

Open system dynamics from fundamental Lagrangian

Anirudh Gundhi,^{*} Oliviero Angeli,[†] and Angelo Bassi[‡]

*Department of Physics, University of Trieste, Strada Costiera 11, 34151 Trieste, Italy and
Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Trieste Section, Via Valerio 2, 34127 Trieste, Italy*

(Dated: March 25, 2024)

Lagrangians can differ by a total derivative without altering the equations of motion, thus encoding the same physics. This is in general true both classically and quantum mechanically. We show, however, that in the context of open quantum systems, two Lagrangians that differ by a total derivative can lead to different physical predictions. We then discuss the criterion that allows one to choose between such Lagrangians. Further, starting from the appropriate QED Lagrangian, we derive the master equation for the non-relativistic electron interacting with thermal photons upto second order in the interactions. This case study lends further phenomenological support to our proposed criterion.

I. INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of decoherence in quantum systems [1–4] is ubiquitous and unavoidable. It is found to be relevant in a large variety of physical situations such as matter-wave interferometry [5–10], optomechanical systems [11–13] and quantum computers [14, 15]. Over the years, several models have been developed to understand how a system behaves effectively, having coarse grained its environment. These range from the phenomenological collisional models [3, 16–18] to the ones where the environment is treated as a scalar field (or as a collection of harmonic oscillators) after postulating some interaction between the system and the environment [19–23].

A natural step forward is to derive the reduced dynamics starting from the fundamental Lagrangian, rather than a phenomenological one. However, this poses severe difficulties. For instance, decoherence due to vacuum fluctuations of the electromagnetic (EM) field has been studied, starting from the QED Lagrangian, in [24–26] and most recently in [27]. (See also [28–32] for a related discussion.) However, [24–27] arrive at substantially different conclusions concerning decoherence in position. The source of this discrepancy plagues not only QED but also the recent works concerning gravitational decoherence [33–41], a subject that has attracted a lot of attention as an indirect probe for the quantum nature of gravity. As we will see, the same issue is encountered whenever one attempts a microscopic derivation of the reduced dynamics starting from the fundamental Lagrangian. Therefore, understanding this issue is crucial not only to clarify the differing conclusions in the literature, but also for the foundations of open quantum systems in general. This is the goal of this work.

We show that the root of the problem lies in choosing between two Lagrangians when they differ by a total derivative. Since the two descriptions are related by a

unitary transformation, usually such a difference is inconsequential [42, 43]. However, we show that this is not the case for open quantum systems since such a unitary transformation mixes the system and the environment, making the distinction between the two ambiguous. Faced with this in-equivalence one must then pick one Lagrangian over the other. We argue that for open quantum systems, one must start with a Lagrangian for which the conjugate and the mechanical momentum of the system coincide. Then, starting from the standard QED Lagrangian written in such a form, we derive the master equation for an electron interacting with a thermal bath of photons. We recover established (phenomenological) results in the literature [19, 20] thus providing further support in favor of our criterion for breaking the degeneracy between Lagrangians that are otherwise equivalent.

As already mentioned, this result will be crucial in order to derive the correct dynamics of a quantum probe under the influence of a bath of gravitons: a situation where there is hope to explore the quantum nature of gravity without having to reach the Planck scale.

II. EQUIVALENCE BETWEEN DIFFERENT LAGRANGIANS

The classical equations of motion for two different Lagrangians $L(q, \dot{q}, t)$ and $L'(q, \dot{q}, t)$, that differ by a total derivative

$$L'(q, \dot{q}, t) = L(q, \dot{q}, t) + \frac{dF(q)}{dt} = L + \dot{q} \frac{\partial F}{\partial q}, \quad (1)$$

are the same. This equivalence is also known to exist quantum mechanically [42, 43], however, it takes a few steps to demonstrate. We highlight the main reasoning below.

The conjugate momenta for the two Lagrangians are different, and are related to each other as

$$\pi' = \pi + \frac{\partial F}{\partial q}, \quad \pi' := \frac{\partial L'}{\partial \dot{q}}, \quad \pi := \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}}. \quad (2)$$

^{*} anirudh.gundhi@units.it

[†] oliviero.angeli@phd.units.it

[‡] abassi@units.it

The two Lagrangian descriptions L and L' are said to be equivalent, if the numerical value of any physical observable G remains the same within the two representations. That is, if G is represented by $g(q, \pi)$ and $g'(q, \pi')$ within the descriptions L and L' respectively, we must have $g'(q, \pi + \partial F/\partial q) = g(q, \pi)$. This implies that, in general, $g(q, \pi)$ and $g'(q, \pi')$ must have a different functional form with respect to their arguments.

Quantum mechanically, this translates to the same observable G being represented by two different operators $\hat{g} \neq \hat{g}'$ and the same dynamical state by two different statevectors $|\psi\rangle \neq |\psi'\rangle$. For instance, the two conjugate momenta are related to each other as $\hat{\pi}' = \hat{T}\hat{\pi}\hat{T}^\dagger$ with $\hat{T} := \exp\{-i\hat{F}/\hbar\}$ (assuming \hat{F} to be Hermitian) so that the first equality of Eq. (2) is satisfied. Similarly, other observables and the statevectors in the two representations are related to each other as $\hat{g}' = \hat{T}\hat{g}\hat{T}^\dagger$ and $|\psi'\rangle = \hat{T}|\psi\rangle$. The time evolution operators of the two representations are also related via unitary transformation. This implies that all the probability amplitudes can be consistently calculated. That is, $\hat{U}'(t, t_0) = \hat{T}\hat{U}(t, t_0)\hat{T}^\dagger$ which implies $\langle\phi'|\psi'\rangle_t = \langle\phi|\psi\rangle_t$, where $|\psi\rangle_t$ and $|\psi'\rangle_t$ are the statevectors at time t while $|\phi\rangle$ and $|\phi'\rangle$ can be thought of as the eigenstates of any observable of interest corresponding to the two representations.

III. QED FOR THE NON-RELATIVISTIC ELECTRON

We move forward to study a more specific problem, that of the electron interacting with an external EM field. Furthermore, we are interested in comparing the two standard Lagrangian descriptions. One, L' , in which the interaction term is written as $-e\dot{\mathbf{r}}_e\mathbf{A}_\perp$ and the other one, L , in which it is written as $-e\mathbf{r}_e\mathbf{E}_\perp$. Here \mathbf{r}_e is the position of the electron, \mathbf{A}_\perp the transverse vector potential and \mathbf{E}_\perp the transverse electric field evaluated at the particle location. The two Lagrangians differ by a total derivative $L' = L + dF_{\text{EM}}/dt$ with $F_{\text{EM}} = -e\mathbf{r}_e\mathbf{A}_\perp$. Here we have used the approximation $\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{A}_\perp \approx \partial_t\mathbf{A}_\perp = -\mathbf{E}_\perp$ which is valid for the non-relativistic electron moving at speeds $v \ll c$ [27]. For the discussion that is to follow, we write the two Lagrangians and their corresponding Hamiltonians explicitly. For the first representation the Lagrangian is given by

$$L = \frac{1}{2}m\dot{\mathbf{r}}_e^2 - V_0 + \int d^3r \mathcal{L}_{\text{EM}} - e\mathbf{r}_e\mathbf{E}_\perp, \quad (3)$$

and the Hamiltonian, following the standard prescription, is obtained to be

$$H = \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2m} + V_0 + V_{\text{EM}} + \int d^3r \mathcal{H}_{\text{EM}} + e\mathbf{r}_e\mathbf{\Pi}_E. \quad (4)$$

