

Non-Hermitian description of sharp quantum resetting

Ranjan Modak and S. Aravinda

Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Tirupati, Tirupati, India 517619

We study a non-interacting quantum particle, moving on a one-dimensional, which is subjected to repetitive measurements. We investigate the consequence when such motion is interrupted and restarted from the same initial configuration, known as the quantum resetting problem. We show that such systems can be described by the time evolution under certain time-dependent non-Hermitian Hamiltonians. We construct two such Hamiltonians and compare the results with the exact dynamics. Using this effective non-Hermitian description we evaluate the timescale of the survival probability as well as the optimal resetting time for the system.

1 Introduction

Reaching the target at an optimal time is the most critical aspect in all branches of science, technology, and economics. The tools and methods to optimize the time to reach the target are well-studied in classical stochastic dynamics [1, 2]. The significant discovery in the recent decade in classical stochastic dynamics is to restart (reset) the process to expedite the hitting time [3, 4]. In the classical randomized algorithmic studies, particularly Los Vegas algorithms, it has been shown that the resetting process optimizes the termination of the algorithm (completion).

Quantizing the classical models has provided great insight and spurred progress in the technological aspects. The inherent randomness in quantum mechanical formalism offers an opportunity and a platform for a natural question to be set. Technologically, the emergence of the noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ)-era computers and quantum thermodynamics necessitates all the tools to optimize the processes. Measurement disturbance is the fundamental difference between classical and quantum dynamics which plays its role in studying the first detection process and any modifications.

The natural question addressed in the classical stochastic resetting scenario is to optimize the mean first passage time. Studies on ‘Time’ in quantum theory have been

Ranjan Modak: ranjan@iittp.ac.in

S. Aravinda: aravinda@iittp.ac.in

debated from its inception [5]. The various notions like Mean First passage time, first arrival time distribution, first detected time, etc has been debated extensively [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. Our work is concerned with the *first detected time* of the particles under the quantum evolution as explored in the Ref [17, 18, 19, 20, 21]. In a parallel study, the random resetting of the quantum state to its initial state is been studied as a process to generate non-equilibrium steady states, and the dynamics can be modeled as an open quantum system dynamics [22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31].

In previous studies, [18, 17] it has been shown that the problem of a quantum particle moving on a lattice and subjected to repetitive measurements, can be effectively described by the evolution under non-Hermitian Hamiltonians. Non-Hermitian Hamiltonians have been a subject of interest for the last few decades in various branches of physics including open quantum systems, scattering theory, optics, and biological systems [32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37], such systems have been experimentally realized as well [38, 39]. Very recently in Ref. [40, 41], a similar problem of quantum detection has been studied within the quantum resetting setup. Essentially the goal was to eliminate the dark states in the quantum first-detection problem [42]. It has been argued that with an optimal resetting setup, the quantum walker performs much better than the classical one, in the sense that the detection probability for the former is much higher in comparison to the classical case for a given time. Here, our goal is to see whether a non-Hermitian description can be found for the quantum resetting problems as well. We answer the question affirmatively and show that indeed one can construct time-dependent non-Hermitian Hamiltonians that describe the quantum measurement problem within a sharp resetting set-up efficiently.

2 Quantum First Detection process

The first detection of a quantum particle along a lattice is fundamentally different than its counterpart in the classical dynamics [17, 18, 19, 20]. In classical mechanics, the state is unaffected by the measurement but in quantum theory the measurement disturbs the state and thereby alters the trajectory. In otherwords, the measurement is a non-unitary process. Consider that the dynamics of a quantum system in an one dimensional lattice of length L is governed by the unitary operator $U = e^{-iHt}$, where H is the Hermitian operator called Hamiltonian of the system. We are interested in measuring the statistics of particle detection at an arbitrary site $D = |s\rangle\langle s|$. The measurement \mathcal{M} is defined as a set $\{D, I - D\}$, where I is an identity operator. For simplicity, let's denote $B = I - D$. If the state of the system is $|\Psi\rangle$, then the probability of detecting the particle at s site is $p = |\langle s|\Psi\rangle|^2 = \langle\Psi|D|\Psi\rangle$, and the probability of non-detection (survival probability) is $P = 1 - p = \langle\Psi|B|\Psi\rangle$.

