

Lie-Semigroup Structures for Reachability and Control of Open Quantum Systems

G. Dirr,^{1,*} U. Helmke,¹ I. Kurniawan,¹ and T. Schulte-Herbrüggen^{2,†}

¹*Institute of Mathematics, Würzburg University, Am Hubland, D-97074 Würzburg, Germany*

²*Department of Chemistry, Technical University Munich,*

Lichtenbergstrasse 4, D-85747 Garching, Germany

(Dated: 26th October 2019)

In view of controlling finite dimensional open quantum systems, the structure of completely positive trace-preserving maps governing time evolution is described in terms of Lie semigroups and their respective tangent cones. We identify the Kossakowski-Lindblad generators as the Lie wedge of a Lie subsemigroup and characterise reachable sets and controllability issues in the same unified framework. Moreover, we elucidate under which special conditions time-optimal controls derived for the analogous closed system already give good fidelities in quantum systems that are actually open. In the generic case, obtaining optimal controls requires detailed knowledge of the open system, e.g., in terms of the parameters of its Kossakowski-Lindblad master equation as exploited in state-of-the-art optimal-control algorithms. As an outlook, we sketch the structure of a new, potentially more efficient numerical approach explicitly making use of the corresponding Lie wedge.

PACS numbers: 02.30.Yy, 02.40.Ky, 02.40.Vh, 02.60.Pn; 03.65.Yz, 03.67.-a, 03.67.Lx, 03.65.Yz, 03.67.Pp; 76.60.-k, 82.56.-b

I. INTRODUCTION

Understanding and manipulating open quantum systems and quantum channels is an important challenge for exploiting quantum effects in future technology [1].

Protecting quantum systems against relaxation is therefore tantamount to using coherent superpositions as a resource. To this end, decoherence-free subspaces have been applied [2], bang-bang controls [3] have been used for decoupling the system from dissipative interaction with the environment, while a quantum Zeno approach [4] may be taken to projectively keep the system within the desired subspace [5]. Very recently, the opposite approach has been taken by solely exploiting relaxative processes for state preparation [6, 7].

In either case, for applying the power of Lie-theory-based methods of system and control theory [8, 9], the quantum systems may first be characterised by input-output relations in the sense of quantum process tomography. Deciding whether the dynamics of the quantum system thus specified allows for a Markovian description to good approximation (maybe up to a certain level of noise) has recently been addressed [10, 11]. This is of crucial interest, since a Markovian equation of motion paves the way to applying methods of bi-linear control theory. Moreover, it comes with the well-established frameworks of completely positive semigroups and Kraus representations [12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19].

On the other hand, the specific *Lie-semigroup* aspects of open quantum systems clearly have not been elaborated on in the pioneering period 1971–76 of completely positive semigroups [12, 14, 17, 18, 20], mainly since ma-

ior progress in the understanding of Lie semigroups was made in the decade 1989–99 [21, 22, 23, 24]. While relations of Lie semigroups and optimal control of classical systems were soon established, e.g. in [23, 25, 26], only recently the use of Lie-semigroup terms in the *control of open quantum systems* was initiated [27, 28], where in [27] the elaborations were confined to single two-level systems. However, we see a great potential in exploiting the algebraic structure of Lie-semigroup theory for practical problems of reachability and control of open quantum systems.

Its importance becomes evident, because among the generic tools needed for the current advances in quantum technology (for a survey see, e.g. [1]), quantum control plays a major role. From formal description of quantum optimal control [29] the theoretical aspects of existence of optima soon matured into numerical algorithms solving practical problems of steering quantum dynamics [30, 31, 32]. Their key concern is to find optima of some quality function like the quantum gate fidelity under realistic conditions and, moreover, constructive ways of achieving those optima given the constraints of an accessible experimental setting. For a recent introduction, see [33]. However, realistic implementations in open quantum systems are mostly beyond analytical tractability. Hence numerical methods are often indispensable, where gradient-like algorithms are the most basic, but robust tools. Thus they proved applicable to a broad array of problems including optimal control of closed quantum systems [34, 35] and computing entanglement measures [36, 37, 38]. For mathematical details on gradient systems as numerical tools for constrained optimisation, we refer to [39, 40, 41].

Generalising these well-established gradient techniques, in our previous work [36], we have exploited the geometry of Riemannian manifolds related to Lie groups, their subgroups, and homogeneous spaces in a common

*Electronic address: dirr@mathematik.uni-wuerzburg.de

†Electronic address: tosh@ch.tum.de

framework for setting up gradient flows in closed quantum systems. There we addressed (a) *abstract optimisation tasks* on smooth state-space manifolds and (b) *dynamic optimal control tasks* in the specific time scales of an experimental setting. Here, we will see that the corresponding abstract optimisation tasks for open quantum systems are much more involved, while the dynamic optimal control tasks remain in principle the same. From a mathematical point of view, this difficulty results from the fact that the evolution of a controlled open quantum system is no longer described by a semigroup of unitary propagators, i.e. by a semigroup contained in a *compact* Lie group.

Therefore, we extend the Lie-theoretic approach in [36] to finite dimensional open quantum systems and discuss their dynamics in terms of Lie subsemigroups. In view of practical applications of quantum control, this is highly advantageous: analysing tangent cones (Lie wedges) allows for addressing problems of reachability, accessibility, controllability and actual control in a unified frame providing powerful Lie-algebraic terms.

Overview

To begin with, we briefly indicate how the theory elucidated in previous work [36] can be extended to reachable sets of non necessarily controllable systems. In particular, we concentrate on the structure of reachable sets and obstacles arising from it. Moreover, an interesting application to quantum dynamical systems with relaxation—proving physical relevance of the semigroup setting—is sketched.

The starting point in [36] was a smooth state-space manifold M or a controllable dynamical system on M , i.e. a control system whose *reachable set* $\text{Reach}(X_0)$ satisfies $\text{Reach}(X_0) = M$ for all $X_0 \in M$. For a right invariant system (3) the state space of which is given by a connected Lie group \mathbf{G} , controllability is equivalent to the fact that the entire group \mathbf{G} can be reached from the unity $\mathbf{1}$, i.e.

$$\mathbf{G} = \text{Reach}(\mathbf{1}) := \bigcup_{T \geq 0} \text{Reach}(\mathbf{1}, T), \quad (1)$$

where $\text{Reach}(\mathbf{1}, T)$ denotes the reachability set in time T , i.e. the set of all states to where the systems can be steered from $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbf{G}$ in time T , cf. Eqn.(4). In general, however, we cannot expect Eqn.(1) to hold. Nevertheless, the reachability sets $\text{Reach}(\mathbf{1}, T_1)$ and $\text{Reach}(\mathbf{1}, T_2)$ of right invariant systems at times $T_1 \geq 0$ and $T_2 \geq 0$ obey the following multiplicative structure

$$\text{Reach}(\mathbf{1}, T_1) \cdot \text{Reach}(\mathbf{1}, T_2) = \text{Reach}(\mathbf{1}, T_1 + T_2).$$

Thus $\text{Reach}(\mathbf{1})$ is a subsemigroup of \mathbf{G} , c.f. see Sec.II B. Subsequently, a basic survey of subsemigroups and some of their applications in quantum control will be given.

II. FUNDAMENTALS ON LIE SUBSEMIGROUPS AND REACHABLE SETS

A. Lie Subsemigroups

For the following basic definitions and results on Lie subsemigroups we refer to [21, 22]. However, the reader should be aware of the fact that the terminology in this area is sometimes inconsistent. Here, we primarily adopt the notions used in [21]. For further reading we also recommend [23].

A *subsemigroup* of a (matrix) Lie group \mathbf{G} with Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} is a subset $\mathbf{S} \subset \mathbf{G}$ which contains the unity $\mathbf{1}$ and is closed under multiplication, i.e. $\mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{S}$. The smallest subgroup contained in \mathbf{S} is denoted by $E(\mathbf{S}) := \mathbf{S} \cap \mathbf{S}^{-1}$. The *tangent cone* of \mathbf{S} is defined as

$$L(\mathbf{S}) := \{\dot{\gamma}(0) \mid \gamma(0) = \mathbf{1}, \gamma(t) \in \mathbf{S}, t \geq 0\} \subset \mathfrak{g},$$

where $\gamma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{G}$ denotes any smooth curve contained in \mathbf{S} . In order to relate subsemigroups to their tangent cones, we need some further terminology from convex analysis. A closed convex cone \mathfrak{w} of a finite dimensional real vector space is called a *wedge*. The *edge* of \mathfrak{w} denoted by $E(\mathfrak{w})$ is the largest subspace contained in \mathfrak{w} , i.e. one has $E(\mathfrak{w}) := \mathfrak{w} \cap (-\mathfrak{w})$. Finally, a wedge \mathfrak{w} of a finite dimensional real (matrix) Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} is called a *Lie wedge* if it is invariant under inner automorphisms $\text{Inn}(\mathfrak{w}) := \langle \exp(\text{ad}_{E(\mathfrak{w})}) \rangle$. More precisely,

$$e^{\text{ad}_g}(\mathfrak{w}) := e^g \mathfrak{w} e^{-g} = \mathfrak{w}$$

for all $g \in E(\mathfrak{w})$. Now, the fundamental properties of the tangent cone $L(\mathbf{S})$ can be summarised as follows.

Lemma II.1. *Let \mathbf{S} be a closed subsemigroup of the Lie group \mathbf{G} with Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} and let $\mathfrak{w} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ be any Lie wedge. Then the following statements are satisfied.*

- (a) *The edge of \mathfrak{w} , $E(\mathfrak{w})$, carries the structure of a Lie subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} .*
- (b) *The tangent cone $L(\mathbf{S})$ coincides with*

$$L(\mathbf{S}) = \{g \in \mathfrak{g} \mid \exp(tg) \in \mathbf{S} \text{ for all } t \geq 0\}. \quad (2)$$

In particular, $L(\mathbf{S})$ is a Lie wedge of \mathfrak{g} which is $\text{Ad}_{E(\mathbf{S})}$ -invariant, i.e. $G\mathfrak{w}G^{-1} = \mathfrak{w}$ for all $G \in E(\mathbf{S})$.

