

# Microscopic diagonal entropy and its connection to basic thermodynamic relations

Anatoli Polkovnikov

*Department of Physics, Boston University, Boston, MA 02215*

We define a diagonal entropy (d-entropy) for an arbitrary Hamiltonian system as  $S_d = -\sum_n \rho_{nn} \ln \rho_{nn}$  with the sum taken over the basis of instantaneous energy states. In equilibrium this entropy coincides with the conventional von Neumann entropy  $S_n = -\text{Tr} \rho \ln \rho$ . However, in contrast to  $S_n$ , the d-entropy is not conserved in time. If the system is initially in thermal equilibrium characterized by temperature  $T$  then in accord with the second law of thermodynamics the d-entropy can only increase or stay the same, the d-entropy also automatically satisfies fundamental thermodynamic relation, which reduces to the first law of thermodynamics for quasi-stationary processes. The d-entropy is also automatically conserved for adiabatic processes. We illustrate our results with explicit examples and show that its behavior is consistent with expectations from thermodynamics.

Explicit relations between thermodynamical and microscopical quantities have attracted attention of physics community for a long time [1]. One of the main challenges is the correct microscopic definition of the entropy. While it is established that the von Neumann entropy  $S_n = -\text{Tr} \rho \ln \rho$  correctly describes thermal equilibrium, this entropy clearly disagrees the second law of thermodynamics because for isolated systems it is conserved in time [2]. This entropy also does not satisfy the first law of thermodynamics or fundamental thermodynamic relation unless one makes an additional assumption that the density matrix always remains diagonal. It is well understood that the thermodynamic entropy of a closed system obtained from the von Neumann entropy by coarse-graining increases with time (see E.g. Refs. [1, 3]). If properly defined coarse-graining can lead to correct predictions in complex systems subject to dynamical processes (see e.g. Refs. [4, 5]). Yet the whole situation that on top of the microscopic description one needs to introduce a non-uniquely defined coarse-graining procedure, which is not part of the Hamiltonian dynamics, is not satisfactory.

Microscopic description of thermodynamics using the von Neumann entropy is problematic on several other reasons. For example, consider a sufficiently complex system that was subject to a process which started and ended in a distant past, and eventually achieved some steady state. By the ergodic hypothesis time average of any thermodynamic observable should be equivalent to the equilibrium ensemble average. For any observable  $\Omega$  its time average can be written as  $\bar{\Omega} = \sum_n \Omega_{nn} \rho_{nn}$ , where  $\rho_{nn}$  are the time independent diagonal elements of the density matrix in the eigenbasis of the Hamiltonian and  $\Omega_{nn}$  are the diagonal matrix elements of the operator  $\Omega$ . All information about arbitrary time averaged observables and thus about the steady state is contained in diagonal elements of  $\rho$  (see Refs. [6, 7] for more discussion). At the same time the von Neumann entropy is not an observable. It explicitly depends on the nonlinear combination of the off-diagonal elements of the density matrix, which do not average to zero. So we have the

situation that (i) the von Neumann entropy contains additional information, which does not appear in any thermodynamic measurement and (ii) its time average is different from the entropy of the equilibrium ensemble.

There is another important indication that the entropy should be sensitive only to the diagonal matrix elements of  $\rho(t)$ . It follows from the basic thermodynamics that in adiabatic processes the entropy of the system does not change [2]. At the same time the slow changes in the Hamiltonian do not induce transitions between instantaneous energy levels [8], which implies that diagonal elements of the density matrix (and only they) do not change in time. We note that it is practically impossible to completely avoid transitions between energy levels in macroscopic systems [1, 9]. The proper adiabatic limit, therefore, should be defined as such when the heat generated during a dynamical process is small. In turn heating of the system is related to the transitions between different instantaneous energy levels [9, 10] and is again sensitive only to the diagonal matrix elements of  $\rho(t)$ .

