^2(gt \sqrt{n+1}) + \text{Re}\left[i\left(\frac{\tilde{a}_3(t)\tilde{a}_4^*(t) - \tilde{a}_1^*(t)\tilde{a}_4(t)}{|\tilde{a}_1(t)|^2 - |\tilde{a}_3(t)|^2}\right)p_{n+1,n}\right] \sin(2gt \sqrt{n+1})}{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (p_{n+1} + p_n) \sin^2(gt \sqrt{n+1}) - \text{Re}\left[i\left(\frac{\tilde{a}_3(t)\tilde{a}_2^*(t) - \tilde{a}_1^*(t)\tilde{a}_2(t)}{|\tilde{a}_1(t)|^2 - |\tilde{a}_3(t)|^2}\right)p_{n+1,n}\right] \sin(2gt \sqrt{n+1})}. \quad (\text{A14})$$

Therefore, for a given value of g and time τ , Eqs. (A13) and (A14) uniquely determine a state of the catalyst.

Appendix B: Quantum catalysis and higher moments of observables

In this Appendix we extend the analysis of a catalytic evolution presented in Sec. III. In particular, we derive an expression for the k -th moment of an arbitrary observable O_S on the system S undergoing a catalytic evolution. Specifying this expression to the second moment ($k = 2$) and the particle number observable ($O_S = n_S$) leads to Eq. (9) as stated in the main text. Then, using the results of Appendix A, we obtain an explicit expression for the second moment in a catalytic evolution as specified by the Jaynes-Cummings Hamiltonian.

1. Higher moments of observables under catalytic evolution

Let $O_{SC} = O_S \otimes \mathbb{1}_C + \mathbb{1}_S \otimes O_C$ be an additive and conserved observable on the joint system SC . In a catalytic protocol governed by a unitary U we have $\sigma_{SC} = U(\rho_S \otimes \chi_C)U^\dagger$ such that $\sigma_C = \chi_C$. The conservation assumption means that $[U, O_{SC}] = 0$. The k -th moment of observable A on the system S before and after the catalytic process are respectively given by

$$\langle O_S^k \rangle_\rho := \text{Tr}[O_S^k \rho_S], \quad \langle O_S^k \rangle_\sigma := \text{Tr}[O_S^k \sigma_S] = \text{Tr}[(O_S^k \otimes \mathbb{1}_C) \sigma_{SC}]. \quad (\text{B1})$$

Let us write $O_{SC}^k = O_S^k \otimes \mathbb{1}_C + \mathbb{1}_S \otimes O_C^k + \Delta_k$, where we defined an auxiliary observable

$$\Delta_k := O_{SC}^k - O_S^k \otimes \mathbb{1}_C - \mathbb{1}_S \otimes O_C^k = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{i} O_S^{k-i-1} \otimes O_C^i. \quad (\text{B2})$$

For example, for $k = 2$ we have $\Delta_2 = 2O_S \otimes O_C$. Using this to express $\langle O_S^k \rangle_\sigma$ yields

$$\langle O_S^k \rangle_\sigma = \text{Tr}[O_{SC}^k \sigma_{SC}] - \text{Tr}[(\mathbb{1}_S \otimes O_C^k) \sigma_{SC}] - \text{Tr}[\Delta_k \sigma_{SC}] = \text{Tr}[O_S^k \sigma_S] - \langle O_C^k \rangle_\sigma - \text{Tr}[\Delta_k \sigma_{SC}]. \quad (\text{B3})$$