- (c) *The edge of $L(\mathbf{S})$ fulfills the equality $E(L(\mathbf{S})) = L(E(\mathbf{S}))$.*

Proof.

- (a) Note that $e^{t \text{ad}_g}(h) \in E(\mathfrak{w})$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $g, h \in E(\mathfrak{w})$. Hence

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} e^{t \text{ad}_g}(h) \right|_{t=0} = \text{ad}_g h \in E(\mathfrak{w})$$

for all $g, h \in E(\mathfrak{w})$ and thus $E(\mathfrak{w})$ is a Lie subalgebra.

- (b) The proof of Eqn. (2) is rather technical and therefore we refer to [22], Proposition IV.1.21. Once Eqn. (2) is established, one has

$$L(\mathbf{S}) = \bigcap_{t>0} t^{-1} \exp^{-1}(\mathbf{S})$$

and thus the continuity of the exponential map implies that $L(\mathbf{S})$ is closed. To see that $L(\mathbf{S})$ is a wedge we have to show: (i) $\mu L(\mathbf{S}) = L(\mathbf{S})$ for all $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and (ii) $L(\mathbf{S}) + L(\mathbf{S}) \subset L(\mathbf{S})$. Property (i) is obvious; property (ii) follows by the Trotter product formula

$$e^{t(g+h)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(e^{tg/n} e^{th/n} \right)^n.$$

Finally, let $g \in E(L(\mathbf{S}))$ and $h \in L(\mathbf{S})$, then

$$e^g e^{th} e^{-g} = \exp(t e^g h e^{-g}) \in \mathbf{S}$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Thus $e^g h e^{-g} = e^{\text{ad}_g}(h) \in L(\mathbf{S})$. The same argument applies to $G \in E(\mathbf{S})$.

- (c) Let $g \in E(L(\mathbf{S}))$. Then $e^{tg} \in \mathbf{S}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus $e^{tg} \in E(\mathbf{S})$ and hence $g \in L(E(\mathbf{S}))$. Therefore, we have shown $E(L(\mathbf{S})) \subset L(E(\mathbf{S}))$. The converse, $L(E(\mathbf{S})) \subset E(L(\mathbf{S}))$, holds by definition.

For more details, see Proposition 1.14 in [21]. \square

For closed subsemigroups, Lemma II.1 provides the justification to call the tangent cone $L(\mathbf{S})$ *Lie-* or *Lie-Loewner wedge* of \mathbf{S} .

Unfortunately, the “local-global-correspondence” between Lie wedges and (closed) connected subsemigroups is not as simple as the correspondence between Lie subalgebras and Lie subgroups. On the one hand, there are Lie wedges \mathfrak{w} such that “the” corresponding subsemigroup \mathbf{S} is not unique, i.e. the equality $\mathfrak{w} = L(\mathbf{S})$ holds for more than one subsemigroup \mathbf{S} . On the other hand, there are Lie wedges \mathfrak{w} which do not act as Lie wedge of any subsemigroup \mathbf{S} , i.e. $\mathfrak{w} = L(\mathbf{S})$ does not hold for any \mathbf{S} , cf. [21]. Therefore, the following terminology has been established. A subsemigroup is called *Lie subsemigroup*, if it is closed and characterised by the equality

$$\mathbf{S} = \overline{\langle \exp L(\mathbf{S}) \rangle}_{\mathbf{S}},$$

where $\langle \exp L(\mathbf{S}) \rangle_{\mathbf{S}} := \{e^{g_1} \cdots e^{g_n} \mid g_i \in L(\mathbf{S}), n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ denotes the subsemigroup generated by $\exp L(\mathbf{S}) \subset \mathbf{G}$. A Lie wedge \mathfrak{w} is said to be *global* in \mathbf{G} if there exists a Lie subsemigroup $\mathbf{S} \subset \mathbf{G}$ such that $L(\mathbf{S}) = \mathfrak{w}$, i.e. $\mathbf{S} = \overline{\langle \exp(\mathfrak{w}) \rangle}_{\mathbf{S}}$.

Remark II.1. The term Lie subsemigroup is closely related to the concepts of (completely or strictly) *infinitesimally generated* subsemigroups. However, there are subtle differences, which we do not want to pursue here, cf. [22].

Next, we reformulate a known result on global Lie wedges related to classical Cartan decompositions—a setting which does arise in open quantum systems, cf. Theorem III.4 and Corollary III.1. We do so by stating a highly more convenient version of a more general result, cf. Theorem V.4.57 and Remark V.4.60 in [22], streamlined here in view of practical application.

Theorem II.1. *Let \mathbf{G} be a closed connected (matrix) Lie group which is stable under conjugate transpose inverse, i.e. which is invariant under the involution $\Theta : X \mapsto (X^{-1})^\dagger$. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$ be the decomposition of its Lie algebra into +1 and -1 eigenspaces of the involution $D\Theta(\mathbf{1}) =: \theta : X \mapsto -X^\dagger$. Then*

1. *the map $\mathfrak{p} \times \mathbf{K} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}$, $(p, K) \mapsto \exp(p)K$ with $\mathbf{K} := \langle \exp \mathfrak{k} \rangle$ is a diffeomorphism onto \mathbf{G} ;*
2. *the set $\mathbf{S} := \exp(\mathfrak{c}) \cdot \mathbf{K}$ is a Lie subsemigroup with $L(\mathbf{S}) = \mathfrak{c} \oplus \mathfrak{k}$, provided $\mathfrak{c} \subset \mathfrak{p}$ is a closed pointed cone, i.e. $E(\mathfrak{c}) = \{0\}$.*

Proof. Combining Proposition Prop. 7.14 in [42] and the proof of Theorem V.4.57 in [22], the result follows readily. \square

Fortunately, the somewhat intricate general scenario just outlined simplifies dramatically when considering *compact* Lie subsemigroups.

Proposition II.1. [22, 23]. *Let \mathbf{S} be a compact subsemigroup of a Lie group \mathbf{G} . Then \mathbf{S} itself is a compact Lie subgroup of \mathbf{G} .*

B. Reachable Sets

Let (Σ) be a right invariant control system

$$\dot{X} = A_u X, \quad A_u \in \mathfrak{g}, \quad u \in \mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^m \quad (3)$$

on a connected Lie group \mathbf{G} with Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} and let $\mathfrak{s} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ denote its *system Lie algebra*, i.e. $\mathfrak{s} := \langle A_u \mid u \in \mathcal{U} \rangle_{\text{Lie}}$ is by definition the Lie subalgebra generated by A_u , $u \in \mathcal{U}$. The *reachable set* $\text{Reach}(X_0)$ of (Σ) is defined as the set of all $X \in \mathbf{G}$ that can be reached from X_0 by an admissible control function $u(t)$. More precisely, let $X_u(t)$ denote the unique solution of Eqn. (3) which corresponds to the control $u(t)$. Then

$$\text{Reach}(X_0) := \bigcup_{T \geq 0} \text{Reach}(X_0, T)$$

with

$$\text{Reach}(X_0, T) := \{X_u(T) \in \mathbf{G} \mid T \geq 0, u(t) \in \mathcal{U}\}. \quad (4)$$

Moreover, (Σ) is called *accessible*, if $\text{Reach}(X_0)$ has non-empty interior in \mathbf{G} for all $X_0 \in \mathbf{G}$, and *controllable*, if $\text{Reach}(X_0) = \mathbf{G}$ for all $X_0 \in \mathbf{G}$. For more details on control theoretic terminology we refer to e.g. [8]. Now, in the following series of results the relation between reachable sets of right invariant control systems and subsemigroups will be clarified.

Theorem II.2. [8, 23]. *Let (Σ) be a right invariant control system on \mathbf{G} given by Eqn. (3). Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (a) *The system (Σ) is accessible.*
- (b) *The reachable set $\text{Reach}(\mathbf{1})$ is a subsemigroup of \mathbf{G} with non-empty interior.*
- (c) *The entire Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} of \mathbf{G} is generated by $A_u, u \in \mathcal{U}$, i.e. $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{g}$.*

Theorem II.3. [23]. *Let (Σ) be a right invariant control system on a connected Lie group \mathbf{G} given by Eqn. (3) and assume that (Σ) is accessible, i.e. $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{g}$. Then the following statements are satisfied:*

- (a) *The closure of the reachable set $\text{Reach}(\mathbf{1})$ is a Lie subsemigroup of \mathbf{G} , i.e.*

$$\mathbf{S} = \overline{\langle \exp L(\mathbf{S}) \rangle_{\mathbf{S}}}$$

where $\mathbf{S} := \overline{\text{Reach}(\mathbf{1})}$. Moreover,

$$\text{int } \mathbf{S} = \text{int}(\text{Reach}(\mathbf{1})),$$

and

$$\mathbf{S} = \overline{\text{Reach}_e(\mathbf{1})}, \quad (5)$$

where $\text{Reach}_e(\mathbf{1})$ denotes the reachable set of the so-called extended system, i.e. the system where A_u is allowed to range over the entire Lie wedge $L(\mathbf{S})$.

- (b) *The set $L(\mathbf{S})$ is the largest subset of \mathfrak{g} satisfying (5) and, moreover, it is the smallest Lie wedge which is global in \mathbf{G} and contains $A_u, u \in \mathcal{U}$.*

Due to the characterisation given in part (b) of Theorem II.3, in control theory the Lie wedge $L(\mathbf{S})$ is also called the *Lie saturate* of $A_u, u \in \mathcal{U}$. Conversely, one has the following result.