These considerations suggest a simple resolution. Let us define the following diagonal entropy (or simply d-entropy):

$$S_d = -\sum_n \rho_{nn} \ln \rho_{nn}. \quad (1)$$

There is some ambiguity in this definition associated with possible degeneracies in the energy spectrum which is not important for the purposes of this work. If the Hamiltonian is time-independent then  $S_d$  formally corresponds to the usual von Neumann entropy defined by the time-averaged density matrix  $\bar{\rho} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} 1/t \int_0^t \rho(t') dt'$  (see e.g. Ref. [3]). At the same time, the expression (1) is defined instantaneously and thus does not require coarse-graining of the density matrix or the assumption that the Hamiltonian is stationary. The definition (1) suggests a classical generalization where instead of a sum over many-body states one takes the integral over orbits corresponding to different energies of the system. The analogue of  $\rho_{nn}$  would be a probability to find the system in the corresponding orbit:  $p(E) = \int d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{p} \rho(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \delta(E -$

$E(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})$ ), where  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}$  spans the many-particle phase space and  $\rho(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})$  is the probability to occupy a particular phase-space point. So the classical diagonal entropy can be defined as  $S_d^{\text{cl}} = -\int dE N(E) p(E) \ln p(E)$ , where  $N(E) = \int d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{p} \delta(E - E(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}))$  is the (many-particle) density of states.

Let us show that  $S_d$  is consistent with the known properties of the thermodynamic entropy. In equilibrium, when the density matrix is stationary (diagonal), clearly  $S_d = S_n$ . Thus  $S_d$  satisfies such requirements as extensivity, positivity. It also automatically vanishes in the zero-temperature limit satisfying the third law of thermodynamics. Then we observe that the entropy  $S_d$  can change in time. If the initial state is stationary then for any time-dependent process we have  $S_d(t) \geq S_d(0)$ . The proof of this statement can be adopted from Ref. [3] by straightforward generalization and we sketch it below. The d-entropy also satisfies a much stronger constraint imposed by the fundamental thermodynamic relation (which is equivalent to the first law of thermodynamics for quasi-stationary processes). To be more specific we assume that initially a system is prepared in the Gibbs ensemble in which the density matrix is diagonal and  $\rho_n^0 \propto \exp[-\beta E_n]$ . The system is then perturbed either by changing external parameters  $\lambda_j$  such as the system size or various couplings of the Hamiltonian, or by putting it into a contact with another system or both.

Without specifying the details of the process we know that according to the fundamental thermodynamics relation we must have

$$\Delta E \approx T \Delta S + \sum_j \left( \frac{\partial E}{\partial \lambda_j} \right)_S \Delta \lambda_j \quad (2)$$

where  $S$  is a proper thermodynamic entropy of the system and  $(\partial E / \partial \lambda_j)_S$  are generalized forces [1, 2]. The equality (2) should be always satisfied as long as  $\Delta E$ ,  $\Delta S$  and  $\Delta \lambda_j$  are infinitesimally small, and we can neglect the higher-order differentials.

Microscopically Eq. (2) is a very nontrivial statement. In particular, assuming for simplicity a cyclic process such that all  $\Delta \lambda_j = 0$ , this relation implies that the changes in the two microscopically defined quantities  $E$  and  $S$  both depending on the details of the process are proportional to each other with the proportionality constant being independent of these details. Let us show that the introduced d-entropy satisfies the equality (2) automatically. First we write the change of the energy to the linear order in  $\Delta \rho$  and  $\Delta \lambda_j$ :

$$\Delta E \approx \sum_n \Delta E_n(t) \rho_n^0 + \sum_n E_n(0) \Delta \rho_{nn}(t), \quad (3)$$

where  $\Delta E_n(t) = E_n(t) - E_n(0)$  is a change of the instantaneous energy levels due to time evolution,  $\Delta \rho_{nn}(t)$  is the change of the diagonal matrix elements of the density matrix, and  $\rho_n^0 \equiv \rho_{nn}(0)$ . In the adiabatic limit

$\Delta \rho_{nn}(t) = 0$  and thus the first term in Eq. (3) corresponds to the adiabatic change of the energy  $\Delta E_{\text{ad}}(t)$  while the second one corresponds to the heat [10]. Next we consider a similar expression for the change of the d-entropy. To the leading order in  $\Delta \rho_{nn}(t)$  (using that  $\sum_n \Delta \rho_{nn}(t) = 0$ ) we find

$$\Delta S_d \approx - \sum_n \Delta \rho_{nn}(t) \ln \rho_n^0. \quad (4)$$

In thermal equilibrium we have  $\rho_n^0 \propto \exp[-\beta E_n(0)]$ , and thus comparing Eqs. (3) and (4) we immediately find

$$\Delta E \approx \Delta E_{\text{ad}} + T \Delta S_d. \quad (5)$$

The first term here  $\Delta E_{\text{ad}}$  is a function of the state, i.e. it depends only on the instantaneous values of the external parameters  $\lambda_j$  and the initial probabilities  $\rho_n^0$ . Thus it can be expressed as  $\Delta E_{\text{ad}} = \sum_j (\partial E / \partial \lambda_j)_{S_d} \Delta \lambda_j$ , and Eq. (5) is equivalent to the relation (2). Note that the derivation of Eq. (2) required neither that the initial density matrix is diagonal nor that the system was closed during the process. We remark that the d-entropy which depends only on the diagonal elements of the density matrix can be in principle determined from the distribution function of energy in the system or equivalently from the distribution of work done on the system to perform some dynamical process [11].