Let the initial state at time $t = 0$ be $|\Psi_0\rangle$, and the state evolves under the unitary operator U_τ at discrete time steps τ . The measurement is carried at every time instant $n\tau$, where $n = 1, 2, \dots N$. For quantum detection, τ needs to be non-zero. Otherwise, $\tau \rightarrow 0$ leads to freezing of the dynamics, and hence nothing will be detected. This is

known as the quantum Zeno effect [43]. If the measurement happens at time $t = n\tau$, let the unnormalized state be $|\Psi_n^{\pm\epsilon}\rangle$ at $t = n\tau \pm \epsilon$. $\pm\epsilon$ indicates the small time just after and before the measurement, respectively. Corresponding states at $t = n\tau$ is

$$|\Psi_n^{+\epsilon}\rangle = \tilde{U}^n |\Psi_0\rangle, \quad |\Psi_n^{-\epsilon}\rangle = U_\tau \tilde{U}^{n-1} |\Psi_0\rangle. \quad (1)$$

Note that $\tilde{U} = BU_\tau$ and it is not unitary.

The survival probability at time $t = n\tau$ is

$$P_n = \langle \Psi_n^{+\epsilon} | \Psi_n^{+\epsilon} \rangle = \langle \Psi_0 | \tilde{U}^\dagger \tilde{U} | \Psi_0 \rangle. \quad (2)$$

Hence, the probability of first detection at n th measurement can thus be estimated as:

$$p_n = P_{n-1} - P_n = \langle \Psi_n^{-\epsilon} | D | \Psi_n^{-\epsilon} \rangle. \quad (3)$$

The amplitude and probability of the quantum first detection is $\Psi_n = \langle s | \Psi_n^{-\epsilon} \rangle$ and $p_n = |\Psi_n|^2$, respectively. The evolution of Ψ_n is governed by the following *quantum renewal equation* [19],

$$\Psi_n = \langle s | U(n\tau) | \Psi_0 \rangle - \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \langle s | U[(n-m)\tau] | s \rangle \Psi_m. \quad (4)$$

It is clear from Eqn. (4) that the first-hitting amplitude is equal to the measurement-free transition amplitude $\langle s | U(n\tau) | \Psi_0 \rangle$ subtracting the measurement-free return amplitude $\langle s | \hat{U}[(n-m)\tau] | s \rangle$ propagating from the prior first-hitting amplitude Ψ_m ($m < n$). Finally, the integrated detection probability up to time $n\tau$ is given by $P_{\text{det}}(n) = \sum_{n'=1}^n p_{n'}$.

3 Model and Protocols

We study a system of fermions in a one-dimensional lattice of size L (L is chosen to be an even number) described by the following tight-binding Hamiltonian:

$$H = \sum_{j=1}^{L-1} (c_j^\dagger c_{j+1} + \text{H.c.}) \quad (5)$$

where c_j^\dagger (c_j) is the Fermionic creation (annihilation) operator at site j , $n_j = c_j^\dagger c_j$ is the number operator. We choose our initial state to be $|\Psi_0\rangle = c_{L/2}^\dagger |0\rangle$ (electron is located at the $\frac{L}{2}$ -th site in the lattice), let it evolve under the Hamiltonian H . We set a detector at $|s\rangle$ site, the unitary evolution $U_\tau = e^{-iH\tau}$ is repeatedly interrupted by projective measurements $D = |s\rangle\langle s|$ at time interval $\tau, 2\tau, 3\tau, \dots$.

We follow the sharp restart strategy, and whenever $t = t_r = r\tau$, we set the system to its initial state $|\Psi_0\rangle$. If the particle is detected before the restart time, the process

stops and calculates its time of first detection, else the particle evolves till restart time and reset to its initial state. If t_f is the first detection time, the mean first detection time (MFDT) under restart can be expressed as $\langle t_f \rangle_r = \tau \langle n_f \rangle$ with $n_f = rR + \tilde{n}$. n_f is the number of measurements carried until first detecting the particle with $R \geq 0$ is the number of restarts, and $1 \leq \tilde{n} \leq r$. By definition, $R = [(n-1)/r]$ with [...] means the integer part, and $\tilde{n} = n - rR = 1 + \text{mod}(n-1, r)$. Now, the quantum first detection probability with restart can be written as:

$$p_n^{(r)} = (1 - P_{\text{det}}(r))^R p_{\tilde{n}}. \quad (6)$$

Consequently, the MFDT reads as [44],

$$\langle t_f \rangle_r = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n\tau F_n^{(r)} = r\tau \frac{[1 - P_{\text{det}}(r)]}{P_{\text{det}}(r)} + \sum_{\tilde{n}=1}^r (\tilde{n}\tau) \frac{p_{\tilde{n}}}{P_{\text{det}}(r)}. \quad (7)$$

We consider a sharp restart technique in the present study because of two reasons: (a) it is found to be most efficient in reducing the completion time of a search process in both classical and quantum mechanical setup [44, 40], and (b) it is easy to implement in a dynamics with discrete time steps.

