

Employing feedback in adiabatic quantum dynamics

Armen E. Allahverdyan¹ and Guenter Mahler²

¹*Yerevan Physics Institute, Alikhanian Brothers Street 2, Yerevan 375036, Armenia,*

²*Institute of Theoretical Physics I, University of Stuttgart, Pfaffenwaldring 57, 70550 Stuttgart, Germany*

We study quantum adiabatic dynamics, where the slowly moving field is influenced by system's state (feedback). The information for the feedback is gained from non-disturbing measurements done on an ensemble of identical non-interacting systems. The situation without feedback is governed by the adiabatic theorem: adiabatic energy level populations stay constant, while the adiabatic eigenvectors get a specific phase contribution (Berry phase). However, under feedback the adiabatic theorem does not hold: the adiabatic populations satisfy a closed equation of motion that coincides with the replicator dynamics well-known by its applications in evolutionary game theory. The feedback generates a new gauge-invariant adiabatic phase, which is free of the constraints on the Berry phase (e.g., the new phase is non-zero even for real adiabatic eigenfunctions).

PACS numbers: 03.65.-w, 05.30.Ch, 03.65.Vf

The adiabatic theorem of quantum mechanics governs the evolution of a quantum system subject to slowly varying external fields. Its applications span a vast array of fields, such as two-level systems (nuclei undergoing magnetic resonance or atoms interacting with a laser field), quantum field theory (where a low-energy effective theory is derived by integrating out fast, high-energy degrees of freedom), and Berry's phase [1–3]. This phase and the adiabatic theorem also find applications in quantum information processing [4, 5]. For a recent discussion on the validity of the adiabatic approach see [6].

A general perspective of the quantum adiabatic physics is that it studies a system subject to a slow, *open loop* (i.e., no feedback) control, where the evolution of the external fields is given *a priori* via time-dependent parameters of the system Hamiltonian. In view of numerous application of this setup, it is natural to wonder about the quantum adiabatic *closed-loop* control, where the external controlling fields evolve under feedback from the controlled quantum system. Any feedback needs information on the evolution of the system. This information is to be gained via measurements, which in the quantum situation are normally related with unpredictable disturbances and irreversibility. Thus quantum control has been restricted to open-system dynamics [7].

However, also quantum measurements can be non-disturbing, if N non-interacting quantum particles (spins, *etc*) couple to the proper measuring apparatus. For $N \gg 1$ [analog of the classical limit] one can measure single-particle observables (almost) without disturbing the single-particle density matrix, since the disturbance caused by such measurements scales as $\frac{1}{N\sigma^2}$, where σ is the measurement precision [8]. The knowledge of these observables allows to implement feedback [9]. Non-disturbing measurements on ensembles of few-level systems are routinely employed in NMR physics (e.g., in ensemble computation) and quantum optics [10–12].

Here we develop adiabatic theory under feedback obtained via such non-disturbing measurements.

Basic equations. Consider a d -level quantum system described by a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ (generalization to mixed states is indicated below). The system evolves according to the Schrodinger equation with Hamiltonian $H[R(t)]$, where $R(t)$ is a classical controlling parameter ($\hbar = 1$):

$$i\dot{|\psi(t)\rangle} = H[R(t)]|\psi(t)\rangle. \quad (1)$$

By means of a continuous non-disturbing measurement performed on an ensemble of identical, non-interacting systems (each one described by $|\psi(t)\rangle$) one finds the average $\langle\psi(t)|A|\psi(t)\rangle$ of a monitoring observable A (in NMR physics A typically corresponds to the magnetization). This average enters the feedback dynamics of R

$$\dot{R} = \varepsilon F(R, \langle\psi(t)|A|\psi(t)\rangle), \quad (2)$$

where $\varepsilon \ll 1$ is a small dimensionless parameter. We assume that $F(\cdot, \cdot)$ is bounded from above, which means that R is a slow variable: its derivative is bounded by a small number. For $F = F(R)$ (no feedback) we recover the standard adiabatic setup. The dynamics (1) conserves the purity of $|\psi(t)\rangle$, but the overlap $\langle\phi(t)|\psi(t)\rangle$ between two different wave-functions is not conserved in time, since H depends on $|\psi(t)\rangle\langle\psi(t)|$ via (2).