In Eqs. (3) and (4) \mathcal{L}_{EM} and \mathcal{H}_{EM} represent the Lagrangian and the Hamiltonian densities respectively corresponding to the free EM field. The potential $V_{\text{EM}}(\mathbf{r}_e) :=$

$e^2k_{\text{max}}^3\mathbf{r}_e^2/(3\pi^2\epsilon_0)$ plays the important role of canceling the divergences that would otherwise prevail in the reduced density matrix. It is not added to the Hamiltonian by hand, but arises naturally when the Hamiltonian is derived starting from Eq. (3). Further, $\mathbf{\Pi}_E := -\mathbf{\Pi}/\epsilon_0$ where $\mathbf{\Pi}$ is the conjugate momentum corresponding to \mathbf{A}_\perp while \mathbf{p} is the conjugate variable corresponding to \mathbf{r}_e for the Lagrangian L . Further details about arriving at Eq. (4) starting from the standard QED Lagrangian can be found in [27].

For the second representation, L' is given by

$$L' = \frac{1}{2}m\dot{\mathbf{r}}_e^2 - V_0 + \int d^3r \mathcal{L}_{\text{EM}} - e\dot{\mathbf{r}}_e\mathbf{A}_\perp, \quad (5)$$

for which the Hamiltonian is derived to be

$$H' = \frac{(\mathbf{p}' + e\mathbf{A}_\perp)^2}{2m} + V_0 + \int d^3r \mathcal{H}_{\text{EM}}, \quad (6)$$

where \mathbf{p}' now represents the conjugate momentum corresponding to \mathbf{r}_e for the Lagrangian (5). Following the previous discussion, the unitary transformation relating the two representations is given by $|\psi'\rangle = \hat{T}|\psi\rangle$ with $\hat{T} = \exp\{ie\hat{\mathbf{A}}_\perp\hat{\mathbf{r}}_e/\hbar\}$.

IV. IN-EQUIVALENCE FOR OPEN QUANTUM SYSTEMS

The in-equivalence follows from the subtle point that when the reduced density matrix is derived in any of the two representations, it is typically obtained by assuming an uncorrelated system-environment (S-E) initial state and by tracing over the environment. However, an uncorrelated S-E state in L corresponds to a correlated state in L' and vice-versa. For instance, if we take for the Lagrangian L the state

$$|\psi\rangle = |\mathbf{r}_e\rangle |0\rangle, \quad (7)$$

where $|\mathbf{r}_e\rangle$ is the definite position state of the electron and $|0\rangle$ is the bare vacuum state of the EM field, the same state is represented by

$$|\psi'\rangle = \exp\{ie\hat{\mathbf{A}}_\perp\hat{\mathbf{r}}_e/\hbar\} |\mathbf{r}_e\rangle |0\rangle = |\mathbf{r}_e\rangle |\alpha(\mathbf{r}_e)\rangle \quad (8)$$

in L' , where now, the state of the EM field $|\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}_e)\rangle_{\psi'}$ is the coherent state $|\alpha(\mathbf{r}_e)\rangle$. In general, a coherent state given by $|\alpha\rangle = \prod_{\mathbf{k}} \exp\{\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger - \alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^*\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}\} |0\rangle$ (where in our case $\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}$ corresponds to the annihilation operator for the EM field) satisfies $\langle\beta|\alpha\rangle = e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\sum_{\mathbf{k}} |\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 + |\beta_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 - 2\beta_{\mathbf{k}}^*\alpha_{\mathbf{k}})}$. It is thus clear that $|\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}_e)\rangle_{\psi'}$ is dependent on the position of the electron while $|\mathbf{E}\rangle_{\psi} = |0\rangle$ is not. Indeed, for the two representations, the overlap between the environmental states corresponding to different electron positions is different and is given by

$$\langle\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}_e)|\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}'_e)\rangle_{\psi} = 1, \quad (9)$$

$$\langle\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}_e)|\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}'_e)\rangle_{\psi'} = e^{-\frac{\alpha}{3\pi}k_{\text{max}}^2|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|^2}. \quad (10)$$

We refer to Appendix A for more details. In Eq. (10) k_{\max} denotes the UV cutoff that is introduced for the field operator $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{\perp}(\mathbf{r}_e)$ and the dipole approximation has been applied for simplicity. Typically, whatever Lagrangian one chooses to derive the density matrix, it is customary to start with an initial factorized S-E state $|s\rangle \otimes |E\rangle$. However, as we just showed, one cannot start with an uncorrelated S-E state in both the representations simultaneously. If one does it, then in general one will arrive at different results.

Note that this problem does not arise in computing scattering amplitudes. This is because both for the initial and final times the particles are generally assumed to be well separated, which effectively *switches-off* the interaction. Therefore, the unitary transformation \hat{T} relating the two representations reduces to $\hat{T} = \mathbb{1}$ both for the asymptotic initial and final states. However, when modeling decoherence, one must trace over the environment while it is still interacting with the system, since one is typically interested in the time evolution of the effective system dynamics in the presence of a macroscopic environment (c.f. pg. 29 of [1]).

In addition to the ambiguity concerning the initial S-E state, the correlation induced by \hat{T} must also be taken into account while performing the partial trace. Indeed, the S-E basis states transform as $|x\rangle |E\rangle \rightarrow \hat{T} |x\rangle |E\rangle$ in going from L to L' [42]. Thus, a standard *uncorrelated* trace operation in one representation $\text{Tr}(\cdot) = \sum_E \langle x' | \langle E | \cdot | E \rangle | x \rangle$, to obtain the reduced density matrix in any basis, say $|x\rangle$, would correspond to a *correlated* trace $\text{Tr}'(\cdot) = \sum_E \langle x' | \langle E | \hat{T}^\dagger \cdot \hat{T} | E \rangle | x \rangle$ in the other representation. If the transformations concerning the initial state and the partial trace in the two representations are not taken into account, one inevitably arrives at two different reduced dynamics

$$\rho_r = \sum_E \langle x' | \langle E | \hat{U}(t; t_0) \hat{\rho}(t_0) \hat{U}^\dagger(t; t_0) | E \rangle | x \rangle, \quad (11)$$

$$\rho'_r = \sum_E \langle x' | \langle E | \hat{U}'(t; t_0) \hat{\rho}(t_0) \hat{U}'^\dagger(t; t_0) | E \rangle | x \rangle. \quad (12)$$

Here, $\hat{U}(t; t_0) = e^{-i\hat{H}(t-t_0)}$ and $\hat{U}'(t; t_0) = e^{-i\hat{H}'(t-t_0)}$. If, however, the initial state and the trace operation are transformed in one of the representations appropriately, say L' , we would get

$$\rho'_r = \sum_E \langle x' | \langle E | \hat{T}^\dagger \hat{U}' \hat{T} \hat{\rho}(t_0) \hat{T}^\dagger \hat{U}'^\dagger \hat{T} | E \rangle | x \rangle \quad (13)$$

which is the same as ρ_r since $\hat{U} = \hat{T}^\dagger \hat{U}' \hat{T}$. We stress that this is generally not done, since while working within one representation there is no reason *a priori* to deviate from the standard prescription and introduce these additional correlations.