4 Effective non-Hermitian model

Unitary evolution followed by the measurement can be modeled as time evolution under an effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian. They are not unique. In the following subsections, we discuss how to construct such non-Hermitian Hamiltonian in two different ways.

4.1 Model I

Given the detector is placed at site s , with detection operator $D = |s\rangle\langle s|$ and the complementary operator $B = I - D$, and the Hamiltonian in Eq. (5) can be rewritten as,

$$H = H_S + V, \quad (8)$$

where $H_S = \sum_{j \neq s, s-1} (c_j^\dagger c_{j+1} + \text{H.c.})$, and $V = (c_{s-1}^\dagger c_s + c_s^\dagger c_{s+1} + \text{H.c.})$.

Expanding the effective evolution operator $\bar{U} = Be^{-iHt}B$ to second order in τ one gets [18],

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{U} &= B \left[I - iH\tau - \frac{\tau^2}{2}H^2 + \dots \right] B \\ &= I - iH_S\tau - \frac{\tau^2}{2}H_S^2 - \frac{\tau^2}{2} \sum_{l,m} V_{l,s}V_{s,m}c_l^\dagger c_m + \dots \\ &= e^{-iH_{eff}^0\tau} + \mathcal{O}(\tau^3),\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{where } H_{eff}^0 = H_S + V_{eff}, \text{ and } V_{eff} = -\frac{i\tau}{2} \sum_{l,m} V_{l,\alpha}V_{\alpha,m}c_l^\dagger c_m .$$

Given the only non-zero elements of the matrix, V are $V_{s,s-1} = V_{s-1,s} = V_{s,s+1} = V_{s+1,s} = 1$, the effective non-Hermitian is given by,

$$H_{eff}^0 = \sum_{j \neq s, s-1} (c_j^\dagger c_{j+1} + \text{H.c.}) - \frac{i\tau}{2} (c_{s-1}^\dagger c_{s+1} + \text{H.c.}) - \frac{i\tau}{2} (n_{s-1} + n_{s+1}) \quad (9)$$

We will refer to this effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian as model I in the rest of the manuscript.

4.2 Model II

The second model, which we call as Model II, in which a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian with a *large* imaginary potential [45, 18] is used. We follow the formalism derived in Ref. [45], according to which the effective Hamiltonian contains a non-Hermitian on-site term $-i\Gamma$ at the site where the detector is placed (Γ being a dimensionless and positive real number) which leads to a non-unitary evolution. Assuming that $\Gamma \gg 1$ and $\tau \ll 1$, one can develop a second-order perturbation theory in these quantities and show that the effective non-Hermitian can mimic the system if $\tau\Gamma = 2$. The effective Hamiltonian is given by,

$$H_{eff}^0 = H + \Gamma H' \quad \text{where } H' = -ic_s^\dagger c_s, \quad (10)$$

where H is the Hamiltonian defined in Eq. (5). The effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian is given by,

$$H_{eff}^0 = \sum_j (c_j^\dagger c_{j+1} + \text{H.c.}) - \frac{2i}{\tau} c_s^\dagger c_s. \quad (11)$$

5 Effective non-Unitary evolution for resetting

In this section, our goal is to derive the effective Hamiltonian for quantum resetting. We assume that resetting time is t_r , given that without resetting the system can be




Figure 1: (a) and (b) show the variation of P_{det} with time T for different values of τ . Broken lines correspond to exact dynamics. Solid lines in (a) and (b) correspond to non-Hermitian dynamics for the model I and model II respectively.

described by a non-unitary evolution where underlying effective Hamiltonian is non-Hermitian ((9) and (11)), the survival probability P at time t_r is given by (assuming the initial state $|\Psi_0\rangle$),

$$P(t_r) = \langle \Psi_0 | e^{iH_{eff}^\dagger t_r} e^{-iH_{eff} t_r} | \Psi_0 \rangle. \quad (12)$$