Importantly, due to the conservation law $[U, O_{SC}] = 0$, we have $\text{Tr}[O_{SC}^k \sigma_{SC}] = \text{Tr}[O_{SC}^k \rho_{SC}] = \langle O_S^k \rangle_\rho + \langle O_C^k \rangle_\rho + \text{Tr}[\Delta_k \rho_{SC}]$. Therefore we can rewrite Eq. (B3) as

$$\langle O_S^k \rangle_\sigma = \langle O_S^k \rangle_\rho + \langle O_C^k \rangle_\rho - \langle O_C^k \rangle_\sigma + \text{Tr}[\Delta_k (\rho_{SC} - \sigma_{SC})] = \langle O_S^k \rangle_\rho + \text{Tr}[\Delta_k (\rho_{SC} - \sigma_{SC})], \quad (\text{B4})$$

where we used the fact that $\langle O_C^k \rangle_\rho = \langle O_C^k \rangle_\sigma$ due to the catalytic constraint. By taking $k = 2$ we obtain the desired result.

2. Second moment of photon statistics in the catalytic Jaynes-Cummings evolution

Consider the second moment of photon statistics

$$\langle n_S^2 \rangle_\sigma = \langle n_S^2 \rangle_\rho + 2 \left[(1-q) \langle n_S \rangle_\rho - \langle n_S \otimes |e\rangle\langle e|_C \rangle_\sigma \right], \quad (\text{B5})$$

where $q := \langle e|\chi_C|e \rangle$ is the excited-state occupation of the catalyst, $\sigma = U(\rho_S \otimes \chi_C)U^\dagger$ and $\text{Tr}_S[\sigma] = \chi_C$. Let us focus on the following term:

$$\langle n_S \otimes |e\rangle\langle e|_C \rangle_\sigma = \text{Tr} \left[U^\dagger (n_S \otimes |e\rangle\langle e|_C) U (\rho_S \otimes \chi_C) \right] = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k \text{Tr} \left[U^\dagger |k, e\rangle\langle k, e| U (\rho_S \otimes \chi) \right], \quad (\text{B6})$$

Using Eq. (A4), we can write

$$U^\dagger |k, e\rangle = e^{i(k+\frac{1}{2})\chi t} (c_k |k, e\rangle - i s_k |k+1, g\rangle), \quad (\text{B7})$$

where $c_k := \cos(gt\sqrt{k+1})$ and $s_k := \sin(gt\sqrt{k+1})$. Substituting the above result into Eq. (B6) leads to

$$\langle n_S \otimes |e\rangle\langle e|_C \rangle_\sigma = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k \left[(1-q) c_k^2 p_{k,k} + 2 s_k c_k \text{Im}(p_{k+1,k} r) + (1-q) s_k^2 p_{k+1,k+1} \right]. \quad (\text{B8})$$

Appendix C: Exploring catalytic evolution in the Jaynes-Cummings model

In this Appendix we examine different aspects of the catalytic evolution in the Jaynes-Cummings model.

1. Which states of the cavity cannot have their non-classicality enhanced?

Let us start by examining Eqs. (A13) and (A14) under the assumption that the initial state of the cavity is an incoherent mixture of Fock states, i.e. $\rho_S = \sum_{n,m} p_{n,m} |n\rangle\langle m|$ with $p_{n,m} = 0$ if $n \neq m$. In this case, from Eqs. (13) and (14) we can infer that the only feasible states of the catalyst are those with $q_{\text{coh}} = 0$ and $r = 0$. Consequently, the atomic state is incoherent in the energy basis and its ground state occupation takes the form of

$$q = \frac{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_n \sin^2(gt\sqrt{n+1})}{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (p_n + p_{n+1}) \sin^2(gt\sqrt{n+1})}. \quad (\text{C1})$$