For a particular case $F = -\langle\psi|\partial_R H|\psi\rangle$, Eqs. (1, 2) can be viewed as a *hybrid* dynamics, where a classical particle with coordinate R performs an overdamped motion and couples to the quantum system. Then ε in (2) corresponds to an inverse damping constant, while $\langle\psi|\partial_R H|\psi\rangle$ is the average (mean-field) force acting on the particle. Hybrid theories are frequently employed in optics and chemical physics; see [13] for the current state of art.

Let us now introduce the adiabatic eigenresolution of the Hamiltonian for a fixed value of R ($n = 1, \dots, d$):

$$H[R]|n[R]\rangle = E_n[R]|n[R]\rangle, \quad \langle n[R]|m[R]\rangle = \delta_{mn}. \quad (3)$$

For simplicity we assume that the adiabatic energy levels are not degenerate. The representation (3) has a gauge-freedom: $|n[R]\rangle \rightarrow e^{i\alpha_n[R]}|n[R]\rangle$, where $\alpha_n[R]$ is an arbitrary single-valued function depending on n and R . All

observables should be gauge-invariant. Expand $|\psi(t)\rangle$ as

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \sum_n c_n(t) e^{i\gamma_n(t)} |n[R(t)\rangle, \quad (4)$$

$$\gamma_n(t) \equiv - \int_0^t dt' E_n[R(t')], \quad c_n(t) = \langle n[R(t)] | \psi \rangle e^{-i\gamma_n(t)},$$

where $\gamma_n(t)$ are the dynamical phases, while c_n are the adiabatic amplitudes. One gets from (1, 2, 4):

$$\dot{c}_n = -\varepsilon \sum_k c_k \langle n|k'\rangle F(R, c, e^{i\Delta\gamma(t)}) e^{i(\gamma_k(t)-\gamma_n(t))}, \quad (5)$$

where $|k'\rangle = \partial_R |k[R]\rangle$. The amplitudes c_n and R are slow variables, since, e.g., $|\dot{c}_n|$ is bounded from above by the small ε in (5). However, the contribution from the dynamical phases γ_n changes fast, since on the slow time $\tau = \varepsilon t$ it behaves as $\sim e^{i\tau/\varepsilon}$; see (4). If the spacings between the adiabatic energy levels $E_n[R]$ remain large enough, the existence of some intermediate time τ_f is guaranteed, over which the dynamical phase contribution performs many oscillations, but c_n and R do not change appreciably. The adiabatic approximation divides c_n into the time-averaged (over τ_f) part \bar{c}_n and the small (at least as $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$) oscillating part: $c_n = \bar{c}_n + \delta c_n$ [14]. To leading order we neglect in the RHS of (5) all the oscillating factors and substitute $c \rightarrow \bar{c}$ and $R \rightarrow \bar{R}$:

$$\dot{\bar{c}}_n^* = - \sum_k \bar{c}_k \langle n|k'\rangle \overline{F(\bar{R}, \bar{c}, e^{i\Delta\gamma})} e^{i(\gamma_k - \gamma_n)}, \quad (6)$$

where $\tau = \varepsilon t$, $\bar{X} \equiv \int_0^{\tau_f} \frac{ds}{\tau_f} X(s)$, and where $X^\bullet \equiv dX/d\tau$.