*Properties of the d-entropy for closed systems.* For closed Hamiltonian systems it is possible to make a further step and show that the d-entropy agrees with the second law of thermodynamics. Thus in Refs. [12, 13] (see also Ref. [10]) it was proven that if the initial density matrix satisfies the conditions of passivity, i.e. it commutes with the Hamiltonian and its elements are monotonically decreasing functions of energy:  $(E_n - E_m)(\rho_n - \rho_m) \leq 0$  then in any cyclic process [23] the energy of the system can either increase or stay the same:  $Q(t) = \sum_n E_n \Delta \rho_{nn}(t) \geq 0$ . This statement is equivalent to the second law of thermodynamics in the Kelvin's (Thompson's) form.

Let us now rewrite the expression (1) in the following form:

$$S_d(t) = S_d(0) - \sum_n \left[ \Delta \rho_{nn}(t) \ln \rho_n^0 + (\rho_n^0 + \Delta \rho_{nn}(t)) \ln (1 + \Delta \rho_{nn}(t) / \rho_n^0) \right]. \quad (6)$$

The second term in this sum  $\Delta S_1$  is linear in  $\Delta \rho$ . Because  $\ln \rho_n^0$  always satisfies  $(\rho_n^0 - \rho_m^0)(\ln \rho_n^0 - \ln \rho_m^0) \geq 0$  the proof of Refs. [12, 13] immediately yields  $\Delta S_1 \geq 0$  for any stationary initial  $\rho$ . The third term in Eq. (6) is non-positive and contains only quadratic and higher order terms in  $\Delta \rho$ . Therefore, we obtain an upper boundary estimate on d-entropy,  $0 \leq \Delta S_d(t) \leq \Delta S_1(t)$ . In the linear order in  $\Delta \rho_{nn} \rightarrow 0$  we have  $\Delta S_d(t) \approx \Delta S_1(t)$ .

The fact that  $\Delta S_d(t) \geq 0$  in closed systems can be proven beyond the linear order in  $\Delta\rho$  as long as the initial state is stationary. The proof is essentially adopted from Ref. [3] (see Eqs. (2.4) - (2.10)) to the quantum case where instead of the time averaging we use the microscopic definition of  $S_d(t)$ . First, we identify  $\rho^d(t)$  as a diagonal part of the full time-dependent density matrix  $\rho(t)$ , i.e.  $\rho_{nn}^d(t) = \rho_{nn}(t)$  and  $\rho_{nm}^d(t) = 0$  for  $n \neq m$ . By using the Jensen's inequality we obtain that (see also Eq. (1.40) in Ref. [14])

$$\text{Tr}(-\rho \ln \rho + \rho_d \ln \rho_d) \leq \text{Tr}(\rho - \rho_d) \ln \rho_d = 0 \quad (7)$$

Hence we find that  $S_d(t) \geq S_n(t)$ . At the same time the von Neumann entropy is conserved in time,  $S_n(t) = S_n(0)$ . Noting that  $S_d(0) = S_n(0)$ , since the initial density matrix is diagonal by the assumption, we prove

$$S_d(t) \geq S_d(0). \quad (8)$$

Note that Eq. (8) does not imply that  $S_d(t)$  is necessarily a monotonic function of time.