Let us now demonstrate that the second-order auto-correlation function $g^{(2)}$ of a pure Fock state, i.e. $\rho_S = |k\rangle\langle k|_S$, cannot decrease under a catalytic evolution. To do this, we will prove that the quantity

$$g^{(2)}(\sigma_S) - g^{(2)}(\rho_S) = \frac{\text{Tr}[(a^{\dagger 2} a^2) \sigma_S]}{\text{Tr}[(a^{\dagger} a) \sigma_S]} - \frac{\text{Tr}[(a^{\dagger 2} a^2) \rho_S]}{\text{Tr}[(a^{\dagger} a) \rho_S]} = \frac{\text{Tr}[(a^{\dagger 2} a^2) (\sigma_S - \rho_S)]}{\text{Tr}[(a^{\dagger} a) \rho_S]} \quad (\text{C2})$$

is nonnegative. This will be accomplished by showing that the following inequality holds:

$$\text{Tr}[(a^{\dagger 2} a^2) (\sigma_S - \rho_S)] \geq 0. \quad (\text{C3})$$

In what follows, we will omit the index S as well as any explicit reference to the variables' dependence on time. When the initial state of the cavity is a Fock state, then Eq. (A5) implies that the state of the cavity after the catalytic evolution is given by

$$\sigma = \left[(1-q) \cos^2(gt\sqrt{k+1}) + q \cos^2(gt\sqrt{k}) \right] |k\rangle\langle k| + q \sin^2(gt\sqrt{k}) |k-1\rangle\langle k-1| + (1-q) \sin^2(gt\sqrt{k+1}) |k+1\rangle\langle k+1|, \quad (\text{C4})$$

where q is determined by Eq. (C1), which for this particular case takes the form:

$$q = \frac{\sin^2(gt\sqrt{k+1})}{\sin^2(gt\sqrt{k+1}) + \sin^2(gt\sqrt{k})} \quad \text{and} \quad 1-q = \frac{\sin^2(gt\sqrt{k})}{\sin^2(gt\sqrt{k+1}) + \sin^2(gt\sqrt{k})}. \quad (\text{C5})$$

By substituting Eq.(C5) into Eq.(A5) and introducing the notation $\psi = \frac{1}{2}(|n-1\rangle\langle n-1| + |n+1\rangle\langle n+1|)$, we obtain:

$$\sigma = \frac{\sin^2(gt\sqrt{k})\cos^2(gt\sqrt{k+1}) + \sin^2(gt\sqrt{k+1})\cos^2(gt\sqrt{k})}{\sin^2(gt\sqrt{k+1}) + \sin^2(gt\sqrt{k})}\rho + \frac{2\sin^2(gt\sqrt{k})\sin^2(gt\sqrt{k+1})}{\sin^2(gt\sqrt{k+1}) + \sin^2(gt\sqrt{k})}\psi. \quad (C6)$$

Alternatively, we can express the above equation as $\sigma = t\rho + (1-t)\psi$, where

$$t = \frac{\sin^2(gt\sqrt{k})\cos^2(gt\sqrt{k+1}) + \sin^2(gt\sqrt{k+1})\cos^2(gt\sqrt{k})}{\sin^2(gt\sqrt{k+1}) + \sin^2(gt\sqrt{k})}. \quad (C7)$$

With these results at hand, we can manipulate Eq. (C3) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}[(a^{\dagger 2}a^2)(\sigma - \rho)] &= (1-t)\text{Tr}[(a^{\dagger 2}a^2)(\psi - \rho)] = \frac{(1-t)}{2}\text{Tr}[(a^{\dagger 2}a^2)(|k+1\rangle\langle k+1| + |k-1\rangle\langle k-1|)] - (1-t)\text{Tr}[(a^{\dagger 2}a^2)|k\rangle\langle k|] \\ &= \frac{(1-t)}{2}[(k+1)k + (k-1)(k-2) - 2k(k-1)] = (1-t) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (C8)$$

Thus, we conclude that second-order coherence $g^{(2)}$ can only increase during a catalytic processes involving a pure Fock state, i.e.

$$g^{(2)}(\sigma) - g^{(2)}(\rho) \geq 0. \quad (C9)$$

It is not clear whether there exist other states of the cavity whose non-classicality, as witnessed by the $g^{(2)}$ function, cannot be further enhanced. We leave this interesting problem for future work.