For these reasons, different works, starting with standard QED Lagrangians (differing by a total derivative only) have arrived at different master equations for the free electron interacting with the vacuum fluctuations of

the radiation field. For instance, [25, 26] start from L' and obtain decoherence in the momentum basis only. In particular, [25] arrive at the following master equation

$$\hbar \partial_t \hat{\rho}'_r = -i \left[\frac{\hat{p}'^2}{2m}, \hat{\rho}'_r \right] - \frac{2e^2}{m^2} f(t) [\hat{p}', [\hat{p}', \hat{\rho}'_r]]. \quad (14)$$

Instead [27] start with L (see also [24]) and arrive at

$$\hbar \partial_t \hat{\rho}_r = -i \left[\frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m}, \hat{\rho}_r \right] - \int_0^t d\tau \mathcal{N}(\tau) [\hat{x}, [\hat{x}_{\text{H}_s}(-\tau), \hat{\rho}_r]]. \quad (15)$$

We refer to [25] and [27] for the explanation of various quantities that appear in Eqs. (14) and (15) respectively.

The two dynamics are radically different. Without necessarily going into the details, it is clear that Eq. (14) only predicts decoherence in the momentum basis and not in position, while Eq. (15) predicts decoherence explicitly in the position basis (see also [32, 44] and [27] for the physical interpretation of this decoherence factor which is different from the one in [24]). We thus emphasize again that following the standard prescription within the two representations L and L' , one arrives at different master equations.

V. WHICH REPRESENTATION?

Given the in-equivalence, how do we decide which Lagrangian to pick to derive the reduced dynamics? Is it for L that we can start with a factorized S-E state and perform the standard trace or is it the Lagrangian L' ? We claim that it must be L . The reason concerns the canonical momentum of the system. Operationally, when the environment has been traced out, what we can directly observe at the level of the system is the mechanical momentum. Instead, computationally, the degree of freedom assigned to the system is the canonical momentum. For L the two coincide since $\mathbf{p} := \partial L / \partial \dot{\mathbf{r}}_e = m \dot{\mathbf{r}}_e$. Instead, for L' we have $\mathbf{p}' = \partial L' / \partial \dot{\mathbf{r}}_e = m \dot{\mathbf{r}}_e - e \mathbf{A}_{\perp}(\mathbf{r}_e)$.

The issue in this second case is that at the level of the reduced density matrix, effectively, one loses access to the environmental degrees of freedom. It is therefore inconsistent to have \hat{p}' in the master equation for ρ'_r , since it involves both the mechanical momentum of the system and \mathbf{A}_{\perp} of the environment. But this is unavoidable if the reduced dynamics is derived from L' because \hat{p}' would always be present in the free Hamiltonian of the system. This problem does not arise if one works with L . Therefore, the correct prescription is to start from the Lagrangian for which the mechanical and the conjugate momentum of the system coincide, in order to derive the reduced dynamics. And this selects L over L' .

VI. THE THERMAL BATH

In light of these results we now reconsider decoherence due to thermal photons [19–22]. Typically, in these

phenomenological models, the environment is modeled as a scalar field or as a collection of harmonic oscillators. One has to further assume a certain interaction between the system and the environment (for example position-position or position-velocity coupling) and/or impose certain time correlations for the environmental degrees of freedom.

If, however, the goal is to study the reduced dynamics of the electron interacting with an external radiation field, one should start with the standard QED Lagrangian (3) rather than a phenomenological one and the time correlations of the environmental degrees of freedom must be derived rather than postulated. Such a derivation would then enable us to relate the free parameters of the aforementioned phenomenological models to fundamental constants.

We now proceed towards such a microscopic derivation. The master equation is derived for the non-relativistic electron interacting with the radiation field, initially assumed to be in a thermal state at temperature T , upto e^2 . Following the prescription above, we start with L rather than L' and apply the influence functional formalism [45]. Therein, the master equation can be written in terms of the so called noise kernel \mathcal{N} and the dissipation kernel \mathcal{D} . We point out that while the influence functional is evaluated exactly, the perturbative treatment is necessary to obtain the master equation in a compact form starting from the influence functional (c.f. chapter three of [46]). For the main conclusion of this work, going beyond e^2 is not required, even though it is possible. Using this formalism (c.f. chapter three in [46] and [27]), the master equation upto e^2 , derived from L , reads

$$\begin{aligned} \hbar \partial_t \hat{\rho}_r = & -i \left[\hat{H}_s, \hat{\rho}_r(t) \right] - \int_0^t d\tau \mathcal{N}(\tau) [\hat{x}, [\hat{x}_{H_s}(-\tau), \hat{\rho}_r(t)]] \\ & + \frac{i}{2} \int_0^t d\tau \mathcal{D}(\tau) [\hat{x}, \{\hat{x}_{H_s}(-\tau), \hat{\rho}_r(t)\}]. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Here, the motion of the electron is assumed to be along the x-axis, $\hat{H}_s := \hat{p}^2/(2m) + \hat{V}_0 + \hat{V}_{EM}$, $\hat{x}_{H_s}(-\tau) := \hat{U}_s^{-1}(t-\tau; t) \hat{x} \hat{U}_s(t-\tau; t)$ with $\hat{U}_s(t-\tau; t)$ being the unitary operator that evolves the statevector of the system from time t to $t-\tau$ via the system Hamiltonian \hat{H}_s and \hat{x} without the subscript is the usual Schrödinger operator such that $\hat{x}_{H_s}(0) = \hat{x}$. Further, the kernels are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}(\tau) & := \frac{e^2}{2\hbar} \langle T | \{ \hat{\Pi}_E(t_1), \hat{\Pi}_E(t_2) \} | T \rangle, \\ \mathcal{D}(\tau) & := \frac{ie^2}{\hbar} \langle T | \left[\hat{\Pi}_E(t_1), \hat{\Pi}_E(t_2) \right] | T \rangle \theta(\tau), \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $\tau := t_1 - t_2$ and

$$\hat{\Pi}_E = iC \int d^3k \sqrt{k} \sum_{\epsilon} \hat{a}_{\epsilon}(\mathbf{k}) e^{i(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r} - \omega t)} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^x + \text{c.c.}, \quad (18)$$

with $C := (\hbar c / (2\epsilon_0 (2\pi)^3))^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^x$ being the x-component of the polarization vector.