Linear feedback. The simplest example of feedback is

$$F = \langle \psi | A | \psi \rangle = \sum_{nm} \bar{c}_n^* c_m A_{nm} e^{i(\gamma_m - \gamma_n)}, \quad (7)$$

where $\langle n|A|m\rangle \equiv A_{nm}$. Eq. (7) can be regarded as the first term of the Taylor expansion assuming that $F(x)$ depends weakly on its argument. Eq. (6) leads to

$$\dot{\bar{c}}_l^* = - \sum_{knm} \bar{c}_k \langle l|k'\rangle \bar{c}_n^* \bar{c}_m A_{nm} \overline{e^{i(\gamma_m - \gamma_n + \gamma_k - \gamma_l)}}. \quad (8)$$

In working out (8) we shall assume that the time-integrated energy-level differences are distinct:

$$\gamma_m(t) - \gamma_n(t) \neq \gamma_l(t) - \gamma_k(t), \quad \text{if } m \neq n \text{ and } m \neq l. \quad (9)$$

This condition is generic for few-level systems. It does not hold for cases like harmonic oscillator, which should be separately worked out from (8). Now in the RHS of (8) the non-zero terms are those with $m = n$ and $l = k$, and those with $m = l$ and $k = n$ (but $n \neq l$, not to count twice the term $m = n = k = l$):

$$\dot{\bar{c}}_l^* = -\bar{c}_l \langle l|l'\rangle \bar{R}^\bullet - \bar{c}_l \sum_{n(\neq l)} |\bar{c}_n|^2 \langle l|n'\rangle A_{nl}, \quad (10)$$

where $\langle l|l'\rangle$ is imaginary, since $\partial_R \langle l|l\rangle = 1$. The nontrivial (second) term in the RHS of (10) is due to non-diagonal elements of A . Defining the phase and module of \bar{c}_n ,

$$\bar{c}_n = \sqrt{p_n} e^{i\phi_n}, \quad \sum_n p_n = 1, \quad (11)$$

we get from (10) [and likewise from (2, 7)]

$$p_l^\bullet = -2p_l \sum_{n(\neq l)} p_n \Re\{ \langle l|n'\rangle A_{nl} \}, \quad (12)$$

$$\phi_l^\bullet = i \langle l|l'\rangle R^\bullet - \sum_{n(\neq l)} p_n \Im\{ \langle l|n'\rangle A_{nl} \}, \quad (13)$$

$$\bar{R}^\bullet = \sum_n p_n A_{nn}. \quad (14)$$

Eqs. (12–14) are our central results. Before exploring them in more detail let us discuss the standard (open-loop, i.e., no feedback) adiabatics, where $A = A(R)$ is a c-number. Now R moves in a prescribed way according to $R^\bullet = A(R)$. Eq. (12) leads to the conservation of the probabilities $p_l^\bullet = 0$ (adiabatic theorem): the system does not get enough energy to move out of the given energy level [1]. The RHS of (13) reduces to Berry's factor $\phi_{B,l}^\bullet = i \langle l|l'\rangle R^\bullet$. As seen from (4), though $\phi_{B,l}$ is by itself not gauge-invariant, it does bring an observable (Berry phase) contribution in a non-diagonal average over the state $|\psi(t)\rangle = \sum_n c_n(0) e^{i\phi_{B,n}(\tau) + i\gamma_n(t)}$. The Berry phase was observed in numerous experiments; see [2, 3] for review. It is constrained by the following conditions. 1. The Berry phase nullifies, $\langle l|l'\rangle = 0$, if the adiabatic eigenvectors $|l\rangle$ can be made real via a gauge transformation, e.g., a spinless particle without magnetic field. (This statement does not hold if there are level-crossings.) 2. $\phi_{B,l} = 0$ for a cyclic motion of a single slow parameter R , where R is switched on at the initial time and then switched off at the final time. The Berry phase may be different from zero if there is more than one slow parameter $\mathbf{R} = (R_1, R_2, \dots)$ on a closed curve \mathcal{C} : $\mathbf{R}(0) = \mathbf{R}(\tau)$ [2]. Then one gets a gauge-invariant expression $\phi_{B,l} = i \oint_{\mathcal{C}} d\mathbf{R} \langle l | \partial_{\mathbf{R}} l \rangle$ [2, 3].