2. Which states of the atom allow to generate non-classicality?

An interesting question is which states of the atom can satisfy the catalytic constraint from Eq. (1) for some value of the stopping time τ , and for a fixed initial (coherent) state of the cavity, i.e. $\rho_S = |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|$ with amplitude $|\alpha|^2$. In what follows we will refer to the set of all atomic states that satisfy Eq. (1) as the *set of catalytic states*. Moreover, we observe that not every state in this set can lead to a final state of the cavity that is non-classical.

To investigate these questions, we characterize numerically the catalytic set for three initial coherent states of the cavity corresponding to $\alpha \in \{0.2, 1/\sqrt{2}, 25\}$. Results are presented in Fig. 5, where the catalytic set is shown in grey. Additionally, we also determine which states in the catalytic set can generate non-classicality, focusing on the $g^{(2)}$ function here. Similarly to Fig. 4(b) of the main text, we represent these states in colour, the latter indicating the level of non-classicality being generated. Interestingly, these sets vary significantly with $|\alpha|$. Also, when $|\alpha|$ is large, catalytic states are distributed close to the equatorial plane of the Bloch sphere, and we could find no instance where non-classicality is generated.




FIG. 5. **Set of catalytic state for different initial state preparation.** Atomic states (projection of the $y-z$ plane of the Bloch ball) that satisfy the catalytic constraint (gray) for (a) $\alpha = 0.2$, (b) $\alpha = 1/\sqrt{2}$, and (c) $\alpha = 25$ are highlighted by a uniform gradient if they produce $g^2(\sigma_S) < 1$. All panels were generated by imposing a limit on interaction time with $\tau \leq 100$ and taking 10^6 samples. The parameters are $\omega = 2\pi$ and $g = \pi$.

3. Boosting non-classicality via a catalytic process for incoherent mixtures of Fock states

For an incoherent mixture of Fock states $\rho = \sum_n p_n |n\rangle\langle n|$, the second-order coherence is given by

$$g^{(2)}(\rho) = \frac{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n(n-1)p_n}{(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} np_n)^2}. \quad (\text{C10})$$

Assuming that the initial state of the cavity is prepared in a state $\rho_S = \frac{1}{4} |0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{3}{4} |2\rangle\langle 2|$, then its second-order coherence is $g^{(2)}(\rho_S) = 2/3$. According to Eq. (A5), the state of the cavity after the catalytic protocol (at time $t = \tau$) takes the form of

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_S = \frac{1}{4} [q + (1-q) \cos^2 g\tau] |0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{3q}{4} \left[\sin^2(g\tau\sqrt{2}) + \frac{(1-q)}{4} \sin^2 g\tau \right] |1\rangle\langle 1| + \frac{3}{4} [q \cos^2(g\tau\sqrt{2}) + (1-q) \cos^2(g\tau\sqrt{3})] |2\rangle\langle 2| \\ + \frac{3(1-q)}{4} \sin^2(g\tau\sqrt{3}) |3\rangle\langle 3| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C11})$$

where q is determined by Eq. (C1):

$$q = \frac{\sin^2(g\tau) + 3 \sin^2(g\tau\sqrt{3})}{\sin^2(g\tau) + 3 [\sin^2(g\tau\sqrt{3}) + \sin^2(g\tau\sqrt{2})]}. \quad (\text{C12})$$

Using Eq. (C10), the second-order coherence for the final state is given by

$$g^{(2)}(\sigma_S) = \frac{2}{3} \left\{ q \cos^2(g\tau\sqrt{2}) + (1-q) [1 + 2 \sin^2(g\tau\sqrt{3})] \right\}. \quad (\text{C13})$$

Therefore, for $g\tau = 7.5\pi$, we obtain $g^{(2)} \approx 0.505$, indicating that non-classicality in the mode was catalytically increased.

Interestingly, when the cavity is initially prepared in a mixture of Fock states, we observe that the catalyst must necessarily be in an incoherent state for satisfying the catalytic constraint.