Having expressed $\hat{\Pi}_E(\mathbf{r}, t)$ in terms of the creation and annihilation operators, the kernels can be calculated explicitly. Further, since the electron is assumed to travel at non-relativistic speeds $v \ll c$, the dipole approximation can be applied for computing the kernels (c.f. the discussion below Eq. (53) of [27] and Appendix B). The full noise kernel can be written as $\mathcal{N}(\tau) = \mathcal{N}_0(\tau) + \mathcal{N}_{\beta}(\tau)$ where \mathcal{N}_0 is the contribution of the zero point fluctuations and \mathcal{N}_{β} is the contribution of the thermal photons. The dissipation kernel is indifferent to the initial state of the radiation field, i.e., $\mathcal{D}(\tau) = \mathcal{D}_0(\tau)$. This is consistent with the intuition that for a charged particle there is only one way to loose energy: the emission of radiation upon acceleration, which is already encoded in \mathcal{D}_0 .

The explicit expression for \mathcal{N} is given by

$$\mathcal{N}(\tau) = \frac{4\alpha\hbar}{\pi c^2} \frac{(\epsilon^4 - 6\epsilon^2\tau^2 + \tau^4)}{(\epsilon^2 + \tau^2)^4} - \frac{4\alpha}{3\beta c^2} \delta_{\beta}''(\tau), \quad (19)$$

where $\epsilon = 1/(ck_{\max})$, $\beta := 1/(k_B T)$ and $\delta_{\beta} := (\beta\hbar/\pi) \int_0^{\infty} d\omega \omega \cos(\omega\tau) / (e^{\beta\hbar\omega} - 1)$. The first term on the right in Eq. (19), which is independent of β , is due to \mathcal{N}_0 and taken from [27] while the second term is what we call \mathcal{N}_{β} . Like \mathcal{N}_0 , \mathcal{D} is the same as in [27] and given by

$$\mathcal{D} = \frac{4\hbar\alpha}{3c^2} \theta(\tau) \delta_{\epsilon}'''(\tau), \quad \delta_{\epsilon} := \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{d}{d\tau} \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{\tau}{\epsilon} \right). \quad (20)$$

We now specify the external potential \hat{V}_0 and take it to be that of a harmonic oscillator $\hat{V}_0(x) = \frac{1}{2}m\Omega^2 \hat{x}^2$. Using the identity $\int_0^t d\tau \delta_{\epsilon}'''(\tau) f(-\tau) = (f'''/2 - \delta_{\epsilon} f'' - \delta_{\epsilon}' f)|_{\tau=0}$, and the relations $\hat{x}_{H_s}(0) = \hat{x}$, $\hat{x}_{H_s}''(0) = -\Omega^2 \hat{x}$, $\hat{x}_{H_s}'''(0) = -\Omega^2 \hat{p}/m$, the master equation can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \hbar \dot{\hat{\rho}}_r = & -i \left[\frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2}m\Omega^2 \hat{x}^2, \hat{\rho}_r \right] - \frac{i\alpha\hbar\Omega^2}{3mc^2} [\hat{x}, \{\hat{p}, \hat{\rho}_r\}] \\ & - \int_0^t d\tau (\mathcal{N}_0(\tau) + \mathcal{N}_{\beta}(\tau)) [\hat{x}, [\hat{x}_{H_s}(-\tau), \hat{\rho}_r]]. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

In Eq. (21) \hat{V}_{EM} is cancelled exactly by the term involving $\delta_{\epsilon}''(0)$, which comes from the integral involving the dissipation kernel, and the term involving $\delta_{\epsilon}(0)$ simply leads to the renormalization of mass/frequency which we have included in the redefinition of the parameters (c.f. Appendix C). We emphasize that the fundamental Lagrangian (3) naturally provides the so-called counter-term V_{EM} which would have to be added by hand in the phenomenological models with a supraohmic bath [24].

The first term on the right of Eq. (21) governs the free evolution, the second term describes dissipation and the third term concerns decoherence. For an electron at rest, the suppression of the off-diagonal elements of $\hat{\rho}_r$ due to \mathcal{N}_0 was argued to be due to tracing over the dressed states of the electron. However, generally this must not be done as the electron at rest is observed with its dressing and the dressing must therefore be considered part of the system rather than the environment. Indeed, it

was shown in [27] how this decoherence factor goes away when the interaction with the environment is switched on and off adiabatically.

For an accelerated electron the situation is different as it emits bremsstrahlung. For the case that we are considering in this work, i.e., the electron accelerated by the harmonic potential $\hat{x}_{\text{H}_s}(\tau) = \cos(\Omega\tau)\hat{x} + \sin(\Omega\tau)\hat{p}/(m\Omega)$, part of the contribution coming from \mathcal{N}_0 must be considered observationally relevant. Thus, both the thermal photons and those emitted by the accelerated charge *measure* the electron's position and lead to positional decoherence. For temperatures high enough, however, we expect the physics to be dominated by thermal photons (c.f. Appendix E). Indeed, for high temperatures the contribution coming from \mathcal{N}_β dominates over \mathcal{N}_0 and the master equation (ignoring free evolution) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{\rho}}_r = & -\frac{i\alpha\Omega^2}{3mc^2} [\hat{x}, \{\hat{p}, \hat{\rho}_r\}] - \frac{2\alpha\Omega^2 k_B T}{3\hbar c^2} [\hat{x}, [\hat{x}, \hat{\rho}_r]] \\ & - \left(\frac{k_B T}{mc^2}\right) \frac{2\pi\alpha k_B T}{9\hbar^2} [\hat{x}, [\hat{p}, \hat{\rho}_r]]. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The details of the derivation are presented in Appendix C, where we show how the master equation (22) takes this form in the high temperature limit where $t \gg \hbar\beta$ and $\hbar\Omega \ll k_B T$.

The first term, involving both the commutator and the anti-commutator, describes dissipation. It is proportional to the external frequency Ω and would therefore be zero for a free particle. Indeed, for a free particle, one would expect no dissipation, upto e^2 , from classical electrodynamics. According to Larmor's formula, the power radiated is proportional to $e^2 a^2$, a being the acceleration of the charged particle. Therefore, such a term can only survive in the master equation, upto second order, if and only if the particle can be accelerated independently of the thermal photons.

The second term, involving the double commutator of $\hat{\rho}_r$ with \hat{x} , describes decoherence explicitly in the position basis. Again, it goes to zero for a free particle upto e^2 . This can also be understood intuitively; to acquire which-path information about the charged particle, one would have to look at the change in momentum of the incoming photon upon its interaction with the particle at a certain location [1, 3, 16, 17]. Classically, for this change in momentum to occur, the electron must be first accelerated by absorbing an incoming thermal photon and it must then emit a photon with a different momentum. However, as argued before, such a process would not be captured upto e^2 for a free particle. It appears at e^2 , however, in the presence of the harmonic potential.