Theorem II.4. [23]. *Let \mathbf{G} be a connected Lie group and let \mathbf{S} be a Lie subsemigroup of \mathbf{G} . Then, there exists a right-invariant control system (Σ) on \mathbf{G} with control set $\{A_u \mid u \in \mathcal{U}\} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ such that*

$$\mathbf{S} := \overline{\text{Reach}(\mathbf{1})}.$$

In particular, one may choose $\{A_u \mid u \in \mathcal{U}\} = L(\mathbf{S})$.

Finally, we summarise some well-known necessary and sufficient controllability conditions for right invariant control systems. While the first criterion is rather difficult to check, as the computation of the global Lie wedge corresponding to a given control set A_u is in general an unsolved problem, the second one provides a simple algebraic test for compact Lie groups, cf. Proposition II.1.

Corollary II.1. *Let (Σ) be an accessible right invariant control systems on a connected Lie group \mathbf{G} , i.e. $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{g}$. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a) *The systems (Σ) is controllable.*
- (b) *The Lie wedge of $\overline{\text{Reach}(\mathbf{1})}$ is all of \mathfrak{g} .*

Proof. The implication (a) \implies (b) is trivial; the converse (b) \implies (a) follows from Theorem II.2(b) and Theorem II.3(a), cf. [23]. \square

Corollary II.2. [8, 9]. *Let (Σ) be a right invariant control systems on a connected compact Lie group \mathbf{G} . Then, controllability of (Σ) is equivalent to accessibility, i.e. to $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{g}$.*

Remark II.2. If the assumption $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{g}$ in Theorem II.3 and Corollary II.1 is not fulfilled, the above results, however, still remain valid when restricting to the *unique* Lie group $\mathbf{G}_0 := \langle \exp \mathfrak{s} \rangle$.

III. APPLICATIONS TO QUANTUM CONTROL

A. Reachable Sets of Closed Quantum Systems

An application of Corollary II.2 to closed finite-dimensional quantum systems, e.g. n spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ qubit systems with possibly *non-connected* spin-spin interaction graph yields an explicit characterisation of their reachable sets. The same result based on a sketchy controllability argument can be found in [43].

Theorem III.1. *Assume that the spin-spin interaction graph, which corresponds to the controlled n spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ system*

$$\dot{U} = -i \left(H_d + \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ \alpha \in \{x,y\}}}^n u_k H_{k,\alpha} \right) U \quad (6)$$

with $H_d := \sum_{k < l} J_{kl} \sigma_{k,z} \sigma_{l,z}$ and $H_{k,\alpha} := \sigma_{k,\alpha}$, $\alpha \in \{x, y\}$, decomposes into r connected components with n_j vertices in the j -th component. Then, the reachable set $\text{Reach}(I_2^n)$ of Eqn. (6) is given (up to renumbering) by the Kronecker product $SU(2^{n_1}) \otimes \cdots \otimes SU(2^{n_r})$.

Proof. Suppose that the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ particles of the system are numbered such that the first component of the graph contains the vertices $1, \dots, n_1$, the second one the vertices $n_1 + 1, \dots, n_1 + n_2$ and so on. Thus $n = n_1 + \cdots + n_r$. Then, it is straightforward to show that the system Lie algebra is equal to the Lie algebra of $\mathbf{G}_0 := SU(2^{n_1}) \otimes \cdots \otimes SU(2^{n_r})$. Therefore, we can consider Eqn. (6) as a control system on \mathbf{G}_0 . Since \mathbf{G}_0 is a closed subgroup of $SU(2^n)$, it is compact and thus Corollary II.2 applied to \mathbf{G}_0 yields the desired result. \square

B. Open Quantum Systems and Completely Positive Semigroups

In open relaxative quantum systems [20, 44, 45, 46, 47] however, the situation is different because relaxation

translates into “contraction”. Thus the dynamics on density operators is no longer described by the action of a *compact* unitary Lie group as before.

For n spins- $\frac{1}{2}$, read $N := 2^n$ henceforth. Moreover, we use the following short-hand for the total Hamiltonian

$$H_u := H_d + \sum_j u_j H_j, \quad (7)$$

where u_j and H_j denote possibly time-dependent control amplitudes and control Hamiltonians, respectively. Now, we consider a finite dimensional controlled *Master equation* of motion

$$\dot{\rho} = -i \text{ad}_{H_u}(\rho) - \Gamma(\rho) = -\mathcal{L}_u(\rho), \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^m \quad (8)$$

on the set of density operators

$$\text{pos}_1(N) := \{\rho \in \mathfrak{gl}(N, \mathbb{C}) \mid \rho = \rho^\dagger, \rho \geq 0, \text{tr} \rho = 1\}$$

modelling a finite dimensional relaxative quantum system. Here, ad_{H_u} denotes the adjoint operator, i.e. $\text{ad}_{H_u}(\rho) := [H_u, \rho]$, and $-\Gamma$ represents the infinitesimal generator of a semigroup $\{\exp(-t\Gamma) \mid t \geq 0\}$ of linear trace- and positivity-preserving (super-)operators [70]. Clearly, \mathcal{L}_u and thus Eqn. (8) extend to the vector space of all Hermitian matrices

$$\mathfrak{her}(N) := \{H \in \mathfrak{gl}(N, \mathbb{C}) \mid H = H^\dagger\}.$$

Thus it makes sense to ask for the self-adjointness of Γ with respect to the standard scalar product $\text{tr}(H_1 H_2)$ on $\mathfrak{her}(N)$. Unfortunately, Γ need not be self-adjoint, yet it is self-adjoint e.g., if it can be written as double-commutator form, cf. Eqn. (19).

Moreover, since the flow of Eqn. (8) is trace preserving, the image of Γ is contained in the space of all traceless Hermitian matrices

$$\mathfrak{her}_0(N) := \{H \in \mathfrak{gl}(N, \mathbb{C}) \mid H = H^\dagger, \text{tr} H = 0\}.$$

Therefore, the restriction of $\Gamma|_{\mathfrak{her}_0(N)}$ yields an operator from $\mathfrak{her}_0(N)$ to itself and thus Eqn. (8) can also be regarded as an equation on $\mathfrak{her}_0(N)$. To distinguish these two interpretations of Eqn. (8), we call the latter *homogeneous Master equation* [71]. Note that the homogeneous Master equation completely characterizes the dynamics of the open system, once an equilibrium state ρ_* of Eqn. (8) is known. More precisely, if $\mathcal{L}_u(\rho_*) = 0$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ (e.g. choose $\rho_* = \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{1}_N$ for unital equations) the dynamics of $\rho_0 := \rho - \rho_*$ is described by the homogeneous Master equation. Finally, we associate to Eqn. (8) a *lifted Master equation*

$$\dot{X} = -\mathcal{L}_u \circ X \quad (9)$$

on $GL(\mathfrak{her}(N))$ and $GL(\mathfrak{her}_0(N))$, respectively. Equation (9) will play a key role in the subsequent subsemigroup approach.

For a constant control $u(t) \equiv u$, the formal solution of the lifted Master equation Eqn. (9) is given by $T_u(t) := \exp(-t\mathcal{L}_u)$. Thus

$$\{T_u(t) \mid t \geq 0\} \quad (10)$$

yields a one-parameter semigroup of linear operators acting on $\mathfrak{her}(N)$. Actually, the operators $T_u(t)$ form a *contraction semigroup of positive and trace preserving linear operators* on $\mathfrak{her}(N)$ in the sense that

$$\|T_u(t)(A)\|_1 \leq \|A\|_1$$

for all $A \in \mathfrak{her}(N)$, cf. [12, 18]. Recall, that the trace norm $\|A\|_1$ of $A \in \mathfrak{her}(N)$ is given by

$$\|A\|_1 := \sum_i^N \sigma_i = \sum_i^N |\lambda_i|,$$

where σ_i and λ_i denote the singular- and eigenvalues of A , respectively. Moreover, the semigroup (10) is said to be *purity-decreasing* if moreover all $T_u(t)$ constitute a contraction with respect to the norm induced by the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product $\langle A, B \rangle = \text{tr}(A^\dagger B)$, i.e. if

$$\langle T_u(t)(\rho), T_u(t)(\rho) \rangle \leq \langle \rho, \rho \rangle$$

holds for all $\rho \in \text{pos}_1(N)$ and all $t \geq 0$. In general, $T_u(t)$ is *not* purity-decreasing. However, if Γ is in the Kossakowski-Lindblad form, cf. Eqn. (12), a necessary and sufficient condition for being purity-decreasing is unitality of Γ_L , i.e. $\Gamma_L(\mathbb{1}_N) = 0$, cf. [48]. Thus for a unital Kossakowski-Lindblad term Γ_L , the subsemigroup

$$\mathbf{P}_\Sigma := \langle T_u(t) \mid t \geq 0, u \in \mathcal{U} \rangle_S \quad (11)$$

generated by the one-parameter semigroups (10) is contained in a *linear contraction semigroup* of a Hilbert space.

