

Comment on “Typicality for Generalized Microcanonical Ensemble”

In a recent Letter, Reimann [1] has proposed an interesting heuristic argument for the typicality of a particular microcanonical ensemble. However, closer examination reveals that the claimed results cannot be substantiated.

The main claim of Ref. [1] can be summarised as follows: Provided that a probability distribution over the space of quantum states is such that (i) it is uniformly distributed over the relative phase variables and the amplitude variables are independently distributed; and (ii) the associated density matrix satisfies $\text{tr}\rho^2 \ll 1$, then the quantity $\sigma_{A_\psi}^2$ defined by

$$\sigma_{A_\psi}^2 = \mathbb{E} [(A_\psi - \bar{A})^2]$$

is small. Here $\bar{A} = \mathbb{E}[A]$ denotes the ensemble average (unconditional expectation) of A , and $A_\psi = \langle \psi|A|\psi \rangle$ denotes the expectation of A conditional on the random pure state $|\psi\rangle$ (cf. [2]). In what follows I shall examine (a) the plausibility of the two assumptions, (b) the validity of the claim that $\sigma_{A_\psi}^2$ is small for generic observables, and (c) the feasibility of the so-called typicality argument.

(a) First, consider the plausibility of the proposed equilibrium states. The condition (i) on $\{\phi_n\}$ is a classical result that can be established explicitly [3], whereas justification for the independence of $\{\rho_n\}$ is missing [4]. As regards condition (ii), one can show that the values of ρ_n are completely determined by the initial values of a commuting family of observables that includes the Hamiltonian [3]. Therefore, *a priori* one cannot decide whether this condition is plausible without specific knowledge of the system under consideration. Otherwise stated, for a closed and isolated system, $\text{tr}\rho^2$ is a constant of motion, and thus one cannot decide whether it should be large or small from the dynamics.

(b) As regards the magnitude of $\sigma_{A_\psi}^2$, in Ref. [1] the author obtains the upper bound $\Delta_A^2 \text{tr}\rho^2$, where Δ_A is the difference between the largest and the smallest eigenvalues of A . Clearly, $\text{tr}\rho^2$ assumes the minimum value N^{-1} if $\bar{\rho}_n = N^{-1}$ for all n . However, this is multiplied by Δ_A^2 , and if the spectrum of A grows linearly in the levels (like the energy eigenvalues of a spin system or a harmonic oscillator), then we have $\Delta_A^2 \sim N^2$, which outweighs $\text{tr}\rho^2 \sim N^{-1}$. Indeed, one can calculate $\sigma_{A_\psi}^2$ directly by use of the measure introduced in Ref. [1] to establish that $\sigma_{A_\psi}^2$ can be either very large or as small as zero, depending on the observable A . Thus, the claim

that $\sigma_{A_\psi}^2$ is small for an “arbitrary observable” A is false.

(c) I conclude by remarking that the variance resulting from measurements of A is determined by the sum

$$\sigma_A^2 = \mathbb{E} [(A_\psi - \bar{A})^2] + \mathbb{E} [(A^2)_\psi - A_\psi^2]$$

of the *variance of the conditional expectation* and the *expectation of the conditional variance*, where $(A^2)_\psi = \langle \psi|A^2|\psi \rangle$. Now the first term largely (but not exclusively) reflects the statistical mixture of the state, and vanishes, in particular, for pure states. The second term largely (but not exclusively) reflects the pure quantum uncertainty of the observable. If the first of the two terms is small for generic observables, then it implies that the purity of the state is correspondingly high, so that $\text{tr}\rho^2 \lesssim 1$. Thus, any attempt to establish the generality of the smallness of the first term, starting from a highly mixed ensemble with $\text{tr}\rho^2 \ll 1$ as introduced in Ref. [1], would be futile. If the ensemble is highly mixed, then only under special circumstances can this quantity be small. Therefore, starting with a highly mixed ensemble satisfying the conditions (i) and (ii), one cannot justify any microcanonical typicality argument, even if one accepts the premise that small $\sigma_{A_\psi}^2$ implies typicality.

Dorje C. Brody

Department of Mathematics

Imperial College London

London SW7 2BZ, United Kingdom

PACS numbers: 05.30.-d

[1] Reimann, P. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 160404 (2007).

[2] The use of probability measures on the space of pure states to establish the foundations of the quantum microcanonical ensemble goes back to Khinchin, A. Y. *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Statistics* (Graylock Press, Toronto 1960). See also Brody, D. C., Hook, D. W., and Hughston, L. P. *Proc. R. Soc. London A* **463**, 2021 (2007) and references cited therein. One of the issues involved here is the proper treatment of infinite-dimensional systems, since the measure in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ is not well defined, contrary to the relevant assertion in [1].

[3] Brody, D. C., Hook, D. W., and Hughston, L. P. *J. Phys.* **A40**, F503 (2007); *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **67**, 012025 (2007).

[4] The assertion that vanishing correlation “almost always” implies independence is factually false. See Drouot Mari, D. and Kotz, S. *Correlation and Dependence* (Imperial College Press, London 2001) for numerous counter examples.