Finally, we compare our master equation with the well-known Caldeira-Leggett (CL) equation [1, 19] (ignoring free evolution)

$$\dot{\hat{\rho}}_r = -\frac{i\eta}{2m} [\hat{x}, \{\hat{p}, \hat{\rho}_r\}] - \frac{\Lambda}{\hbar} [\hat{x}, [\hat{x}, \hat{\rho}_r]], \quad (23)$$

where the friction coefficient η and the diffusion coefficient Λ satisfy $\Lambda = \eta k_B T$. We see that our master

equation also respects this relationship between the two coefficients. This is essential to achieve equipartition. Moreover, the coefficient η , which in the CL model is essentially a free parameter depending upon the details of how the system couples to a bath of harmonic oscillators, is now predicted in terms of fundamental constants to be $\eta = 2\alpha\Omega^2/(3c^2)$ by our microscopic derivation for QED. Clearly, this expression for η would be the leading contribution to dissipation unless the frequency Ω was so low that the higher order scattering contribution (of the order α^2 , as in collisional models) starts dominating. The difference between our master equation and the CL equation is the term involving a double commutator between $\hat{\rho}_r$, \hat{x} and \hat{p} . The presence of this term has been discussed in previous works (c.f. pgs. 69-76 in [1], [21] and [47]). This extra term only affects the time evolution of the variances $\langle \hat{x}^2 \rangle$ and $\langle \hat{p}^2 \rangle$ and not of the expectation values $\langle \hat{x} \rangle$ and $\langle \hat{p} \rangle$. However, as shown in Appendix D, the extra contribution coming from this term is suppressed if $k_B T \ll mc^2$. Since our calculations are aimed at describing the non-relativistic electron, consistency demands $k_B T \ll mc^2$. Therefore, for the non-relativistic electron, this extra term turns out to be inconsequential for all practical purposes.

VII. DISCUSSION

In this work we highlight an un-avoidable difficulty in deriving the reduced dynamics starting from a fundamental Lagrangian. We show that two Lagrangians, that differ by a total derivative and are therefore unitarily equivalent to each other globally, give different predictions at the level of reduced system dynamics.

To consistently describe an open system, we argue that one must work with the Lagrangian for which the conjugate and the canonical momentum of the system coincide. We then derive, starting from the QED Lagrangian, the master equation for the electron interacting with thermal photons in the presence of an external harmonic potential. Our master equation assumes only that the electron travels at non-relativistic speeds and consistently predicts decoherence in position. If instead the derivation was performed starting from L' rather than L , one would arrive at a different master equation which would also be at odds with the well-known standard results such as the CL equation. Since within L the system dynamics is consistent from various physical considerations, this specific case study adds further support for picking one class of Lagrangians over the others.

We believe that this result is of value for the foundations of open quantum systems and will find applications in a variety of situations.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledge financial support from the University of Trieste, INFN and the EIC Pathfinder project QuCoM (GA No. 101046973). A.B. also acknowledges financial support from the PNRR MUR project PE0000023-NQSTI.

Appendix A: The coherent state

For the statevector $|\psi'\rangle$,

$$|\psi'\rangle = \exp\left\{ie\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{\perp} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_e/\hbar\right\} |\mathbf{r}_e\rangle |0\rangle, \quad (\text{A1})$$

the state of the radiation field is correlated to the position of the electron and corresponds to a coherent state. To see this, following the notations of [27], we write the field operator corresponding to the vector potential $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{\perp}$ as

$$\hat{A}_{\perp}^m = C \int \frac{d^3k}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{\varepsilon} \hat{a}_{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{k}) \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^m + \text{c.c.}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where $C := \left(\frac{\hbar}{2c\varepsilon_0(2\pi)^3}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Note that in Eq. (A2), we have omitted the factor $e^{i(\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}-\omega t)}$. The time dependence because we are primarily interested in the properties of the state at $t = 0$ (and not in the free evolution), and the \mathbf{r} dependence for simplicity motivated by the dipole approximation. In the Fock space, the mode \mathbf{k} goes into the coherent state $|\alpha_{\mathbf{k}\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}}(\mathbf{r})\rangle$

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha_{\mathbf{k}\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}}(\mathbf{r})\rangle &= \exp\left\{\alpha_{\mathbf{k}\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}}(\mathbf{r})\hat{a}_{\varepsilon}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k}) - \text{c.c.}\right\} |0\rangle, \\ \alpha_{\mathbf{k}\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}}(\mathbf{r}) &:= \frac{ieC}{\hbar\sqrt{k}} \sum_m \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^m r_m. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

Since the inner product between two coherent states is given by $\langle\beta|\alpha\rangle = \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}(|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 - 2\beta^*\alpha)\right\}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\alpha(\mathbf{r}_1)|\alpha(\mathbf{r}_2)\rangle &= \prod_{\mathbf{k}} \prod_{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}} \langle\alpha_{\mathbf{k}\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}}(\mathbf{r}_1)|\alpha_{\mathbf{k}\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}}(\mathbf{r}_2)\rangle \\ &= \exp\left\{-I(k)\frac{4\pi e^2}{3\hbar^2}|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|^2\right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

where, from Eq. (A3), it can be deduced that $I(k) = C^2 \int_0^{\infty} dk k e^{-k/k_{\max}}$. Here again, the additional factor of $e^{-k/k_{\max}}$ imposes the UV cutoff in the calculations, as detailed in [27]. Computing the integral explicitly, using $\alpha := e^2/(4\pi c\hbar\varepsilon_0)$, we get

$$\langle\alpha(\mathbf{r}_1)|\alpha(\mathbf{r}_2)\rangle = \exp\left\{-\frac{\alpha}{3\pi}k_{\max}^2|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|^2\right\}. \quad (\text{A5})$$

Appendix B: The noise kernel for thermal photons

The noise kernel corresponding to zero point fluctuations \mathcal{N}_0 and the dissipation kernel \mathcal{D} were derived in

detail in [27]. We therefore only detail the derivation of \mathcal{N}_{β} . We remember that without loss of generality, the motion of the electron can be assumed to be along the x-axis only, such that only the x-component of the field operator,

$$\hat{\Pi}_{\text{E}}(\mathbf{r}, t) = iC \int d^3k \sqrt{k} \sum_{\varepsilon} \hat{a}_{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{k}) e^{i(\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}-\omega t)} \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^x + \text{c.c.}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where $C = (\hbar c/(2\varepsilon_0(2\pi)^3))^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is relevant. Using this expression, and the number distribution for a thermal state, the two-point correlation

$$\langle\hat{\Pi}_{\text{E}}(1)\hat{\Pi}_{\text{E}}(2)\rangle_T := \langle T | \hat{\Pi}_{\text{E}}(x_1, t_1) \hat{\Pi}_{\text{E}}(x_2, t_2) | T \rangle, \quad (\text{B2})$$

where $x_1 := x(t_1)$ and $x_2 := x(t_2)$, can be computed. In using Eq. (B1) to compute the two-point correlation, only the terms of the form $\hat{a}_{\varepsilon}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k})\hat{a}_{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{k})$ and $\hat{a}_{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{k})\hat{a}_{\varepsilon}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k})$ contribute. The second term can also be expressed as the number operator at the cost of a C-number. This C-number is precisely what one gets in computing the two-point correlations for the vacuum state and is captured by \mathcal{N}_0 calculated in [27]. The noise kernel for thermal photons \mathcal{N}_{β} , by definition, is calculated by excluding this contribution. The intermediate expression for \mathcal{N}_{β} is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_{\beta}((1); (2)) &= \frac{e^2}{2\hbar} \langle : \hat{\Pi}_{\text{E}}(1)\hat{\Pi}_{\text{E}}(2) + \hat{\Pi}_{\text{E}}(2)\hat{\Pi}_{\text{E}}(1) : \rangle_T \\ &= \frac{e^2 c}{2\pi^2 \varepsilon_0} \hat{\square}_x \int_0^{\infty} dk n_k \frac{\sin(kr) \cos(kc\tau)}{r}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B3})$$

where,

$$\hat{\square}_x := -\frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \tau^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}, \quad n_k := \frac{1}{e^{\beta \hbar c k} - 1}, \quad (\text{B4})$$