Remark III.1. Let \mathcal{H} be a complex Hilbert space with scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Then the *linear contraction semigroup* of \mathcal{H} is defined by

$$\mathbf{C}(\mathcal{H}) := \{T \in GL(\mathcal{H}) \mid \langle Tv, Tv \rangle \leq \langle v, v \rangle \text{ for all } v \in \mathcal{H}\}.$$

Note that $\mathbf{C}_0(\mathcal{H})$ —the connected component of the unity in $\mathbf{C}(\mathcal{H})$ —is in fact a Lie subsemigroup. This can easily be seen by the polar decomposition $T = PU$, because $PU \in \mathbf{C}(\mathcal{H})$ with U unitary and $P = P^\dagger$ positive definite holds, if and only if the eigenvalues of P are at most equal to 1. Thus

$$\mathbf{C}_0(\mathcal{H}) = \exp(-\mathfrak{c}) \cdot U(\mathcal{H}),$$

where \mathfrak{c} denotes the cone of all positive semidefinite elements in $\mathfrak{gl}(\mathcal{H})$ and $U(\mathcal{H})$ the corresponding unitary group. Similarly, one can define contraction semigroups for real vector spaces, cf. [21].

Next, we briefly fix some fundamental notions and notations of complete positivity in the theory of open quantum systems. Recall that a linear map $T_u(t)$ is *completely positive*, if $T_u(t)$ and all its extensions of the form $T_u(t) \otimes \mathbf{1}_m$ are positivity-preserving, i.e.

$$(T_u(t) \otimes \mathbf{1}_m)(\text{pos}_1(N \cdot m)) \subset \text{pos}_1(N \cdot m)$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Complete positivity of the Markovian semigroup $\{T_u(t) \mid t \geq 0\}$ is required to guarantee that $\{T_u(t) \mid t \geq 0\}$ can be associated with a Hamiltonian evolution on a larger Hilbert space, cf. [20, 49, 50].

According to the celebrated work by Kossakowski [17] and Lindblad [14], Eqn. (8) generates a one-parameter semigroup $\{T_u(t) \mid t \geq 0\}$ of linear trace-preserving and completely positive operators, if and only if Γ_L can be written as

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_k V_k^\dagger V_k \rho + \rho V_k^\dagger V_k - 2V_k \rho V_k^\dagger =: \Gamma_L(\rho) \quad (12)$$

with arbitrary complex matrices $V_k \in \mathfrak{gl}(N, \mathbb{C})$. Thus the Master equation (8) then specialises to the *Kossakowski-Lindblad form*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_u(\rho) := \\ \text{i ad}_{H_u}(\rho) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_k V_k^\dagger V_k \rho + \rho V_k^\dagger V_k - 2V_k \rho V_k^\dagger. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Suppose we consider the complexification of $\mathfrak{het}(N)$, i.e. the complex vector space

$$\mathfrak{het}(N)^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{gl}(N, \mathbb{C}) = \mathbb{C}^{N \times N} \cong \mathbb{C}^{N^2}.$$

By extending the linear operators $\text{ad}_{H_u}, \Gamma_L \in \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{het}(N))$ to $\widehat{H}_u, \widehat{\Gamma}_L : \mathbb{C}^{N^2} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{N^2}$ one arrives at the superoperator representations

$$\widehat{H}_u := \mathbf{1}_N \otimes H_u - H_u^\top \otimes \mathbf{1}_N \quad \text{and} \quad (14)$$

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_L := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{N^2} \mathbf{1}_N \otimes V_k^\dagger V_k + V_k^\top V_k^* \otimes \mathbf{1}_N - 2V_k^* \otimes V_k, \quad (15)$$

where $\widehat{H}_u, \widehat{\Gamma}_L \in \mathfrak{gl}(N^2, \mathbb{C})$ are $N^2 \times N^2$ complex matrices. In particular, if Γ_L is self-adjoint, the corresponding matrix representation $\widehat{\Gamma}_L \in \mathfrak{gl}(N^2, \mathbb{C})$ is Hermitian. Moreover, note that the matrix representation $\widehat{\Gamma}_L$ contains some redundancies on $\mathfrak{gl}(N^2, \mathbb{C})$ since the original Γ_L operates on the real vector space $\mathfrak{het}(N)$ which has obviously smaller (real) dimension than \mathbb{C}^{N^2} . Viewed in this way, note that $\widehat{\Gamma}_L$ is not the same as the matrix representation of Γ_L in the *coherence-vector formalism*, see [44] for an introduction and [51] for a recent characterisation of positive semidefiniteness in terms of Casimir invariants.

Finally, it is instructive to interpret the Kossakowski-Lindblad master equation in terms of Lie subsemigroups. We define \mathbf{P} to be the semigroup of all positive, trace preserving *invertible* linear operators on $\mathfrak{het}(N)$, i.e.

$$\mathbf{P} := \{T \in GL(\mathfrak{het}(N)) \mid T \cdot \text{pos}_1(N) \subset \text{pos}_1(N)\}.$$

and \mathbf{P}^{cp} to be the closed subsemigroup of all completely positive ones, i.e.

$$\mathbf{P}^{\text{cp}} := \{T \in \mathbf{P} \mid T \text{ completely positive}\} \subsetneq \mathbf{P}.$$

Moreover, let \mathbf{P}_0 and \mathbf{P}_0^{cp} be the corresponding connected components of the unity. Then a key-result by Kossakowski and Lindblad can be formulated as follows.

Theorem III.2. (Kossakowski, Lindblad [14, 17])
The Lie wedge $L(\mathbf{P}_0^{\text{cp}})$ is given by the set of all linear operators $-\mathcal{L}$ of the form $\mathcal{L} := \text{i ad}_H + \Gamma_L$, where Γ_L is defined by Eqn.(12).

While the finite-dimensional version of Theorem III.2 stated above was originally proven by Gorini, Kossakowski and Sudarshan [17], at the same time Lindblad [14] handled the explicitly infinite-dimensional case of a norm (uniform) continuous semigroup of completely positive operators acting on a W^* -algebra. (Note that Kossakowski-Lindblad-type equations with *time-dependent* coefficients were analysed e.g. by [52] or [53].)

For proving Theorem III.2, a former, actually infinite-dimensional result by Kossakowski [12] on one-parameter semigroups of positive (not necessarily completely positive) operators on trace-class operators $\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and their infinitesimal generators was recast into a finite-dimensional setting in [17]. Although Kossakowski and Lindblad exploited different methods from functional analysis, a crucial point in both papers [12] and [14] is the theory of dissipative semigroups on Banach spaces, cf. Lumer and Phillips [54].

Yet in the context of finite-dimensional Lie-semigroups, the same results now show up as a consequence of a more general invariance theorem for convex cones: roughly spoken the infinitesimal generator of a one-parameter semigroup leaving a fixed convex cone invariant is characterised via its values at the extreme points of the cone, cf. Theorem I.5.27 in [22]. In particular, Kossakowski's work [12] on one-parameter semigroups of positive operators then turns out to be a special application of the afore-mentioned invariance theorem to the convex cone of all positive semidefinite $N \times N$ -matrices

$$\text{pos}(N) := \{H \in \mathfrak{het}(N) \mid H \geq 0\} \quad .$$

Likewise, Theorem III.2 can be obtained by the invariance theorem applied to the cone $\text{pos}(N^2)$, once the equivalence of complete positivity of $\exp(-t\mathcal{L})$ and positivity of $\exp(-t\mathcal{L} \otimes I_N)$ is established, cf. [17]. For more details see [55].

Thus having derived the Lie wedge of \mathbf{P}_0^{cp} , the issue of its *globality* as well as the closely related problem whether \mathbf{P}_0^{cp} is a Lie subsemigroup in the sense of Section II naturally arise. Since \mathbf{P}_0^{cp} is closed in $GL(\mathfrak{het}(N))$, we have the following partial answer to these problems, cf. Proposition V.1.14 in [22].

Theorem III.3. *The semigroup*

$$\mathbf{T} := \overline{\langle \exp(\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{P}_0^{\text{cp}})) \rangle_S} \subseteq \mathbf{P}_0^{\text{cp}}$$

generated by $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{P}_0^{\text{cp}})$ is a Lie subsemigroup with the Lie wedge $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{T}) = \mathbf{L}(\mathbf{P}_0^{\text{cp}})$. In particular, $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{P}_0^{\text{cp}})$ is a global Lie wedge.

To the best of our knowledge, the ultimate question whether $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{P}_0^{\text{cp}}$ holds such that \mathbf{P}_0^{cp} itself is a Lie-subsemigroup remains an open research problem.

C. Controllability Aspects for Open Quantum Systems

Structural Preliminaries

Studying reachable sets of open quantum systems subject to a controlled Hamiltonian, cf. Eqn. (16), is intricate, as will be evident already in the following simple scenario: consider a Master equation in the superoperator form

$$\text{vec } \dot{\rho} = -\left(i \sum_j \widehat{H}_j + \widehat{\Gamma}_L\right) \text{vec } \rho,$$

where the $i\widehat{H}_j$ are skew-Hermitian, while $\widehat{\Gamma}_L$ shall be Hermitian. Thus they respect the standard Cartan decomposition of $\mathfrak{gl}(N^2, \mathbb{C}) := \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$ into skew-Hermitian matrices (\mathfrak{k}) and Hermitian matrices (\mathfrak{p}). Then the usual commutator relations $[\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{k}] \subseteq \mathfrak{k}$, $[\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}] \subseteq \mathfrak{k}$, $[\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{p}] \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ suggest that double commutators of the form

$$[[\widehat{H}_j, \widehat{\Gamma}_L], [\widehat{H}_k, \widehat{\Gamma}_L]]$$

generate *new* \mathfrak{k} -directions in the system Lie algebra as will be described below in more detail.

For the moment note on a general scale that such controlled open systems thus fail to comply with the standard notions of controllability: not only does this hold for operator controllability of the lifted system but also for usual controllability on the set of all density operators, cf. [27, 28]. Hence it is natural to ask for weaker controllability concepts in open systems.