Another important property of d-entropy is that it is not additive away from equilibrium. This is clear from Eq. (5), which implies that e.g. in closed systems d-entropy can change only while external parameters are changing in time. For example for sudden instantaneous quenches d-entropy also changes instantaneously. At the same time equilibration of the system after the quench may take a long time during which there is energy exchange between different parts of the system. This implies that local d-entropies change on much longer time scales and during intermediate times the d-entropy is not additive. We will illustrate this non-additivity using an explicit example below. Note that in this respect the behavior of d-entropy is again similar to the behavior of the thermodynamic entropy defined as  $S = \ln \Omega(E)$ , where for a microcanonical  $\Omega(E)$  is the number of available states within a small energy interval  $\delta E$  (see e.g. Ref. [15]). In fact  $S_d$  coincides with this entropy if we assume that  $\rho_{nn}$  is constant independent of  $n$  within this energy window. Like  $S_d$ , the entropy  $S$  defined in this way can change only if we change energy by heating the system or changing the external parameter or if we change density of states by changing the external parameter or both. In equilibrium the entropy  $S$  is additive. I.e. if we split the system into two weakly interacting subsystems 1 and 2 so that  $E = E_1 + E_2$  then  $\Omega(E) \approx \Omega_1(E_1)\Omega_2(E_2)$ . This implies that  $S = S_1 + S_2$ . At the same time away from equilibrium  $\Omega(E) > \Omega(E_1)\Omega(E_2)$  thus  $S > S_1 + S_2$  [15] so this entropy becomes non-additive. The crucial difference between the d-entropy and  $S = \ln(\Omega(E))$  is that we do not assume any particular distribution of  $\rho_{nn}(E)$ , it is determined by the microscopic description. Quite often in non-equilibrium situations one associates full entropy with the sum of local entropies. The analogue of this

will be sum of diagonal entropies in the system. Like in usual thermodynamics away from equilibrium the difference  $S_d - S_{1d} - S_{2d}$  might serve as the measure of how far the system is away from equilibrium (steady state). Careful investigation of this issue requires detailed analysis of properties of d-entropy in open systems, which is beyond the scope of this work.

*Examples:* Let us now illustrate properties of d-entropy using a couple of particular examples. First we consider a toy-BCS model under repeated quench. This model is described by the Hamiltonian:

$$\mathcal{H} = S_1^z - S_2^z - \frac{g}{2N} S^+ S^-, \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathbf{S}_{1,2} = \sum_j \mathbf{s}_{1,2}(j)$  is the total spin of  $N+1$  spin-1/2 states,  $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}_1 + \mathbf{S}_2$  and  $S^\pm = S^x \pm iS^y$ . This Hamiltonian is a simplified version of the BCS Hamiltonian in pseudospin representation [16], where single-particle spectrum consists of two groups of degenerate energy levels. The simplicity of the toy-BCS model (9) allows us to perform large-scale simulations of quantum dynamics in this system. The classical dynamics of the BCS model was recently studied by several groups to analyze oscillating superfluidity in BCS superconductors [17, 18]. Let us point that the ground state of the model (9) within the invariant sector  $\langle S^z \rangle = 0$  (which reflects the particle-hole symmetry in the BCS model) at  $g < 1$  and  $N \gg 1$  corresponds to a state fully polarized along the  $z$ -axis,  $\langle S_2^z \rangle = -\langle S_1^z \rangle = N/2$ . At  $g = 1$  a quantum phase transition occurs to the ordered state tilted towards the  $x - y$  plane with  $\langle S_2^z \rangle < N/2$ , in analogy to the transition to the superconducting state in the BCS model.

We calculate the response of the quantum-mechanical system (9) to a repeated quench realized by periodically changing the coupling  $g$  between two values  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  both corresponding to the ordered phase (see Fig. 1(a)). The system is initially prepared in its ground state at  $g = g_1 = 1.1$ . Then  $g$  is changed instantaneously to the value  $g_2 = 1.2$ . This results in damped oscillations of the magnetization  $M_z(t) = \langle S_1^z \rangle / (N + 1)$  around the mean  $\overline{M_z}$  (see Fig. 1(b)). The amplitude of these oscillations follows a simple gaussian law  $\delta M_z \simeq \exp(-t^2/\tau_0^2)$  with a characteristic decay time of the evolution  $\tau_0 \simeq N^{1/2}$ . At longer times  $t \sim N$  there is revival of oscillations due to finite size of the Hilbert space. However, if we choose large number  $N \gg 1$  then the decay and revival time are well separated and the system is in the steady state in the interval  $\sqrt{N} \ll t \ll N$ . Once the steady-state is reached, the coupling is changed back to its initial value  $g_1$ , and then the process is repeated many times. As a result, we find that the average magnetization  $\overline{M_z}$  decreases with the number of cycles asymptotically approaching zero as depicted in Fig.1 (see the first fifty cycles). We are contrasting the microscopic dynamical treatment with the coarse-grained one (red circles), in which after each quench after the systems reaches the




FIG. 1: The average magnetization  $\overline{M}_z$  of the system (9) with  $N = 2000$  states, as a function of the cycle number under repeated quench (see the text for details). After 50 cycles the time reversal transformation is applied to the system. The blue diamonds correspond to exact time reversibility, black squares and green triangles correspond to small time reversal symmetry breaking perturbations of different magnitudes. Red circles represent the coarse-grained dynamics. *Inset (a)*: Sketch of a coupling change in the repeated quench. *Inset (b)*: Magnetization  $M_z(t)$  as a function of time after a quench.