$r := |x_2 - x_1|$ and $\tau := t_2 - t_1$. If the full integration in Eq. (B3) is performed, it can be seen that the spatial dependence is absent to leading order in v/c (or $r \ll c\tau$) for the noise kernel. A more direct way to see this is to notice that $2 \sin(kr) \cos(kc\tau)/r = (\sin(k(r+ c\tau)) + \sin(k(r- c\tau)))/r$. Thus, the spatial dependence inside the sin functions appears only in the form $kr \pm c\tau$ and can thus be ignored for the non-relativistic electron. It is only in this sense that the so-called dipole approximation is applied in our work. As already emphasized in [27], its usage is justified not only when the particle is confined to small distances ($kr \ll 1$) but also when it moves at non-relativistic speeds ($r \ll c\tau$). The leading order contribution to \mathcal{N}_{β} can be more simply, and equivalently, calculated by applying the dipole approximation from the very beginning and gives

$$\mathcal{N}_{\beta}(\tau) = -\frac{4\hbar\alpha}{3\pi c^2} \frac{d^2}{d\tau^2} \int_0^{\infty} d\omega \frac{\omega \cos(\omega\tau)}{e^{\beta \hbar \omega} - 1} = -\frac{4\alpha}{3\beta c^2} \delta_{\beta}''(\tau), \quad (\text{B5})$$

where, as defined in the main text,

$$\delta_\beta(\tau) := \frac{\beta\hbar}{\pi} \int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{\omega \cos(\omega\tau)}{e^{\beta\hbar\omega} - 1}. \quad (\text{B6})$$

Appendix C: The master equation

We now evaluate the master equation (ignoring the contribution due to \mathcal{N}_0 for now),

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \hat{\rho}_r &= -\frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{H}_s, \hat{\rho}_r(t)] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_0^t d\tau \mathcal{N}_\beta(\tau) [\hat{x}, [\hat{x}_{H_s}(-\tau), \hat{\rho}_r(t)]] \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{2\hbar} \int_0^t d\tau \mathcal{D}(\tau) [\hat{x}, \{\hat{x}_{H_s}(-\tau), \hat{\rho}_r(t)\}], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C1})$$

given the relations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_\beta(\tau) &= -\frac{4\alpha}{3\beta c^2} \delta_\beta''(\tau), \quad \mathcal{D}(\tau) = \frac{4\alpha\hbar}{3c^2} \theta(\tau) \delta_\epsilon'''(\tau), \\ \hat{x}_{H_s}(-\tau) &= \cos(\Omega\tau) \hat{x} - \sin(\Omega\tau) \frac{\hat{p}}{m\Omega}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C2})$$

On time scales $t \gg \epsilon$ and $t \gg \hbar\beta$ both the functions $\delta_\epsilon(\tau)$ and $\delta_\beta(\tau)$ can be effectively treated as a Dirac delta. The integrals involving $\mathcal{N}_\beta(\tau)$ and $\mathcal{D}(\tau)$ can be evaluated by integrating by parts and ignoring the upper boundary term $\tau = t$, as such terms in the differential equation correspond to unphysical (transient) effects related to suddenly switching on the S-E interactions (c.f. pg. 77 of [46]). In shifting the derivatives from δ_ϵ onto $\hat{x}_{H_s}(-\tau)$, we get two non-zero boundary terms. The one proportional to $\delta_\epsilon''(0)$ cancels the contribution coming from \hat{V}_{EM} in \hat{H}_s while the one proportional to $\delta_\epsilon(0)$ leads to the renormalization of mass/frequency. We refer to [27] for more details. In addition to these two terms, the integral involving $\mathcal{D}(\tau)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} &-\frac{2i\alpha}{3c^2} \int_0^t \delta_\epsilon(\tau) [\hat{x}, \{\hat{x}_{H_s}'''(-\tau), \hat{\rho}_r(t)\}] = \\ &= -\frac{i\alpha\Omega^2}{3mc^2} [\hat{x}, \{\hat{p}, \hat{\rho}_r(t)\}] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C3})$$

which is indeed the dissipation term in the master equation of the main text. Next, we compute the integral involving the noise kernel \mathcal{N}_β . Upon integration by parts we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{4\alpha}{3\hbar\beta c^2} \int_0^t d\tau \delta_\beta''(\tau) [\hat{x}, [\hat{x}_{H_s}(-\tau), \hat{\rho}_r(t)]] = \\ &= \frac{4\alpha}{3\hbar\beta c^2} \int_0^t \delta_\beta(\tau) [\hat{x}, [\hat{x}_{H_s}''(-\tau), \hat{\rho}_r(t)]] \\ &\quad + \frac{4\alpha}{3\hbar\beta c^2} \delta_\beta(0) [\hat{x}, [\hat{x}'_{H_s}(-\tau), \hat{\rho}_r(t)]]|_{\tau=0} \\ &= -\frac{2\alpha\Omega^2}{3\hbar\beta c^2} [\hat{x}, [\hat{x}, \hat{\rho}_r(t)]] - \frac{2\pi\alpha}{9\hbar^2\beta^2 mc^2} [\hat{x}, [\hat{p}, \hat{\rho}_r(t)]]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C4})$$

Here, we have used $\delta_\beta(0) = \pi/(6\hbar\beta)$, and the high temperature assumption $t \gg \hbar\beta$, $1/\Omega \gg \hbar\beta$, for the usage of $\delta_\beta(\tau)$ as a Dirac delta. Using these relations the master equation becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \hat{\rho}_r &= -\frac{i}{\hbar} \left[\frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2} m \Omega_r^2 \hat{x}^2, \hat{\rho}_r \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{i\alpha\Omega^2}{3mc^2} [\hat{x}, \{\hat{p}, \hat{\rho}_r\}] - \frac{2\alpha\Omega^2}{3\hbar\beta c^2} [\hat{x}, [\hat{x}, \hat{\rho}_r]] \\ &\quad - \frac{2\pi\alpha}{9\hbar^2\beta^2 mc^2} [\hat{x}, [\hat{p}, \hat{\rho}_r]], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C5})$$

where $\Omega_r^2 := \Omega^2 (1 - 4\alpha\hbar\omega_{\text{max}}/(3\pi mc^2))$. Note that the distinction between Ω and Ω_r would only give a higher order contribution to the master equation in other terms (such as the ones describing decoherence and dissipation), and is therefore not relevant since the master equation in our work is derived upto e^2 . Therefore, wherever Ω appears in the dynamics, it can be treated as the renormalized frequency.