For simplicity, we confine the subsequent considerations to *unital* systems of Kossakowski-Lindblad form, i.e. $\Gamma_L(\mathbf{1}_N) = 0$, as their dynamics is completely described by the homogeneous Master equation

$$\dot{\rho} = -i \text{ad}_{H_u}(\rho) - \Gamma_L(\rho) = -\mathcal{L}_u(\rho) \quad (16)$$

on $\mathfrak{her}_0(N)$ and its lift

$$\dot{X} = -\mathcal{L}_u \circ X \quad (17)$$

to $GL(\mathfrak{her}_0(N))$. Here the controlled Hamiltonian takes the form of Eqn. (7) with H_d and H_j in $\mathfrak{su}(N)$ and *no bounds* on the controls $u_j \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus the semigroup \mathbf{P}_Σ given by Eqn. (17) will be regarded as a subsemigroup

of $GL(\mathfrak{her}_0(N))$ in the sequel. Alternatively, by the previously introduced superoperator representation, we can think of \mathbf{P}_Σ as embedded in $GL(N^2, \mathbb{C})$.

If, in the absence of relaxation, the Hamiltonian system is fully controllable, we have

$$\langle iH_d, iH_j \mid j = 1, \dots, m \rangle_{\text{Lie}} = \mathfrak{su}(N), \quad (18)$$

or, equivalently,

$$\langle i\widehat{H}_d, i\widehat{H}_j \mid j = 1, \dots, m \rangle_{\text{Lie}} = \mathfrak{psu}(N) \subset \mathfrak{su}(N^2),$$

where we envisage $\mathfrak{psu}(N)$ to be represented as Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{su}(N^2)$ given by all matrices of the form $i(\mathbf{1} \otimes H - H^\top \otimes \mathbf{1})$ with $iH \in \mathfrak{su}(N)$. Master equations which satisfy Eqn. (18) are expected to be generically accessible, i.e. their system Lie algebras generically meet the condition

$$\langle i \text{ad}_{H_d} + \Gamma_L, i \text{ad}_{H_j} \mid j = 1, 2, \dots, m \rangle_{\text{Lie}} = \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{her}_0(N)),$$

cf. [28, 55, 56]. Here, the system Lie algebra of the control system (Section IIB) is not to be misunderstood as its Lie wedge, which in general is but a proper subset of the system Lie algebra.

The *group* generated by Eqn. (17) therefore generically coincides with $GL(\mathfrak{her}_0(N))$. Thus already the coherent part of the open system's dynamics, i.e. the "orthogonal part" of the polar decomposition of elements in \mathbf{P}_Σ , has to be embedded into a larger orthogonal (unitary) group than of the same system being closed, i.e. when $\Gamma_L = 0$. This can easily be seen if the Master equation (16) specialises so that the respective matrix representations $i\widehat{H}_j$ for $i \text{ad}_{H_j}$ are skew-Hermitian, while $\widehat{\Gamma}_L$ is Hermitian. For instance, this is the case in the simple double-commutator form

$$\dot{\rho} = -\left(i \text{ad}_{H_u} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \text{ad}_{V_k}^2\right)(\rho) \quad (19)$$

It exemplifies the details why in terms of \mathfrak{k} - \mathfrak{p} decomposition, double commutators like $[[\widehat{H}_j, \widehat{\Gamma}_L], [\widehat{H}_k, \widehat{\Gamma}_L]]$ typically generate new \mathfrak{k} -directions in the system Lie algebra of Eqn. (17). This holds *a fortiori* if—as henceforth—we allow for general Kossakowski-Lindblad generators no longer confined to be in double-commutator form. We can therefore summarize the above considerations as follows.

Resume. *In open quantum systems that are fully controllable for $\Gamma_L = 0$, one finds:*

1. *Only if $\Gamma_L|_{\mathfrak{her}_0(N)}$ is scalar and thus $[iH_j, \Gamma_L] = 0$ for all j , the open dynamics is confined to the contraction semigroup $(0, 1] \cdot \text{Ad}_{SU(N)}$ of the unitary adjoint group $\text{Ad}_{SU(N)}$. Moreover, the contractive relaxative part and the coherent Hamiltonian part are independent in the sense that their interference does not generate new directions in the Lie algebra.*

2. Yet in the generic case, the open systems' dynamics explore a semigroup larger than the contraction semigroup of the unitary part $\text{Ad}_{SU(N)}$ of the closed analogue.

Thus for an explorative overview, the task is three-fold:

- (i) find the system Lie algebra

$$\mathfrak{s}_{\text{open}} := \langle \text{i ad}_{H_d} + \Gamma_L, \text{i ad}_{H_j} \rangle_{\text{Lie}}; \quad (20)$$

- (ii) if $\mathfrak{s}_{\text{open}} = \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{her}_0(N))$ already (as will turn out to be the case in most of the physical applications with generic relaxative parts Γ_L), then the dynamics of the entire open system takes the form of a contraction semigroup contained in $GL(\mathfrak{her}_0(N))$; the relaxative part interferes with the coherent Hamiltonian part generating new directions in the Lie algebra, where the geometry of the interplay determines the set of explored states;
- (iii) in the (physically rare) event of $\mathfrak{s}_{\text{open}} \subsetneq \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{her}_0(N))$ the system dynamics takes the form of a contraction semigroup contained in a proper subgroup of $GL(\mathfrak{her}_0(N))$.

Weak Hamiltonian Controllability

As mentioned before, controllability notions for open systems weaker than the classical one are desirable, since Eqn. (16) is in general non-controllable in the classical sense. Here, we define a unital open quantum system to be *Hamiltonian controllable* (H-controllable) if the subgroup $\{\text{Ad}_U \mid U \in SU(N)\}$ is contained in the closure of the subsemigroup \mathbf{P}_Σ , i.e.

$$\{\text{Ad}_U \mid U \in SU(N)\} \subset \overline{\mathbf{P}}_\Sigma.$$

In contrast, we will call a system to be *weakly Hamiltonian controllable* (WH-controllable) if the subgroup $\{\text{Ad}_U \mid U \in SU(N)\}$ is contained in the closure of the subsemigroup $\mathbb{R}^+ \cdot \mathbf{P}_\Sigma \subset GL(\mathfrak{her}_0(N))$, i.e.

$$\{\text{Ad}_U \mid U \in SU(N)\} \subset [1, \infty) \cdot \overline{\mathbf{P}}_\Sigma.$$

So far, WH-controllability has not been studied in the literature, although it provides a partial answer for the problem of finding the best-approximation to the unitary orbit $\mathcal{O}(\rho)$ on reachable set $\text{Reach}(\rho)$ of a given density operator. Here, we establish a first basic result on WH-controllable systems under the additional assumption that the controlled Hamiltonian is given by Eqn.(7) with *no bounds* on the controls $u_j \in \mathbb{R}$. For a first analysis, the subalgebra generated by the controls terms

$$\mathfrak{k}_c := \langle \text{i}H_1, \dots, \text{i}H_m \rangle_{\text{Lie}}$$

and by the *Hamiltonian drift* plus controls terms

$$\mathfrak{k}_d := \langle \text{i}H_d, \text{i}H_1, \dots, \text{i}H_m \rangle_{\text{Lie}}$$

play an essential role for WH-controllability.

Proposition III.1. *A unital open quantum system (16) with the Hamiltonian given by Eqn. (7) is*

- (a) H-controllable, if $\mathfrak{k}_c = \mathfrak{su}(N)$ and
- (b) WH-controllable, if $\mathfrak{k}_d = \mathfrak{su}(N)$ and $\Gamma_L|_{\mathfrak{her}_0(N)} = \gamma \mathbf{1}$ with $\gamma \geq 0$.

Moreover, for $U \in SU(N)$, the smallest $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\text{Ad}_U \in \lambda \overline{\mathbf{P}}_\Sigma$ is given by $e^{\gamma T^*(U)}$, where $T^*(U)$ denotes the optimal time to steer the lifted system given by Eqn. (17) without relaxation, i.e. for $\Gamma_L = 0$, from the identity $\mathbf{1}$ to Ad_U . In particular, for $\mathfrak{k}_c = \mathfrak{su}(N)$ one has $\lambda = 1$ for all $U \in SU(N)$.

Proof. (a) First, suppose $\mathfrak{k}_c = \mathfrak{su}(N)$. Then, the fact that we do not assume any bounds on the controls $u_j \in \mathbb{R}$ implies for $\Gamma_L = 0$ that one can steer from the identity $\mathbf{1}$ to any Ad_U arbitrarily fast. Thus for $\Gamma_L \neq 0$ a standard continuity argument from the theory of ordinary differential equations shows that one can approximate Ad_U up to any accuracy by elements of \mathbf{P}_Σ . Thus H-controllability holds.

(b) Suppose $\mathfrak{k}_d = \mathfrak{su}(N)$ and $\Gamma_L|_{\mathfrak{her}_0(N)} = \gamma \mathbf{1}$. By Corollary II.2, we obtain controllability of $\{\text{Ad}_U \mid U \in SU(N)\}$ for $\Gamma_L = 0$. Therefore, we can choose a control $u(t)$ which steers the identity $\mathbf{1}$ to Ad_U in optimal time $T^*(U)$. Applying the same control to the system under relaxation one yields a trajectory which finally arrives at $e^{-\gamma T^*(U)} \text{Ad}_U$. Thus WH-controllability holds for $\lambda = e^{\gamma T^*(U)}$. Moreover, by the time optimality of $T^*(U)$ it is guaranteed that $\lambda = e^{\gamma T^*(U)}$ is the smallest $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\text{Ad}_U \in \lambda \overline{\mathbf{P}}_\Sigma$ holds. \square

In general, an open quantum system that is operator controllable in the absence of relaxation will not be necessarily WH-controllable when including relaxation, even though it may be accessible. A counterexample showing this fact for the simplest two-level system and simulations will be provided in [55]. Establishing necessary and sufficient conditions for WH-controllability of open quantum systems is therefore an open research problem. For unital systems which are controllable in the absence of relaxation, we do expect that the ‘‘ratio’’ of the Hamiltonian and the relaxative drift term completely determines WH-controllability.