Closed-loop adiabatics. Eq. (12) for p_l arises out of the averaging over the fast dynamic phases under condition (9). Eq. (12) is non-linear over p_n due to the feedback. The probabilities p_n are no longer conserved [due to the resonance between the oscillations of c_n and those of R , see (8)], and if p_n 's are known, the phases ϕ_l are obtained directly from (13). The matrix

$$a_{ln} \equiv -2\Re\{ \langle l | \partial_{R_n} n \rangle \langle n | A | l \rangle \}, \quad a_{ln} = -a_{ln}, \quad (15)$$

in (12) is antisymmetric; in particular, $a_{ll} = 0$, which means $\sum_l p_l(\tau) = 1$. The edges of the probability simplex, e.g. $p_l = \delta_{ll}$, are (possibly unstable) stationary solutions of (12), and $p_l(\tau)$ is always non-negative.

It is noteworthy that (12) coincides with the replicator equation for a zero-sum population game [15, 16]. Consider a population of agents that consists of groups $l = 1, \dots, d$. The fraction p_l of each group in the total population changes due to interaction between the groups, so that p_l^\bullet is proportional to p_l itself (*autocatalyst principle*), while the proportionality coefficient is the average payoff of the group l : $p_l^\bullet = p_l \sum_n a_{ln} p_n$ [15, 16]. Here the payoff matrix a_{ln} determines the gain (or the fitness increase) of the group l in its interaction with the group




FIG. 1: Adiabatic amplitudes c_{nl} versus τ for a three-level system. c_{nl} are obtained from solving (22) in the case $A = -\partial_R H$ (hybrid dynamics). The external field is not acting on the first energy level: $|\langle 2|1'\rangle| = |\langle 3|1'\rangle| = 0$; thus c_{11} is constant. We put $|\langle 2'|3\rangle| = 1$. All $|k\rangle$ are real (no Berry phases), and additionally the adiabatic energies are constant: $A_{ll} = -\partial_R E_l = 0$; thus \bar{R} is constant according to (23). Normal curve: c_{23} . Dashed curve: c_{12} . Thick curve: c_{13} . Thick dashed curved: c_{22} . Recall that $c_{33} + c_{22} = \text{const}$.

n . The actual mechanism of this interaction depends on the concrete implementation of the model (inheritance, learning, imitation, infection, etc) [16]. The condition $a_{nl} = -a_{ln}$ means a zero-sum game (e.g., poker): the gain of one group equals to the loss of the other. Thus in (12) the population game, with (in general) τ -dependent payoffs a_{ln} , is now played by the energy levels. Interesting features of the replicator equation can be found without solving it; see (16–19).

For the open-loop control changing of R on the slow time-scale is mandatory, otherwise no adiabatic motion occurs at all. The closed-loop situation is different, since now for $\langle n|A|n\rangle = 0$ the slow motion of R is absent, $\bar{R}^\bullet = 0$ [see (14)], with still non-trivial adiabatic dynamics. Thus R does move on the fast time, but this motion averages out on the slow time. Let us focus on this situation, since we cannot study (12–14) in full generality.

Eqs. (12, 15), now with τ -independent a_{ln} , is conveniently studied via the time-averages [16]:

$$\frac{1}{T} \ln \frac{p_l(T)}{p_l(0)} = \sum_n a_{ln} \bar{p}_n(T), \quad \bar{p}_n(T) = \int_0^T \frac{d\tau}{T} p_n(\tau). \quad (16)$$

There are now two different dynamic scenarios depending on the concrete form of τ -independent a_{lp} in (12, 15).