Appendix D: The variances

The last term in Eq. (C5) does not contribute to the time evolution of $\langle \hat{x} \rangle$ and $\langle \hat{p} \rangle$. Therefore, to study its impact on the dynamics, we can study the time evolution of the variances. Their coupled equations are derived from Eq. (C5) to be

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \langle \hat{x}^2 \rangle &= \frac{1}{m} \langle \{\hat{x}, \hat{p}\} \rangle, \\ \frac{d}{dt} \langle \hat{p}^2 \rangle &= -m\Omega^2 \langle \{\hat{x}, \hat{p}\} \rangle - \frac{4\alpha\hbar\Omega^2}{3mc^2} \langle \hat{p}^2 \rangle + \frac{4\alpha\hbar\Omega^2}{3\beta c^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D1})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \langle \{\hat{x}, \hat{p}\} \rangle &= -\frac{2\alpha\hbar\Omega^2}{3mc^2} \langle \{\hat{x}, \hat{p}\} \rangle + \frac{2}{m} \langle \hat{p}^2 \rangle - 2m\Omega^2 \langle \hat{x}^2 \rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{4\pi\alpha}{9\beta^2 mc^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D2})$$

For the stationary state, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \hat{p}^2 \rangle &= mk_B T, \\ \frac{1}{2} m \Omega^2 \langle \hat{x}^2 \rangle &= \frac{1}{2m} \langle \hat{p}^2 \rangle - \frac{\pi\alpha}{9} \left(\frac{k_B T}{mc^2} \right) k_B T. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D4})$$

We see that last term on the right hand side of Eq. (C5) would only give a significant contribution when $k_B T \simeq mc^2$. However, since the calculations are performed within the non-relativistic regime, we must have $k_B T \ll mc^2$ for consistency. Therefore, it is in this sense that the last term in the master equation (C5) can be ignored, for all practical purposes. The equations above also demonstrate how, upto e^2 , for the non-relativistic electron, the equipartition theorem is respected.

Appendix E: Decoherence due to bremsstrahlung

In the presence of an external potential, the accelerated electron emits bremsstrahlung which carries which-path information and thus leads to decoherence. These effects can be captured by the master equation describing the electron interacting with the electromagnetic field initially in the vacuum state. As already mentioned in the main text, however, when working with \mathcal{N}_0 , one unavoidably encounters terms due to tracing over the virtual photons that surround the electron as its dressing [27, 32]. For instance, in [27] it was shown that the decoherence effects due to tracing over these dressed states for a free particle are false and do not show up if the interaction with the environment is switched on and off adiabatically. We therefore do not retain such terms which are independent of Ω and scale explicitly with the UV cutoff [32, 44].

To proceed with the calculations, we recall the vacuum noise kernel for the non-relativistic electron

$$\mathcal{N}_0(\tau) = \frac{4\alpha\hbar}{\pi c^2} \frac{(\epsilon^4 - 6\epsilon^2\tau^2 + \tau^4)}{(\epsilon^2 + \tau^2)^4}. \quad (\text{E1})$$

The contribution of \mathcal{N}_0 to the master equation describing emission of bremsstrahlung splits into two pieces:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \hat{\rho}_r |_{\mathcal{N}_0} = & -\frac{1}{\hbar} \int_0^t d\tau \mathcal{N}_0(\tau) \cos \Omega\tau [\hat{x}, [\hat{x}, \hat{\rho}_r(t)]] \\ & + \frac{1}{\hbar m \Omega} \int_0^t d\tau \mathcal{N}_0(\tau) \sin \Omega\tau [\hat{x}, [\hat{p}, \hat{\rho}_r(t)]] . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E2})$$

The first integral has a complicated time dependence, but can be computed easily in the long time limit $t \gg \epsilon$. It gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_0^t d\tau \mathcal{N}_0(\tau) \cos \Omega\tau &= \frac{1}{2\hbar} \Re \int_{-t}^t d\tau \mathcal{N}_0(\tau) e^{i\Omega\tau} \\ &\stackrel{t \rightarrow \infty}{=} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\hbar^2}} \Re \{ \mathfrak{F}[\mathcal{N}_0](\Omega) \} \\ &= \frac{\alpha\Omega^3}{3c^2} e^{-\epsilon\Omega}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E3})$$

where \mathfrak{F} denotes the Fourier transform. The term (E3) is well behaved for an arbitrarily large cutoff $\epsilon = 1/\Omega_{\max}$ such that $\Omega/\Omega_{\max} \ll 1$. As expected, it describes loss of coherence in position due to radiation emission

$$\partial_t \hat{\rho}_r |_{\text{dec}} = -\frac{\alpha\Omega^3}{3c^2} [\hat{x}, [\hat{x}, \hat{\rho}_r(t)]] . \quad (\text{E4})$$

The second contribution in (E2) in the large time limit

$t \gg \epsilon$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{m\hbar\Omega} \int_0^t d\tau \mathcal{N}_0(\tau) \sin \Omega\tau [\hat{x}, [\hat{p}, \hat{\rho}_r(t)]] \stackrel{t \rightarrow \infty}{=} \\ & \left(-\frac{2\alpha}{3\pi m c^2 \epsilon^2} + \frac{2\alpha\Omega^2}{3\pi m c^2} \log[\epsilon\Omega] + \frac{2\alpha\gamma_E \Omega^2}{3\pi m c^2} \right) [\hat{x}, [\hat{p}, \hat{\rho}_r(t)]] \\ & + O(\epsilon), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E5})$$

where γ_E is the Euler-Mascheroni constant. The first term on the right in Eq. (E5) is independent of Ω and scales explicitly with the UV cutoff $1/\epsilon = \Omega_{\max}$. As mentioned before it must therefore be attributed to the dressing of the electron and discarded.

The second term, which diverges logarithmically, has been discussed in detail, for example, in [47]. There it was argued that such divergence leads to the renormalization of the two point function $\langle p(t_1)p(t_2) \rangle$ in the limit $t_1 \rightarrow t_2$. One may also take the point of view, as we do in this work, that since our calculations are performed in the non relativistic regime, the value of the cutoff is bounded from above as $\hbar\Omega_{\max} \lesssim mc^2$ (c.f. pgs. 200-202 in [48]). This makes the logarithmic term finite in any case. Therefore, setting the cutoff to $\hbar\Omega_{\max} = mc^2$, the equation corresponding to (D3) for the emission of bremsstrahlung, including the dissipation kernel, reads

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \langle \{\hat{x}, \hat{p}\} \rangle = & -\frac{2\alpha\hbar\Omega^2}{3mc^2} \langle \{\hat{x}, \hat{p}\} \rangle - 2m\Omega^2 \langle \hat{x}^2 \rangle + \frac{2}{m} \langle \hat{p}^2 \rangle \\ & + \frac{4\alpha\gamma_E \hbar^2 \Omega^2}{3\pi m c^2} + \frac{4\alpha\hbar^2 \Omega^2}{3\pi m c^2} \log \frac{\hbar\Omega}{mc^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E6})$$