Finally we will see that under additional assumptions ensuring the preconditions of Theorem II.1, the simple case specified in Proposition III.1(a) also allows for an inclusion of the global Lie wedge of Eqn. (16).

Theorem III.4. *Assume that the unital Master equation (16) with the Hamiltonian given by Eqn. (7) fulfilling the following condition: there exists a pointed cone \mathfrak{c} in the set of all positive semidefinite linear operators on $\mathfrak{her}_0(N)$ such that*

1. $\Gamma_L|_{\mathfrak{her}_0(N)} \in \mathfrak{c}$;
2. $[\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{c}] \subset \text{ad}_{\mathfrak{su}(N)}$ and $[\mathfrak{c}, \text{ad}_{\mathfrak{su}(N)}] \subset \mathfrak{c} - \mathfrak{c}$;




Figure 1: (Colour online) Quantum state-space manifolds for open relaxative systems shown as subsets of $\mathfrak{hcr}_0(N)$ with scales corresponding to the metric induced by the Hilbert-Schmidt scalar product. The centre of the high-dimensional sphere is the zero-matrix, and the geometry refers to larger, e.g., multi-qubit systems with $N \geq 4$. If in the absence of relaxation, the system is fully controllable, the reachable set for a fixed initial state represented as density operator ρ_0 takes the form of the entire unitary orbit $\text{Ad}_{\text{SU}(N)}(\rho_0)$. It serves as a reference and is shown as closed curve in red. In the text we focus on two different scenarios of open systems: (a) Dynamics for *weakly Hamiltonian controllable* systems with the Kossakowski-Lindblad term acting approximately as scalar $\Gamma_L \simeq \gamma \mathbb{1}$ are confined to the subset (marked in blue) of states evolving from ρ_0 under the action of the contraction semigroup $(0, 1] \cdot \text{Ad}_{\text{SU}(N)}$. The latter is depicted as grey *surface* of a “funnel” intersecting the surface of the high-dimensional sphere in the unitary orbit. Towards the origin, i.e., at long times, the reachable set of WH-controllable systems typically wraps the entire surface (dark blue portion). (b) In the *generic case* when $[\Gamma_L, H_\nu] \neq 0$ ($\nu = d; 1, 2, \dots, m$), the dynamics with initial state ρ_0 evolves within the *volume* shown in blue. New directions due to the interplay of coherent Hamiltonian evolution and relaxation make the dynamics explore a much larger state space than resulting from the simple contraction semigroup $(0, 1] \cdot \text{Ad}_{\text{SU}(N)}$, i.e. the surface in part (a) or the volume contained in its interior. The intersection (green portion) of the volume $\text{Reach}(\rho_0)$ with the surface of the sphere consists of the set of all states reachable from ρ_0 in zero time or without relaxative loss. This may often collapse to the single point ρ_0 or its *local* unitary orbit [57, 58].

3. $\text{Ad}_U \mathfrak{c} \text{Ad}_U^{-1} \subset \mathfrak{c}$ for all $U \in \text{SU}(N)$.

Then, the Lie subsemigroup $\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\Sigma$ of Eqn. (16) is contained in the Lie subsemigroup

$$\exp(-\mathfrak{c}) \cdot \text{Ad}_{\text{SU}(N)}$$

with Lie wedge $\text{ad}_{\mathfrak{su}(N)} \oplus (-\mathfrak{c})$.

Proof. By Theorem II.3(b), it is sufficient to verify that $\exp(-\mathfrak{c}) \cdot \text{Ad}_{\text{SU}(N)}$ is a Lie subsemigroup with Lie wedge $\text{ad}_{\mathfrak{su}(N)} \oplus (-\mathfrak{c})$. This will be achieved by applying Theorem II.1. To this end, we define $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$ with $\mathfrak{k} := \text{ad}_{\mathfrak{su}(N)}$ and $\mathfrak{p} := (\mathfrak{c} - \mathfrak{c}) + (\mathfrak{c} - \mathfrak{c})^\top$. Note that the set $\mathfrak{c} - \mathfrak{c}$ consisting of all differences within the cone \mathfrak{c} coincides with the vector space spanned by \mathfrak{c} . Thus \mathfrak{p} is a subspace of $\mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{hcr}_0(N))$ which is invariant under the involution $\Lambda \mapsto -\Lambda^\top$, where Λ^\top denotes the adjoint operator of Λ with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product on $\mathfrak{hcr}_0(N)$. Then, \mathfrak{g} constitutes a Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{hcr}_0(N))$ which is also invariant under the involution $\Lambda \mapsto -\Lambda^\top$. By choosing an orthogonal basis in $\mathfrak{hcr}_0(N)$, this invariance of \mathfrak{g} translates into a matrix representation of \mathfrak{g} which is stable under $X \mapsto -X^\dagger$. Then Proposition 1.59 in [42] implies that \mathfrak{g} is reductive and thus it decomposes into a direct sum of its centre \mathfrak{z} and its semi-simple commutator ideal $\mathfrak{g}_0 := [\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$,

i.e. $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{z} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_0$. Since $\text{ad}_{\mathfrak{su}(N)}$, is contained in \mathfrak{g} , the centre \mathfrak{z} is either trivial or $\mathbb{R} \cdot \mathbb{1}$. Thus, similar to Corollary 7.10 in [42], one can show that $\mathbf{G} := \langle \exp \mathfrak{g} \rangle$ is a closed connected subgroup of $GL(\mathfrak{hcr}_0(N))$. Therefore, Theorem II.1 applies to \mathbf{G} . In particular, \mathfrak{k} and \mathfrak{p} yield the required eigenspace decomposition of \mathfrak{g} . Hence we conclude that $\exp(-\mathfrak{c}) \cdot \langle \exp \mathfrak{k} \rangle = \exp(-\mathfrak{c}) \cdot \text{Ad}_{\text{SU}(N)}$ is a Lie subsemigroup of $GL(\mathfrak{hcr}_0(N))$ with Lie wedge $\text{ad}_{\mathfrak{su}(N)} \oplus (-\mathfrak{c})$. Thus the result follows. \square

The previous findings suggest the following procedure to compute or at least to approximate the Lie wedge of $\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\Sigma$:

- (a) Check, whether Γ_L is self-adjoint (implying positive semidefiniteness for Γ_L). This is for example the case, if all V_k in Eqn. (12) are Hermitian or, equivalently, if the Kossakowski-Lindblad term can be rewritten as a sum of double commutators, cf. Eqn. (19).
- (b) If (a) holds, find the smallest cone \mathfrak{c} containing Γ_L and satisfying the conditions of Theorem III.4.

Note that the above procedure yields but an *outer approximation* of the Lie wedge. In general, further arguments are necessary to obtain equality. For the generic

two-level system in [27], however, equality can be proven as the following result shows.

Corollary III.1. *Let (Σ) be a unital \mathbb{H} -controllable two-level system with generic Kossakowski-Lindblad term Γ_L . Then, the Lie subsemigroup $\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\Sigma$ coincides with*

$$\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\Sigma = \exp(-\mathbf{c}) \cdot \text{Ad}_{SU(2)} \subset \mathbf{C}_0(\mathfrak{her}_0(2))$$

where \mathbf{c} denotes the convex cone

$$\mathbf{c} := \text{conv}\{\lambda\Theta\Gamma_L\Theta^\top \mid \lambda \geq 0, \Theta \in \text{Ad}_{SU(2)}\} \quad (21)$$

contained in the set of all positive semidefinite elements in $\mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{her}_0(2))$, cf. Remark III.1. Here, Θ^\top denotes the adjoint operator of Θ with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product on $\mathfrak{her}_0(2)$. Moreover, the Lie wedge of $\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\Sigma$ is given by $(-\mathbf{c}) \oplus \text{ad}_{\mathfrak{su}(2)}$.

Proof. \mathbb{H} -controllability of the system implies that $\text{ad}_{\mathfrak{su}(2)}$ is contained in $L(\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\Sigma)$. Moreover, for $N = 2$ it is known that $\Gamma_L|_{\mathfrak{her}_0(2)}$ is a positive semidefinite operator of $\mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{her}_0(2))$. Thus Theorem III.4 applied to the cone \mathbf{c} given by Eqn. (21) yields $\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\Sigma \subset \exp(-\mathbf{c}) \cdot \text{Ad}_{SU(2)}$. For the converse inclusion, we refer to a standard convexity result on Lie saturated systems, cf. [8]. \square

The geometry of reachability sets under contraction semigroups are illustrated and summarised in Fig. 1.

In general, it is quite intricate to show that outer approximations of the Lie wedge $L(\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\Sigma)$ derived from Theorem III.4 in fact coincide with $L(\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\Sigma)$. To the best of our knowledge, no efficient procedure to explicitly determine the global Lie wedge of Eqn. (13) does exist. Thus, for optimisation tasks on $\text{Reach}(\rho)$, one currently has to resort to standard optimal control methods. A straightforward but robust algorithm will be mentioned in the final section.

IV. RELATION TO OPTIMISATION TASKS

We follow [36] in considering optimisation tasks that come in two scenarios, see also Fig. 2: (a) abstract optimisation over the reachable set and (b) optimal control of a dynamic system specified by its equation of motion (e.g. of Kossakowski-Lindblad form). More precisely, an abstract optimisation task means the problem of finding the global optimum of a given quality function f over the reachable set of an initial state ρ (independently of the controls that may drive the system to the desired optimum). In contrast, a problem is said to be a dynamic optimisation task if one is interested in an explicit (time-dependent) control u_* that steers the system in some sense optimal (e.g. time- or energy-optimal) to a desired final state.