1. If all $p_l(t)$ (which were non-zero at the initial time $\tau = 0$) stay non-zero for all times, $\ln p_l(T)$ in the LHS of (16) is limited, which means that this LHS can be neglected for $T \rightarrow \infty$. We then get from (16) [15, 16]

$$\sum_n a_{ln} \bar{p}_n(\infty) = 0. \quad (17)$$

Thus all $p_l(t)$ may remain non-zero for all times provided that there is a probability vector $\bar{p}(\infty)$ that satisfies (17). Clearly, $\bar{p}(\infty)$ is a stationary state of (12, 15). Recall that

the [non-negative] relative entropy is defined as

$$S[\bar{p}(\infty)|p(\tau)] = \sum_l \bar{p}_l(\infty) \ln [\bar{p}_l(\infty)/p_l(\tau)], \quad (18)$$

where $p(t)$ is a time-dependent solution of (12). $S[\bar{p}_n(\infty)|p(\tau)]$ is equal to zero if and only if $\bar{p}(\infty) = p(\tau)$. Due to (17), $S[\bar{p}_n(\infty)|p(t)]$ is a constant of motion [thus an adiabatic invariant], since

$$S^\bullet[\bar{p}(\infty)|p(\tau)] = \sum_{ln} p_l(\tau) a_{ln} \bar{p}_n(\infty). \quad (19)$$

This constant can be associated with Hamiltonian, and then (12) can be recast into a Hamiltonian form [15]. The non-linearity of this dynamics is essential, since it can demonstrate chaos for $d \geq 5$ [18]. In some closely related systems the chaotic behavior was seen in [17].

2. If the matrix a_{ln} is such that (17) does not have any probability vector solution, $\frac{1}{T} \ln \frac{p_l(T)}{p_l(0)}$ in (16) is necessarily finite for at least one l . The corresponding probability $p_l(T)$ goes to zero (for a large T): $p_l(T) \rightarrow p_l(\infty) = 0$, so that for all k one has $\sum_n a_{kn} \bar{p}_n(\infty) \leq 0$. This inequality is strict at least for $k = l$. Eq. (19) shows that $S[\bar{p}(\infty)|p(\tau)]$ now decays to zero meaning that $p(\tau)$ relaxes to $\bar{p}(\infty)$. This relaxation is due to the non-linearity of (12); it is impossible without feedback.

Eq. (13) for the phases integrates as

$$\phi_l(\tau) = -\tau \sum_{n(\neq l)} \bar{p}_n(\tau) b_{ln}, \quad b_{ln} \equiv \Im \{ \langle l|n'\rangle \langle n|A|l\rangle \} \quad (20)$$

where $\bar{p}_n(\tau)$ satisfies to the algebraic equation (16). Note that b_{ln} is symmetric: $b_{ln} = b_{nl}$. Eq. (20) gives the phases of the adiabatic (linear) feedback control. It is clear that $\phi_l(\tau)$ is free of the constraints for the open-loop (Berry) phase $\phi_{B,l}$: *i*) it is explicitly gauge-invariant together with b_{ln} ; *ii*) its existence does not require complex adiabatic eigenvectors $|l\rangle$, provided that the monitoring observable A has at least some complex elements $\langle n|A|l\rangle$; *iii*) it does not require several control parameters for cyclic processes; *iv*) even if a_{nl} , defined via (15), is zero, i.e., if the probabilities p_n are conserved, the feedback-driven phases ϕ_l in (20) can be non-zero. Note that $\phi_l = 0$ if the evolution starts from a strictly one adiabatic eigenvector $p_n(0) = \delta_{nk}$ (however this stationary state of (12) need not be stable, as we saw above).

Examples. We now apply our findings to two simple examples. For a two-level system (12, 15) reduce to $p_1(\tau) = \frac{p_1(0)e^{a_{12}\tau}}{1+p_1(0)[e^{a_{12}\tau}-1]}$, which means that independent of the initial value $p_1(0)$, $p_1 \rightarrow 1$ ($p_1 \rightarrow 0$) if $a_{12} > 0$ ($a_{12} < 0$). Properly choosing the time τ and a_{12} , and knowing $p_1(0)$, we can reach any value $0 \leq p_1(\tau) \leq 1$. Eq. (20) leads to $\phi_{1,2}(\tau) = \pm \frac{b_{12}}{a_{12}} \ln [p_1(0)(e^{\mp a_{12}\tau} - 1) + 1]$. Two basic examples of two-level systems are the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ and the polarization states of light. The standard Berry phase was observed in both these cases [2].