The survival probability after a time $t_r R + t$ (R represents the number of time resetting has already taken place), where $t < t_r$, is given by,

$$P(Rt_r + t) = \langle \Psi_0 | e^{iH_{eff}^\dagger t} e^{-iH_{eff} t} | \Psi_0 \rangle [P(t_r)]^R. \quad (13)$$

Let's first consider the $R = 1$ case. The survival probability at time $t_r + t$ is $P(t_r + t) = \langle \Psi_0 | e^{iH_{eff}^\dagger t} e^{-iH_{eff} t} | \Psi_0 \rangle [P(t_r)] = \langle \Psi_1 | e^{iH_{eff}^\dagger t} e^{-iH_{eff} t} | \Psi_1 \rangle$, where $|\Psi_1\rangle = \sqrt{P(t_r)} |\Psi_0\rangle$. One can re-write this as,

$$P(t_r + t) = \langle \Psi_0 | e^{iH_{eff}^{1\dagger} t} e^{-iH_{eff}^1 t} | \Psi_0 \rangle,$$

where

$$H_{eff}^1 = H_{eff}^0 + \frac{i}{2t} \ln |\langle \Psi_0 | e^{iH_{eff}^{0\dagger} t} e^{-iH_{eff}^0 t} | \Psi_0 \rangle| \sum_j n_j. \quad (14)$$

Similarly, it is straightforward to check that, for arbitrary R and at a time $Rt_r + t$ the survival probability reads as,

$$P(Rt_r + t) = \langle \Psi_0 | e^{iH_{eff}^{R\dagger} t} e^{-iH_{eff}^R t} | \Psi_0 \rangle,$$




Figure 2: (a) shows the variation of δP_R (see Eqn. (18)) with R (number of resetting) for different values of τ . Open symbols (filled symbols) correspond to δP_R where H_{eff} is taken to be model II (model I). (b) shows the variation of survival probability $P(T)$ with time T for different resetting time t_r and $\tau = 0.25$. Solid lines are analytical prediction $P(T) \sim e^{-T/T_s}$, where $T_s = t_r \alpha^{-1}$ is obtained from the model II.

where

$$H_{eff}^R = H_{eff}^0 + \frac{iR}{2t} \ln |\langle \Psi_0 | e^{iH_{eff}^{0\dagger} t} e^{-iH_{eff}^0 t} | \Psi_0 \rangle| \sum_j n_j. \quad (15)$$

Assuming $\alpha = -\ln |\langle \Psi_0 | e^{iH_{eff}^{0\dagger} t} e^{-iH_{eff}^0 t} | \Psi_0 \rangle| > 0$, the survival probability at time $Rt_r + t$ can be written as,

$$P(Rt_r + t) = \langle \Psi_0 | e^{iH_{eff}^{0\dagger} t - \frac{R\alpha}{2} \sum_j n_j} e^{-H_{eff}^0 t - \frac{R\alpha}{2} \sum_j n_j} | \Psi_0 \rangle.$$

Given $[H_{eff}^0, \sum_j n_j] = [H_{eff}^{0\dagger}, \sum_j n_j] = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} P(Rt_r + t) &= \langle \Psi_0 | e^{iH_{eff}^{0\dagger} t} e^{-H_{eff}^0 t} e^{-R\alpha \sum_j n_j} | \Psi_0 \rangle \\ &= e^{-\alpha R} \langle \Psi_0 | e^{iH_{eff}^{0\dagger} t} e^{-H_{eff}^0 t} | \Psi_0 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

This ensures that in the limit $R \rightarrow \infty$, $P(Rt_r + t) \rightarrow 0$, which implies $P_{det} \rightarrow 1$. It also proves that the survival probability goes to zero with increasing time T as $P(T) \sim e^{-T/T_s}$, where $T_s = t_r \alpha^{-1}$ can be identified as a survival timescale.