In cases where the reachable set $\text{Reach}(\rho)$ can conveniently be characterised—e.g., via the system Lie subalgebra as in closed quantum systems—numerical methods

from constrained optimization are appropriate to solve an abstract optimisation tasks on $\text{Reach}(\rho)$. Details have been elaborated in [36]. However, in open quantum systems a satisfactory characterization of the reachable set $\text{Reach}(\rho)$ —e.g., via Lie algebraic methods—is currently an unsolved problem. Thus numerical methods designed for optimal control tasks (b) may serve as a handy substitute to solve also abstract optimisation tasks (a) on $\text{Reach}(\rho)$.

To be more explicit, we consider the Kossakowski-Lindblad equation (16) with controlled Hamiltonian (7) in superoperator representation. We are faced with a system taking the form of a standard *bilinear control system* (Σ) for $\text{vec } \rho(t) \in \mathbb{C}^{N^2}$ reading

$$\text{vec } \dot{\rho} = (A_0 + \sum_{j=1}^m u_j A_j) \text{vec } \rho \quad (22)$$

with drift term $A_0 := -i(\mathbb{1}_N \otimes H_d - H_d^\top \otimes \mathbb{1}_N) - \widehat{\Gamma}_L$, control directions $A_j := -i(\mathbb{1}_N \otimes H_j - H_j^\top \otimes \mathbb{1}_N)$, and control amplitudes $u_j \in \mathbb{R}$, while $\widehat{\Gamma}_L$ is given by Eqn. (15). Then an optimal control task boils down to maximising a quality functional with respect to some finite dimensional function space, e.g. piecewise constant control amplitudes (for details see [36] Overview Section). Clearly, one can reduce the size of system (22) by choosing a coherence-vector representation instead of a superoperator representation without changing the principle approach.

In this context, we would like to point out a remarkable interpretation of $L(\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\Sigma)$. The method just outlined may lead to a (discretised) unconstrained gradient flow on some high-dimensional \mathbb{R}^m (again cf. [36] Overview Section). While the “local” search directions (pulled back to state space) are confined to directions available in the “local” Lie wedge of Eqn. (13), i.e. to the smallest Lie wedge generated by A_0 and $u_j A_j$, $u_j \in \mathbb{R}$, the entire method nevertheless allows to vary the final point $\rho(T)$ within an open neighbourhood of $\text{Reach}(\rho)$, cf. Fig. 2(b). In contrast, a gradient-like method on the reachable set itself similar to the one for closed systems, but with search directions constrained to the (local) Lie wedge would in general fail, cf. Fig. 2(a).

Outlook: An Optimal Control Algorithm Exploiting the Lie-Wedge

Yet, combining both methods yields a new approach to abstract optimization tasks: (i) First determine an *inner* approximation \mathbf{c} of the Lie wedge. (ii) Then, choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and define a map from the n -fold cartesian product $\mathbf{c} \times \dots \times \mathbf{c}$ to \mathbb{R} by $(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_n) \mapsto f(e^{\Omega_n} \dots e^{\Omega_1})$. Optimise this function over the *convex set* $\mathbf{c} \times \dots \times \mathbf{c}$ and increase n if necessary. We do expect that the performance of such an approach improves the better the approximation of the Lie wedge is. In particular, the length of the necessary products $e^{\Omega_n} \dots e^{\Omega_1}$ will significantly decrease if \mathbf{c} is a




Figure 2: (Colour online) Steering dynamics of open relaxative systems represented by semigroup actions on a state space manifold M : (a) gradient-like method on the reachable set $\text{Reach}(\rho)$ itself; admissible directions are confined to directions available in the Lie wedge; (b) optimal control approach: “implicit method” on the reachable set $\text{Reach}(\rho)$ brought about by a gradient flow on the set of control amplitudes as in Fig. 3 of Ref. [36]. Note that in (b) the entire trajectory at all points in time is updated from $k \mapsto k + 1$ thus exploring more directions than in (a), which may be an advantage over local gradient-like methods in open systems.

good approximation to $L(\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\Sigma)$. Thus even for numerical aspects the knowledge of the Lie wedge is of considerable interest. — With these remarks we will turn to other points pertinent in practice.

Practical Implications for Current Numerical Optimal Control

The above considerations have further implications for numerical approaches to optimal control of open systems in the sense of the dynamic task (b) of the previous section. They provide the framework to understand why time-optimal control makes sense in certain WH-controllable systems, whereas all other situations ask for explicitly taking the Kossakowski-Lindblad master equation into account. Consider three scenarios: (i) an open quantum system that is WH-controllable with almost uniform decay rate, (ii) generic open systems with known Markovian (or non-Markovian) relaxation characteristics, and (iii) open systems with unknown relaxation behaviour.

In the simple case (i) of a WH-controllable system with almost uniform decay rate γ , Γ_L approximately acts on $\mathfrak{her}_0(N)$ as scalar $\gamma\mathbb{1}$. Now assume that by numerical optimal control a build-up top curve $g(T)$ (value function) of maximum obtainable quality against total duration T was calculated for the corresponding closed system with $\Gamma_L = 0$. Moreover, let T_* denote the smallest time allowing for a quality above a given error-correction threshold. Together with the uniform decay rate γ this already provides all information if the quality function depends linearly on $\rho(T)$. Hence determining $T'_* := \text{argmax}\{g(T) \cdot e^{-\gamma T}\}$ gives the optimal time for the desired solution. More coarsely, if $T'_* \simeq T_*$ *time-optimal controls for the closed system* are already a good guess for steering a WH-controllable system with almost uniform decay rate.

For case (ii), when the Kossakowski-Lindblad opera-

tor is known, but generically does not commute with all Hamiltonian drift and control components, it is currently most advantageous to use optimal control techniques based on the Master equation with specific Kossakowski-Lindblad terms as has been illustrated in [59]. The importance of including the Kossakowski-Lindblad terms roots in the fact that their non-commutative interplay with the Hamiltonian part actually introduces new directions in the semigroup dynamics. Likewise, in [60], we treated the optimal control task of open quantum systems in a non-Markovian case, where a qubit interacts in a non-Markovian way with a two-level-fluctuator, which in turn is dissipatively coupled to a bosonic bath in a Markovian way.

Clearly, the case of entirely unknown relaxation characteristics (iii), where e.g. model building and system identification of the relaxative part is precluded or too costly, is least expected to improve by suitable open-loop controls, if at all. Yet in [59] we have demonstrated that guesses of time-optimal control sequences (again obtained from the analogous closed system) may—by sheer serendipity—be apt to cope with relaxation. In practice, this comes at the cost of making sure a sufficiently large family of time-optimal controls is ultimately tested in the actual experiment for selecting among many optimal-control based candidates by trial and error. — Since this procedure is clearly highly unsatisfactory from a scientific viewpoint, efficient methods of determining pertinent decay parameters are highly desirable.

CONCLUSIONS

Optimising quality functions for open quantum dynamical processes as well as determining steerings in concrete experimental settings that actually achieve these optima is tantamount to exploiting and manipulating quantum effects in future technology.

To this end, we have recast the structure of completely

positive trace-preserving maps describing the time evolution of open quantum systems in terms of *Lie semigroups*. In particular, we have identified the set of Kossakowski-Lindblad generators as *Lie wedge* in the sense that the tangent cone at the unity of the subsemigroup of all invertible, completely positive, and trace-preserving operators coincides with the set of Kossakowski-Lindblad operators. Moreover, the framework of completely positive semigroups now emerges as a special instance within the more general theory of invariant cones.

In view of controlling open quantum systems, reachable sets have been described in the same framework. Compared to closed systems, the structure of reachable sets of open systems has turned out to be much more delicate. To this end, we have introduced the terms *Hamiltonian controllability* and *weak Hamiltonian controllability* replacing the classical notion of controllability, which fails in open quantum systems whenever the control restricts to the Hamiltonian part of the system. For simple cases, we have characterized Hamiltonian controllability and weak Hamiltonian controllability. These definitions also allow for characterising the conditions under which time-optimal controls derived for the analogous closed systems already give good approximations in quantum systems that are actually open. In the generic case, obtaining optimal controls requires numerical tools from optimal control theory based on the full knowledge of the system's parameters in terms of its Kossakowski-Lindblad master equation.

Finally, we have outlined a new algorithmic approach making explicit use of the Lie wedge of the open system. In cases simple enough to allow for a good approximation of their respective Lie wedges, a target quantum map can then be least-squares approximated by a prod-

uct with comparatively few factors each taking the form of an exponential of some Lie-wedge element.

Since the theory of *Lie semigroups* has only scarcely been used for studying the dynamics of open quantum systems, the present work is also meant to structure and trigger further developments. E.g., the \mathfrak{k} - \mathfrak{p} decomposition considerations serve as a framework to describe the interplay of Hamiltonian coherent evolution and relaxative evolution: this interplay gives rise to new coherent effects. Some of them relate to well-established observations like, e.g., the Lamb-shift [61] or dynamic frequency shifts in magnetic resonance [62, 63, 64], while others form the basis to very recent findings such as dephasing-assisted quantum transport in light-harvesting molecules [65, 66, 67, 68].

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the integrated EU programme QAP and by *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (DFG) in the collaborative research centre SFB 631. We also gratefully acknowledge support and collaboration enabled within the two International Doctorate Programs of Excellence *Quantum Computing, Control, and Communication* (QCCC) as well as *Identification, Optimization and Control with Applications in Modern Technologies* by the Bavarian excellence network ENB. T.S.H. thanks Prof. Hans Primas (ETH-Zurich) for his early attracting attention to completely positive semigroups and for fruitful discussion.