For the three-level situation the internal stationary vector is obtained from (17) (up to normalization)

$$\bar{p}_1(\infty) \propto a_{23}/a_{12}, \quad \bar{p}_2(\infty) \propto -a_{13}/a_{12}, \quad \bar{p}_3(\infty) \propto 1. \quad (21)$$

provided these probabilities are positive, i.e., (using game-theoretic terms) the group 1 beats 2, 2 beats 3, but 3 beats 2 (rock-swissor-paper game). Now the τ -dependent solution $p(\tau)$ of (12) oscillates around (21). Naturally, if one group (say 1) beats both others ($a_{12} > 0$, $a_{13} > 0$), the only attractor of (12) is $\bar{p}(\infty) = (1, 0, 0)$. The latter conclusion holds also for a τ -dependent \bar{R} , if the conditions $a_{12}(\tau) > 0$ and $a_{13}(\tau) > 0$ are satisfied for all τ 's. However, the general arguments (16–19) do not proceed for τ -dependent a_{ln} .

Mixed states. So far we focussed on pure states of the quantum system. Now we assume that the quantum state ρ is mixed and the feedback goes via the average $\text{tr}(A\rho)$; compare with (2). Since the closed loop equations (1) is not linear, the mixed-state dynamics (in general) does not reduce to the pure case. Defining for the adiabatic amplitude $c_{nm} \equiv \langle n|\rho|m\rangle e^{i\gamma_m - i\gamma_n}$ [compare with (4)], and proceeding along the lines of (3–9) leads to

$$\dot{\bar{c}}_{nm} + \bar{R}^\bullet \bar{c}_{nm} (\langle n|n'\rangle + \langle m'|m\rangle) \quad (22)$$

$$= -\sum_{l(\neq n)} \langle n|l'\rangle A_{ln} \bar{c}_{nl} \bar{c}_{lm} - \sum_{l(\neq m)} \langle l'|m\rangle \bar{c}_{nl} \bar{c}_{lm} A_{ml}$$

$$\bar{R}^\bullet = \sum_l \bar{c}_{ll} A_{ll}. \quad (23)$$

There is a case where the pure-state analysis applies directly: Pseudo-pure states in NMR are important for ensemble computation and are given as $\rho = (1 - \eta)\frac{\hat{1}}{d} + \eta|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, where $\hat{1}$ is the unit matrix, and where $0 < \eta < 1$ is a parameter [11]. Since $\hat{1}$ is an invariant of (22), Eq. (22) reduces to (10), but with $A_{nl} \rightarrow \eta^2 A_{nl}$. In general the phases of c_{nm} do not decouple from $|c_{nm}|$, and we do not have a general theory for mixed states.

Let us study in more detail the hybrid dynamics $A = -\partial_R H$; see our discussion after (2). This is a pertinent example, since its pure-state dynamics is straightforward: due to $A_{ln} = (E_n - E_l)|\langle l'|m\rangle|^2$, the new phases (20) nullify, while (12) for the probabilities predicts relaxation to the ground state (cooling). The mixed-state dynamics will be seen to be more interesting. Eq. (22) implies

$$\dot{\bar{c}}_{nm} = 2\sum_{l(\neq m)} (E_l - E_n)|\langle l'|m\rangle|^2 |\bar{c}_{nl}|^2. \quad (24)$$

Let $n = 1$ be the lowest energy level. If all $|\langle l'|1\rangle|$ differ from zero, $c_{l\neq 1}$ has to nullify for large τ , since c_{11} should be limited. Continuing this way for $n > 1$, we get that all non-diagonal elements $c_{n\neq l}$ nullify (decoherence), if all $|\langle l'|n\rangle|$ are positive.