Given that T_s provides a time scale for survival, the optimal resetting time t_r^* is the one, for which T_s is the minimum. It implies,

$$t_r^* = \min_{t_r} \frac{1}{t_r} \ln |\langle \Psi_0 | e^{iH_{eff}^{0\dagger} t} e^{-H_{eff}^0 t} | \Psi_0 \rangle|. \quad (17)$$




Figure 3: (a) shows the variation of MFDT with t_r for different values of τ . (b) shows the variation $-\alpha/t_r$ with t_r for different values of τ , where α is obtained from the effective models. Broken lines correspond to model II and solid lines correspond to model I.

6 Numerical Results

First, we compare our exact results with two effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonians (model I and model II). For all our numerical calculations in this manuscript, we choose $L = 500$, and the position of the detector is set to be at the site $s = L/2 + 10$. Given it has been argued that the non-Hermitian Hamiltonians constructed here, are effective descriptions of the exact dynamics only in the small τ limit, we compare our results in Fig. 1 for different values of τ and plot P_{det} vs T . We find that indeed for small τ , the non-Hermitian dynamics can mimic the exact dynamics brilliantly. However, as τ increases the comparison becomes worse. In order to quantify it, we define a quantity,

$$\delta P_R(R) = \frac{\tau}{t_r} \sum_{(R-1)t_r < T \leq Rt_r} |P_{det}^{exact} - P_{det}^{H_{eff}}|. \quad (18)$$

Now depending on how small $\delta P_R(R)$ is, we can conclude our effective non-Hermitian description is that much accurate. Figure. 2a clearly demonstrate that δP_R decreases as we increase τ . That is expected from the construction of H_{eff} . However, Fig. 2a also suggests that model II works better compared to the model I, given for fixed τ , δP_R for model II (data shown in open symbols) are much smaller than the model I data (data shown in filled symbols). Next, we also study how the survival probability behaves with time. Figure. 2b shows the variation of the survival probability $P(T)$ with time for different values of resetting time t_r . It shows an exponential decay $P(T) \simeq e^{-T/T_s}$ (results in Fig. 2b shown in the semi-log scale). Using the effective non-Hermitian description, we predicted in the previous section that the survival time-scale $T_s = t_r \alpha^{-1}$. Solid lines in Fig. 2b correspond to $P(T) \simeq e^{-\alpha T/t_r}$ (where α is obtained using model II), they match brilliantly with the exact dynamics.

Finally, we study the mean first detection time (MFDT) and estimate optimal resetting time. While studying exact dynamics, MFDT can be calculated using Eqn. (7).

The optimal reset time t_r^* corresponds to the resetting for which MFDT is minimum. The question is whether one can obtain t_r^* from the effective non-Hermitian dynamics. In the previous section, we derived a condition to obtain t_r^* from the non-Hermitian dynamics (see Eqn. (17)), Fig. 3 is a numerical validation of our finding. Figure. 3a shows the variation MFDT with t_r for different values of τ . We find that the minimum occurs around $t_r^* \simeq 6.5$, which corresponds to the optimal resetting time. Figure. 3b shows the variation of $-\alpha/t_r$ with t_r for both effective models. Indeed, we find that the minimum corresponds once again around $t_r^* \simeq 6.5$. Interestingly, in Fig. 1a, it was observed that for $\tau = 1$, model I fails to describe the exact dynamics efficiently, however, it still predicts optimal resetting time quite efficiently even for $\tau = 1$.

7 Conclusions

We show that the quantum detection within a resetting set-up can be modeled as time evolution under a time-dependent non-Hermitian Hamiltonian. We have demonstrated it for one-dimensional tight-binding Hamiltonian where the detector was placed at a single site. Such effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian is not unique, we have constructed two such Hamiltonians and compared them with exact dynamics. While by construction the effective description is much more accurate in small τ limits, surprisingly we find one of them (which we refer to as model II) works much better than the other (model I) even relatively large τ . These non-Hermitian descriptions allow us to predict the survival time scale analytically and it is also straightforward to see that without resetting the probability of detection is less than 1 but resetting ensures confirmed detection in the long time limit. Moreover, we also demonstrate how the optimal resetting time can be computed from the effective non-Hermitian dynamics.

In the future, it may be interesting to look at many-body interacting systems and investigate the effect of quantum resetting in the context of repetitive quantum measurements [46]. Moreover, this effective description can be extremely useful to understand the role of entanglements in quantum resetting and also to study the effect of measurements of observable other than the position.