-
- [1] J. Dowling and G. Milburn, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. A* **361**, 1655 (2003).
 - [2] P. Zanardi and M. Rasetti, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 3306 (1997) and D.A. Lidar, I.L. Chuang, and B.K. Whaley, *ibid.* **81**, 2594 (1998).
 - [3] L. Viola, E. Knill, and S. Lloyd, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 2417, (1999); *ibid.* **83**, 4888, (1999); *ibid.* **85**, 3520, (2000).
 - [4] B. Misra and E. C. G. Sudarshan, *J. Math. Phys.* **18**, 756 (1977).
 - [5] P. Facchi and S. Pascazio, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 080401 (2001).
 - [6] F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, and J. I. Cirac (2008), e-print: <http://arXiv.org/pdf/0803.1447>.
 - [7] H. P. Büchler, S. Diehl, A. Kantian, A. Micheli, and P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 042307 (2008), see also e-print: <http://arXiv.org/pdf/0803.1463>.
 - [8] V. Jurdjevic, *Geometric Control Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997).
 - [9] V. Jurdjevic and H. Sussmann, *J. Diff. Equat.* **12**, 313 (1972).
 - [10] M. M. Wolf and J. I. Cirac, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **279**, 147 (2008).
 - [11] M. M. Wolf, J. Eisert, T. S. Cubitt, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 150402 (2008).
 - [12] A. Kossakowski, *Bull. Acad. Pol. Sci., Ser. Sci. Math. Astron. Phys.* **20**, 1021 (1972).
 - [13] M. D. Choi, *Lin. Alg. Appl.* **10**, 285 (1975).
 - [14] G. Lindblad, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **48**, 119 (1976).
 - [15] K. Kraus, *States, Effects, and Operations*, Lecture Notes in Physics, Vol. 190 (Springer, Berlin, 1983).
 - [16] K. Kraus, *Ann. Phys.* **64**, 311 (1971).
 - [17] V. Gorini, A. Kossakowski, and E. Sudarshan, *J. Math. Phys.* **17**, 821 (1976).
 - [18] A. Kossakowski, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **3**, 247 (1972).
 - [19] R. Wu, A. Pechen, C. Brif, and H. Rabitz, *J. Phys. A.: Math. Theor.* **40**, 5681 (2007).
 - [20] E. B. Davies, *Quantum Theory of Open Systems* (Academic Press, London, 1976).
 - [21] J. Hilgert and K. Neeb, *Lie Semigroups and Applications*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics Vol. 1552 (Springer, Berlin, 1993).
 - [22] J. Hilgert, K. Hofmann, and J. Lawson, *Lie Groups, Convex Cones, and Semigroups* (Clarendon Press, Oxford,

- 1989).
- [23] J. D. Lawson, in *Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics, Vol. 64* (American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1999), pp. 207–221, Proceedings of a Summer Research Institute on Differential Geometry and Control, Boulder, Colorado, 1997.
- [24] K. Hofmann, J. Lawson, and E. Vinberg, *Semigroups in Algebra, Geometry and Analysis* (DeGruyter, Berlin, 1995).
- [25] D. Mittenhuber, *Control Theory on Lie Groups, Lie Semigroups Globality of Lie Wedges* (PhD Thesis, University of Darmstadt, 1994).
- [26] D. Mittenhuber, *Semigroups in Algebra, Geometry and Analysis* (DeGruyter, Berlin, 1995), chap. Applications of the Maximum Principle to Problems in Lie Semigroups, pp. 313–338.
- [27] C. Altafini, *J. Math. Phys.* **46**, 2357 (2003).
- [28] G. Dirr and U. Helmke, *GAMM-Mitteilungen* **31**, 59 (2008).
- [29] A. G. Butkovskiy and Y. I. Samoilenko, *Control of Quantum-Mechanical Processes and Systems* (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1990), see also the translations from Russian originals: A. G. Butkovskiy and Yu. I. Samoilenko, Control of Quantum Systems, Part I and II, *Autom. Remote Control (USSR)* **40**, pp 485–502 and pp 629–645 (1979), as well as: A. G. Butkovskiy and Yu. I. Samoilenko, Controllability of Quantum Objects, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk. USSR* **250**, pp 22–24 (1980).
- [30] A. Peirce, M. Dahleh, and H. Rabitz, *Phys. Rev. A* **37**, 4950 (1987).
- [31] M. Dahleh, A. Peirce, and H. Rabitz, *Phys. Rev. A* **42**, 1065 (1990).
- [32] V. F. Krotov, *Global Methods in Optimal Control* (Marcel Dekker, New York, 1996).
- [33] D. D’Alessandro, *Introduction to Quantum Control and Dynamics* (Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, 2008).
- [34] N. Khaneja, T. Reiss, C. Kehlet, T. Schulte-Herbrüggen, and S. J. Glaser, *J. Magn. Reson.* **172**, 296 (2005).
- [35] G. Dirr, U. Helmke, K. Hüper, M. Kleinstüber, and Y. Liu, *J. Global Optim.* **35**, 443 (2006).
- [36] T. Schulte-Herbrüggen, S. J. Glaser, G. Dirr, and U. Helmke (2008), e-print: <http://arXiv.org/pdf/0802.4195>.
- [37] G. Dirr, U. Helmke, S. Glaser, and T. Schulte-Herbrüggen, *PAMM* **6**, 711 (2006), proceedings of the GAMM Annual Meeting, Berlin, 2006.
- [38] O. Curtef, G. Dirr, and U. Helmke, *Proc. ICIAM 2007*, Zürich (submitted 2007).
- [39] R. W. Brockett, in *Proc. IEEE Decision Control, 1988, Austin, Texas* (1988), pp. 779–803, see also: *Lin. Alg. Appl.*, 146 (1991), 79–91.
- [40] U. Helmke and J. B. Moore, *Optimisation and Dynamical Systems* (Springer, Berlin, 1994).
- [41] A. Bloch, ed., *Hamiltonian and Gradient Flows, Algorithms and Control*, Fields Institute Communications (American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1994).
- [42] A. W. Knap, *Lie Groups beyond an Introduction* (Birkhäuser, Boston, 2002), 2nd ed.
- [43] F. Albertini and D. D’Alessandro, *Lin. Alg. Appl.* **350**, 213 (2002).
- [44] R. Alicki and K. Lendi, *Quantum Dynamical Semigroups and Applications*, Lecture Notes in Physics, Vol. 286 (Springer, Berlin, 1987).
- [45] U. Weiss, *Quantum Dissipative Systems* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1999).
- [46] H. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002).
- [47] S. Attal, A. Joye, and C.-A. Pillet, eds., *Open Quantum Systems I–III*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics Vols. 1880,1881,1882 (Springer, Berlin, 2006).
- [48] D. Lidar, A. Shabani, and R. Alicki, *Chem. Phys.* **322**, 82 (2006).
- [49] C. A. Rodriguez-Rosario, K. Modi, A. Kuah, A. Shaji, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **41**, 205301 (2008).
- [50] A. Shabani and D. Lidar (2008), e-print: <http://arXiv.org/pdf/0808.0175>.
- [51] M. S. Byrd and N. Khaneja, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 062322 (2003).
- [52] K. Lendi, *Phys. Rev. A* **33**, 3358 (1986).
- [53] A. M. Chebotarev, J. C. Garcia, and R. B. Quezada, *Math. Notes* **61**, 105 (1997).
- [54] G. Lumer and R. S. Phillips, *Pacific J. Math.* **11**, 679 (1961).
- [55] I. Kurniawan, *Controllability Aspects of the Lindblad-Kossakowski Master Equation—A Lie-Theoretical Approach* (PhD Thesis, Universität Würzburg, to appear 2009).
- [56] C. Altafini, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 062321 (2004).
- [57] T. Schulte-Herbrüggen, G. Dirr, U. Helmke, M. Kleinstüber, and S. Glaser, *Lin. Multin. Alg.* **56**, 3 (2008).
- [58] G. Dirr, U. Helmke, M. Kleinstüber, and T. Schulte-Herbrüggen, *Lin. Multin. Alg.* **56**, 27 (2008).
- [59] T. Schulte-Herbrüggen, A. Spörl, N. Khaneja, and S. Glaser (2006), e-print: <http://arXiv.org/pdf/quant-ph/0609037>.
- [60] P. Rebentrost, I. Serban, T. Schulte-Herbrüggen, and F. Wilhelm (2006), e-print: <http://arXiv.org/pdf/quant-ph/0612165>.
- [61] W. E. Lamb and R. C. Retherford, *Phys. Rev.* **72**, 241 (1947).
- [62] A. Abragam, *The Principles of Nuclear Magnetism* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1961).
- [63] L. G. Werbelow, *J. Chem. Phys.* **70**, 5381 (1979).
- [64] R. Brüschweiler, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **257**, 119 (1996).
- [65] M. Mohseni, P. Rebentrost, S. Lloyd, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, *J. Chem. Phys.* **129**, 174106 (2008).
- [66] P. Rebentrost, M. Mohseni, and A. Aspuru-Guzik (2008), <http://arXiv.org/pdf/0806.4725>.
- [67] P. Rebentrost, M. Mohseni, I. Kassal, S. Lloyd, and A. Aspuru-Guzik (2008), <http://arXiv.org/pdf/0807.0929>.
- [68] M. B. Plenio and S. F. Huelga, *New J. Phys.* **10**, 113019 (2008), URL <http://stacks.iop.org/1367-2630/10/113019>.
- [69] T. Levante and R. R. Ernst, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **241**, 73 (1995).
- [70] In abuse of language, it is common to call a positivity-preserving (super-)operator, i.e. an operator which leaves the set of positive semidefinite elements in $\text{her}(N)$ invariant, *positive* for short.
- [71] Note that the term *homogeneous Master equation* is used here in a general sense and *without* any restriction to high-temperature approximations [69] to Eqn. (8).