steady state we artificially set all off-diagonal elements of the density matrix to zero. As we discussed earlier, this procedure is equivalent to time-averaging of the density matrix. Clearly, microscopic and coarse-grained dynamics give close results (see Fig. 1). Similar trends are observed if we analyze time-dependence of the heat and the diagonal entropy (see Fig. 2). Both quantities monotonically increase in time without significant differences between the exact and coarse-grained curves. Note that as the system heats up the slope of the entropy decreases with the cycle number, consistent with general thermodynamic expectations that  $\Delta S \sim \Delta Q/T$ .

It is the time-reversed dynamics, which distinguishes between full microscopic and coarse-grained descriptions. After 50 cycles we perform a time-reversal transformation in the system repeating the same sequence of cycles in the time-reversed order. All microscopically defined quantities including entropy return back to the initial values as they should do (see blue diamonds in Figs. 1, 2). However, the coarse-grained dynamics is completely insensitive to the time-reversal transformation and the system continues to heat up. Note that the exact dynamics is very sensitive to the presence of small perturbations that break the time-reversal symmetry. We analyze this effect by slightly changing the coupling  $g_2 \rightarrow \tilde{g}_2 = g_2 + \delta g_2$  during only the first cycle after the time-reversal transformation with  $\delta g_2 = 10^{-5}$  (green triangles) and  $\delta g_2 = 10^{-4}$  (black squares). We observe that even for very small  $\delta g_2$

the magnetization, d-entropy, and heat are only weakly affected by the time-reversal transformation. We note that in a recent work [19] a model similar to (9) subject to repeated quench was analyzed. There the authors used a different criterion as a measure of irreversibility and came to similar conclusions.




FIG. 2: Same as in Fig. 1 but for the d-entropy (main graph) and heat (inset).




FIG. 3: Illustration of the second example: expanding gas.

Another illustrative example we briefly mention is the expanding classical noninteracting gas initially confined to the one half of the container separated by the membrane [20] (see Fig. 3). At moment  $t = 0$  the membrane is removed and the gas expands to the whole container. From the point of view of classical thermodynamics the entropy of the gas increases by the amount  $\Delta S = N \ln 2$ , where  $N$  is the total number of particles. It is easy to see

that the same result applies to the d-entropy. One can obtain it by explicit calculation re-expanding the initial density matrix in the new basis and computing d-entropy. However, there is a trivial way to see this. As we double the volume the density of the momentum states per particle doubles, because the momentum is quantized in units of  $2\pi/(L/2)$  before the expansion and  $2\pi/L$  after the membrane is removed. This means the the same momentum distribution (momenta of particles do not change in this process) is now projected to the twice the number of energy states so that by conservation of probability diagonal elements of the density matrix for each particle are reduced by a factor of two  $\rho_{nn} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}\rho_{nn}$ . Thus we immediately see that d-entropy per particle increase by  $\ln(2)$  so that  $\Delta S_d = N \ln(2)$ . This example also highlights the issue of non-additivity of the d-entropy away from equilibrium (or more generally steady state). Indeed the jump of  $S_d$  occurs immediately after the membrane is removed. At the same time the local d-entropies corresponding to the left and right parts of the container do not change right away. We expect that the sum of  $S_{1d}$  and  $S_{2d}$  will gradually increase in time and after the gas reaches the steady state this sum will approach  $S_d$ . Then at intermediate times the difference between  $S_d$  and  $S_{1d} + S_{2d}$  is a possible measure characterizing how far the system is away from reaching the steady state. This example also highlights importance of quantum mechanics even in this purely classical problem. Note that the d-entropy changes here purely because we double the number of microscopic single particle quantum states.