Acknowledgements

RM acknowledges the DST-Inspire fellowship by the Department of Science and Technology, Government of India, SERB start-up grant (SRG/2021/002152). SA acknowledges the start-up research grant from SERB, Department of Science and Technology, Govt. of India (SRG/2022/000467). The authors Debasish Mondal and Somrita Ray for the discussion. The authors also thank Diptiman Sen for his comments on the manuscript.

References

- [1] Sidney Redner. *A guide to first-passage processes*. Cambridge university press, 2001.
- [2] Ralf Metzler, Sidney Redner, and Gleb Oshanin. *First-passage phenomena and their applications*, volume 35. World Scientific, 2014.
- [3] Martin R Evans, Satya N Majumdar, and Grégory Schehr. Stochastic resetting and applications. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 53(19):193001, 2020.
- [4] Shamik Gupta and Arun M Jayannavar. Stochastic resetting: A (very) brief review. *Frontiers in Physics*, page 130, 2022.
- [5] Gonzalo Muga, R Sala Mayato, and Inigo Egusquiza. *Time in quantum mechanics*, volume 734. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [6] O Lumpkin. Extending schrödinger’s first-passage-time probability to quantum mechanics. *Physical Review A*, 51(4):2758, 1995.
- [7] N Kumar. Quantum first-passage problem. *Pramana*, 25(4):363–367, 1985.
- [8] Axel Schild. Time in quantum mechanics: A fresh look at the continuity equation. *Physical Review A*, 98(5):052113, 2018.
- [9] Kamal Sharma and N Kumar. First-passage time: Lattice versus continuum. *Physical Review E*, 86(3):032104, 2012.
- [10] Simone Roncallo, Krzysztof Sacha, and Lorenzo Maccone. When does a particle arrive? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.02219*, 2022.
- [11] Juan Gonzalo Muga and C Richard Leavens. Arrival time in quantum mechanics. *Physics Reports*, 338(4):353–438, 2000.
- [12] Gordon R Allcock. The time of arrival in quantum mechanics i. formal considerations. *Annals of physics*, 53(2):253–285, 1969.
- [13] Yakir Aharonov, Jonathan Oppenheim, Sandu Popescu, Benni Reznik, and WG Unruh. Measurement of time of arrival in quantum mechanics. *Physical Review A*, 57(6):4130, 1998.
- [14] Norbert Grot, Carlo Rovelli, and Ranjeet S Tate. Time of arrival in quantum mechanics. *Physical Review A*, 54(6):4676, 1996.
- [15] Siddhant Das and Ward Struyve. Questioning the adequacy of certain quantum arrival-time distributions. *Physical Review A*, 104(4):042214, 2021.
- [16] Vittorio Giovannetti, Seth Lloyd, and Lorenzo Maccone. Quantum time. *Physical Review D*, 92(4):045033, 2015.
- [17] Shrabanti Dhar, Subinay Dasgupta, and Abhishek Dhar. Quantum time of arrival distribution in a simple lattice model. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 48(11):115304, 2015.