If, however, $|\langle l'|n\rangle| = 0$ for some $n \neq l$, the element c_{nl} survives and undergoes a non-trivial evolution. An example of this is presented in Fig. 1. Here the field R acts only on energy levels 2 and 3; the level 1 does not feel R . Thus $|\langle 2|1'\rangle| = |\langle 3|1'\rangle| = 0$ and $|\langle 2'|3\rangle| > 0$. Nevertheless, c_{12} and c_{13} do change in time. In Fig. 1 all $c_{l\neq n}$ are real, and we see that c_{13} changes its sign, an example of the adiabatic phase. Though c_{23} has to decay to zero, it can increase in the intermediate times.

In summary, we studied how the feedback generated by non-disturbing (ensemble) measurements affects the adiabatic (i.e., slowly driven) quantum dynamics. For the simplest linear feedback we have found that *i*) the populations are no longer constant. Instead, they satisfy the canonical [replicator] equation of the population game theory, allowing us to visualize the corresponding dynamics as a zero-sum game played by the adiabatic energy levels. The [non-linear] replicator equation generates a non-trivial (possibly chaotic) Hamiltonian motion, or alternatively, relaxation towards a certain state. *ii*) In addition to the Berry phase, the feedback generates a new, explicitly gauge-invariant phase, which [as compared to the Berry phase] exists under a wider range of conditions. In particular, there are scenarios of feedback, where the probabilities are constant (resembling the ordinary situation), but the new phases are still non-trivial. These results extend to pseudo-pure quantum states.

The work was supported by Volkswagenstiftung grant “Quantum Thermodynamics: Energy and information flow at nanoscale”.

-
- [1] A. Messiah, *Quantum mechanics* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1962), Vol. 2.
 - [2] A. Shapere and F. Wilczek, *Geometric Phases in Physics* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989).
 - [3] G.G. de Polavieja and E. Sjoqvist, *Am J Phys* **66**, 431 (1998). Y. Ben-Aryeh, arXiv:quant-ph/0402003.
 - [4] J. Pachos *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 010305 (2000). J.A. Jones *et al.*, *Nature* **403**, 869 (2000).
 - [5] E. Farhi *et al.*, *Science* **292**, 472 (2001).
 - [6] S. Duki *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 128901 (2006). J. Ma *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 128902 (2006). K.-P. Marzlin and B.C. Sanders, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **97**, 128903 (2006). D.M. Tong *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 150402 (2007). R. MacKenzie *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 042104 (2006).
 - [7] Special issue on quantum control, *J. Opt B*, **7** (2005).
 - [8] D. Poulin, *Phys. Rev. A*, **62** 012307 (2005).
 - [9] S. Lloyd and J.-J. Slotine, *Phys. Rev. A*, **62** 012307 (2000). C. Altafini, arXiv:quant-ph/0601016.
 - [10] O.R. Ernst, G. Bodenhausen and A. Wokaun, *Principles of Nuclear Magnetic Resonance in One and Two Dimensions* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1987).
 - [11] J.A. Jones, *Prog. NMR Spectr.* **38**, 325 (2001).
 - [12] P. Broekart and J. Jeener, *J. Magn. Reson. A* **113**, 60 (1995).
 - [13] M.J. Hall and M. Reginatto, *Phys. Rev. A*, **72**, 062109 (2005). L. Diosi *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 022108 (2000).
 - [14] N.N. Bogoliubov and Yu.A. Mitropolskii, *Asymptotic Methods in the Theory of Nonlinear Oscillations* (Gordon & Breach, New York, 1961); see chapter V.
 - [15] E. Akin and V. Losert, *J. Math. Biology*, **20**, 231 (1984).
 - [16] J. Hofbauer and K. Sigmund, *Evolutionary Games and Population Dynamics* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1998).
 - [17] G. Picard and T.W. Johnston, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48**, 1610 (1982). Y. Sato *et al.*, *PNAS* **99**, 4748 (2002).
 - [18] A.E. Allahverdyan *et al.*, in preparation.