*Concluding remarks.* We showed that d-entropy  $S_d$  is consistent with properties of the thermodynamic entropy imposed by the laws of thermodynamics provided that initially the system is prepared in thermal equilibrium and then undergoes some dynamical process. The d-entropy is microscopically defined and does not violate the time-reversal symmetry. In complex closed systems for quasi-stationary processes the density matrix always remains effectively diagonal and thus as we demonstrated  $S_d$  should monotonically increase in time. The assumption of density matrix being always diagonal is similar to the assumptions used by Boltzmann in proving the famous H-theorem (see e.g. Ref. [4]). However, these assumptions can not be justified in general. For example, in simple spin systems one can perform spin-echo type experiments, where after quenching magnetic field and initial dephasing in the system due to some randomness, one can perform a time-reversal transformation so that the spins restore the original coherence. In this case, the d-entropy first increases and then decreases back in time to the original value. But the situations like this where the entropy can decrease in time are very non-generic because they require ability to perform a time reversal transformation on the Hamiltonian very accurately (see also discussion in Refs. [4, 21]). In Fig. 2 we illustrate this point with a toy-model system subject to

the spin-echo type process. Even a very small perturbation, which breaks time inversion, completely destroyed the reversibility and the d-entropy continues to increase in time. From our analysis it follows that the maximum entropy state corresponding to  $\rho_{nn}$  independent of  $n$  is a natural attractor of the Hamiltonian dynamics. In this respect, the second law of thermodynamics naturally follows from the microscopic equations of motion.

There is a more subtle issue of relevance of the d-entropy to information. If the Hamiltonian is constant in time,  $S_d$  is only sensitive to the stationary information encoded in time-independent diagonal elements of the density matrix. Conversely the von Neumann's entropy is sensitive to all information in the system, stationary or not. This sensitivity results in  $S_n$  being time independent for any dynamical processes, because time evolution is a unitary transformation, which does not change the total information content.

Using Eq. (1) one can analyze entropy generation in various non-equilibrium processes. Increase in  $S_d$  can be served as a practical measure of non-adiabaticity in the system. One can also use the relation  $T = \Delta E/\Delta S$  for cyclic near equilibrium processes with both  $\Delta E$  and  $\Delta S$  compute independently to determine temperature and verify whether this ratio gives a consistent definition of temperature independent of the process for steady-state non-equilibrium situations. It would be very interesting to see if similar general statement can be formulated in strongly non-equilibrium situations.

The author acknowledges collaboration with R. Barankov on earlier stages of this work as well as for help in proving Eq. (8) and performing analysis of the toy-BCS model (9) relevant to Figs. 1 and 2. The author also acknowledges valuable discussions with E. Altman, S. Girvin, V. Gritsev, V. Gurarie, D. Huse, Y. Kafri, W. Zwerger. The work was supported by AFOSR YIP and Sloan Foundation.

- 
- [1] R. Balian, *From Microphysics to Macrophysics*, (Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1991).
  - [2] L. D. Landau, and E. M. Lifshits, *Statistical Physics, Volume 5*, (Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 1999).
  - [3] O. Penrose, Rep. Prog. Phys. **42**, 129 (1979).
  - [4] J. L. Lebowitz, Physics Today **46**, 32 (1993).
  - [5] P. L. Garrido, S. Goldstein, and J. L. Lebowitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 050602 (2004)
  - [6] M. Rigol, V. Dunjko, M. Olshanii, Nature **452**, 854 (2008).
  - [7] P. Reimann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 190403 (2008)
  - [8] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshits, *Quantum Mechanics: Non-Relativistic Theory, Volume 3*, (Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 1981).
  - [9] A. Polkovnikov and V. Gritsev, Nature Physics **4**, 477 (2008).
  - [10] A. Polkovnikov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 220402 (2008)

- [11] S. R. Manmana, S. Wessel, R. M. Noack, and A. Muramatsu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 210405 (2007)
- [12] A. E. Allahverdyan, Th. M. Nieuwenhuizen, *Physica A* **305**, 542 (2002).
- [13] W. Thirring, *Quantum Mathematical Physics*, Second ed. (Springer, Berlin, 2002).
- [14] A. Wehrl, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **50**, 221 (1978).
- [15] F. Reif, *Fundamentals of Statistical and Thermal Physics*, (Waveland Press., Long Grove, 2009).
- [16] P. W. Anderson, *Phys. Rev.* **112**, 1900 (1958).
- [17] R. A. Barankov, L. S. Levitov, and B. Z. Spivak, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 160401 (2004).
- [18] E. A. Yuzbashyan, B. L. Altshuler, V. B. Kuznetsov, V. Z. Enolskii, *J. Phys. A* **38**, 7831, (2005).
- [19] G. Benenti and G. Casati, arXiv:0808.3243.
- [20] We thank anonymous referee for attracting our attention to this example.
- [21] C. Jarzynski, *European Physical Journal*, to be published.
- [22] A. E. Allahverdyan and Th. M. Nieuwenhuizen, *Phys. Rev. E* **71**, 046107 (2005).
- [23] The same statement is also true for non-cyclic process as long as there are no unavoided level crossings [22].