- [18] Shrabanti Dhar, Subinay Dasgupta, Abhishek Dhar, and Diptiman Sen. Detection of a quantum particle on a lattice under repeated projective measurements. *Physical Review A*, 91(6):062115, 2015.
- [19] H. Friedman, D. A. Kessler, and E. Barkai. Quantum walks: The first detected passage time problem. *Phys. Rev. E*, 95:032141, Mar 2017.
- [20] Varun Dubey, Cédric Bernardin, and Abhishek Dhar. Quantum dynamics under continuous projective measurements: Non-hermitian description and the continuum-space limit. *Physical Review A*, 103(3):032221, 2021.
- [21] David A Kessler, Eli Barkai, and Klaus Ziegler. First-detection time of a quantum state under random probing. *Physical Review A*, 103(2):022222, 2021.
- [22] Sascha Wald and Lucas Böttcher. From classical to quantum walks with stochastic resetting on networks. *Physical Review E*, 103(1):012122, 2021.
- [23] Dominic C Rose, Hugo Touchette, Igor Lesanovsky, and Juan P Garrahan. Spectral properties of simple classical and quantum reset processes. *Physical Review E*, 98(2):022129, 2018.
- [24] B Mukherjee, K Sengupta, and Satya N Majumdar. Quantum dynamics with stochastic reset. *Physical Review B*, 98(10):104309, 2018.
- [25] Gabriele Peretto, Federico Carollo, Matteo Magoni, and Igor Lesanovsky. Designing nonequilibrium states of quantum matter through stochastic resetting. *Physical Review B*, 104(18):L180302, 2021.
- [26] Gabriele Peretto, Federico Carollo, and Igor Lesanovsky. Thermodynamics of quantum-jump trajectories of open quantum systems subject to stochastic resetting. *SciPost Physics*, 13(4):079, 2022.
- [27] Xhek Turkeshi, Marcello Dalmonte, Rosario Fazio, and Marco Schirò. Entanglement transitions from stochastic resetting of non-hermitian quasiparticles. *Physical Review B*, 105(24):L241114, 2022.
- [28] Matteo Magoni, Federico Carollo, Gabriele Peretto, and Igor Lesanovsky. Emergent quantum correlations and collective behavior in noninteracting quantum systems subject to stochastic resetting. *Phys. Rev. A*, 106:052210, Nov 2022.
- [29] Debraj Das and Shamik Gupta. Quantum random walk and tight-binding model subject to projective measurements at random times. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2022(3):033212, 2022.
- [30] Sushanta Dattagupta, Debraj Das, and Shamik Gupta. Stochastic resets in the context of a tight-binding chain driven by an oscillating field. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2022(10):103210, 2022.
- [31] Debraj Das, Sushanta Dattagupta, and Shamik Gupta. Quantum unitary evolution interspersed with repeated non-unitary interactions at random times: the method of stochastic liouville equation, and two examples of interactions in the context of

- a tight-binding chain. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2022(5):053101, 2022.
- [32] S. K. Özdemir, S. Rotter, F. Nori, and L. Yang. Parity γ time symmetry and exceptional points in photonics. *Nature Materials*, 18(8):783–798, Aug 2019.
- [33] Namrata Shukla, Ranjan Modak, and Bhabani Prasad Mandal. Uncertainty relation for non-hermitian systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.02844*, 2022.
- [34] Tanmoy Pal, Ranjan Modak, and Bhabani Prasad Mandal. Dna unzipping as pt-symmetry breaking transition. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2212, 2022.
- [35] Naomichi Hatano and David R. Nelson. Localization transitions in non-hermitian quantum mechanics. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 77:570–573, Jul 1996.
- [36] Naomichi Hatano and David R. Nelson. Vortex pinning and non-hermitian quantum mechanics. *Phys. Rev. B*, 56:8651–8673, Oct 1997.
- [37] H. J. Carmichael. Quantum trajectory theory for cascaded open systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 70:2273–2276, Apr 1993.
- [38] Shang Yu, Yu Meng, Jian-Shun Tang, Xiao-Ye Xu, Yi-Tao Wang, Peng Yin, Zhi-Jin Ke, Wei Liu, Zhi-Peng Li, Yuan-Ze Yang, Geng Chen, Yong-Jian Han, Chuan-Feng Li, and Guang-Can Guo. Experimental investigation of quantum \mathcal{PT} -enhanced sensor. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 125:240506, Dec 2020.
- [39] Vladimir V. Konotop, Jianke Yang, and Dmitry A. Zezyulin. Nonlinear waves in \mathcal{PT} -symmetric systems. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 88:035002, Jul 2016.
- [40] Ruoyu Yin and Eli Barkai. Restart expedites quantum walk hitting times. *Physical Review Letters*, 130(5):050802, 2023.
- [41] Ruoyu Yin and Eli Barkai. Instability in the quantum restart problem. 2023.
- [42] Felix Thiel, Itay Muallem, Dror Meidan, Eli Barkai, and David A. Kessler. Dark states of quantum search cause imperfect detection. *Phys. Rev. Res.*, 2:043107, Oct 2020.
- [43] Baidyanath Misra and EC George Sudarshan. The zeno’s paradox in quantum theory. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 18(4):756–763, 1977.
- [44] Ofek Lauber Bonomo and Arnab Pal. First passage under restart for discrete space and time: Application to one-dimensional confined lattice random walks. *Phys. Rev. E*, 103:052129, May 2021.
- [45] PL Krapivsky, JM Luck, and K Mallick. Survival of classical and quantum particles in the presence of traps. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 154:1430–1460, 2014.
- [46] Ranjan Modak, Debraj Rakshit, and Ujjwal Sen. Finite-size scalings in measurement-induced dynamical phase transition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.14647*, 2021.