As in the thermal case, the last two contributions in (E6) are suppressed in the non relativistic limit $\hbar\Omega \ll mc^2$. To see this, as done in the previous section, one can look at the asymptotic, stationary values of the variances in position and momenta

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} m \Omega^2 \langle \hat{x}^2 \rangle &= \frac{\hbar\Omega}{4} + \frac{\alpha}{3\pi} \left(\frac{\hbar\Omega}{mc^2} \right) \hbar\Omega \left(\gamma_E + \log \frac{\hbar\Omega}{mc^2} \right), \\ \frac{\langle \hat{p}^2 \rangle}{2m} &= \frac{\hbar\Omega}{4}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E7})$$

We see the variances relaxing to the ground state values with the extra contribution heavily suppressed within the non-relativistic limit $\hbar\Omega \ll mc^2$. Therefore, the second term on the right in Eq. (E2) can be neglected for all practical purposes. In conclusion, the master equation for a harmonically trapped electron emitting bremsstrahlung, retaining only the physical contributions, reads:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \hat{\rho}_r(t) = & -\frac{i}{\hbar} \left[\frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2} m \Omega^2 \hat{x}^2, \hat{\rho}_r \right] \\ & - \frac{i\alpha\Omega^2}{3mc^2} [\hat{x}, \{\hat{p}, \hat{\rho}_r\}] - \frac{\alpha\Omega^3}{3c^2} [\hat{x}, [\hat{x}, \hat{\rho}_r(t)]] . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E8})$$

We see that indeed, the additional contribution of bremsstrahlung to decoherence in position, is subdominant with respect to thermal photons in the high temperature limit $k_B T \gg \hbar\Omega$.

-
- [1] E. Joos, H. Zeh, D. Giulini, C. Kiefer, J. Kupsch, and I. Stamatescu, *Decoherence and the Appearance of a Classical World in Quantum Physics* and astronomy online library (Springer, 2003).
- [2] M. A. Schlosshauer, *Decoherence and the Quantum-To-Classical Transition* (Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2007).
- [3] E. Joos and H. D. Zeh, *Z. Phys. B* **59**, 223 (1985).
- [4] H. D. Zeh, Decoherence: Basic concepts and their interpretation (2002), [arXiv:quant-ph/9506020](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9506020) [quant-ph].
- [5] B. Brezger, L. Hackermüller, S. Uttenthaler, J. Petschinka, M. Arndt, and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 100404 (2002).
- [6] K. Hornberger, S. Uttenthaler, B. Brezger, L. Hackermüller, M. Arndt, and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 160401 (2003).
- [7] L. Hackermüller, S. Uttenthaler, K. Hornberger, E. Reiger, B. Brezger, A. Zeilinger, and M. Arndt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 090408 (2003).
- [8] L. Hackermüller, K. Hornberger, B. Brezger, A. Zeilinger, and M. Arndt, *Nature* **427**, 711 (2004).
- [9] J. P. Cotter, S. Eibenberger, L. Mairhofer, X. Cheng, P. Asenbaum, M. Arndt, K. Walter, S. Nimmrichter, and K. Hornberger, *Nature Communications* **6**, 10.1038/ncomms8336 (2015).
- [10] J. P. Cotter, C. Brand, C. Knobloch, Y. Lilach, O. Cheshnovsky, and M. Arndt, *Science Advances* **3**, e1602478 (2017).
- [11] N. P. Bullier, A. Pontin, and P. F. Barker, *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics* **53**, 175302 (2020).
- [12] C. Gonzalez-Ballester, M. Aspelmeyer, L. Novotny, R. Quidant, and O. Romero-Isart, *Science* **374**, eabg3027 (2021).
- [13] J. M. H. Gosling, A. Pontin, J. H. Iacoponi, P. F. Barker, and T. S. Monteiro, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **6**, 013129 (2024).
- [14] R. Acharya, I. Aleiner, R. Allen, T. I. Andersen, M. Ansmann, F. Arute, K. Arya, A. Asfaw, J. Atalaya, R. Babbush, *et al.*, *Nature* **614**, 676 (2023).
- [15] Y. Kim, A. Eddins, S. Anand, K. X. Wei, E. Van Den Berg, S. Rosenblatt, H. Nayfeh, Y. Wu, M. Zaletel, K. Temme, *et al.*, *Nature* **618**, 500 (2023).
- [16] E. P. Wigner, in *Science, Computers, and the Information Onslaught*, edited by D. M. Kerr, K. Braithwaite, N. Metropolis, D. H. Sharp, and G.-C. Rota (Academic Press, 1984) pp. 63–82.
- [17] M. R. Gallis and G. N. Fleming, *Phys. Rev. A* **42**, 38 (1990).
- [18] B. Vacchini, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 1374 (2000).
- [19] A. Caldeira and A. Leggett, *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **121**, 587 (1983).
- [20] A. O. Caldeira and A. J. Leggett, *Phys. Rev. A* **31**, 1059 (1985).
- [21] W. G. Unruh and W. H. Zurek, *Phys. Rev. D* **40**, 1071 (1989).
- [22] B. L. Hu, J. P. Paz, and Y. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **45**, 2843 (1992).
- [23] M. Tegmark, *Found. Phys. Lett.* **6**, 571 (1993).
- [24] P. M. V. B. Barone and A. O. Caldeira, *Phys. Rev. A* **43**, 57 (1991).
- [25] C. Anastopoulos and A. Zoupas, *Phys. Rev. D* **58**, 105006 (1998).
- [26] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, in *Relativistic Quantum Measurement and Decoherence*, edited by H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2000) pp. 31–65.
- [27] A. Gundhi and A. Bassi, *Phys. Rev. A* **107**, 062801 (2023).
- [28] C. Kiefer, *Phys. Rev. D* **46**, 1658 (1992).
- [29] L. H. Ford, *Phys. Rev. D* **47**, 5571 (1993).
- [30] G. Baym and T. Ozawa, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **106**, 3035 (2009).
- [31] E. Santos, *Physics Letters A* **188**, 198 (1994).
- [32] L. Diósi, *Physics Letters A* **197**, 183 (1995).
- [33] C. Anastopoulos, *Phys. Rev. D* **54**, 1600 (1996).
- [34] C. Anastopoulos and B. L. Hu, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **30**, 165007 (2013).
- [35] M. P. Blencowe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 021302 (2013).
- [36] T. Oniga and C. H.-T. Wang, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 044027 (2016).
- [37] S. Kanno, J. Soda, and J. Tokuda, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 044017 (2021).
- [38] L. Asprea, G. Gasbarri, and A. Bassi, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 104041 (2021).
- [39] M. Lagouvardos and C. Anastopoulos, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **38**, 115012 (2021).
- [40] M. Parikh, F. Wilczek, and G. Zahariade, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 046021 (2021).
- [41] D. Carney, V. Domcke, and N. L. Rodd, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 044009 (2024).
- [42] J. R. Ackerhalt and P. W. Milonni, *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B* **1**, 116 (1984).
- [43] C. Cohen-Tannoudji, J. Dupont-Roc, and G. Grynberg, Other equivalent formulations of electrodynamics, in *Photons and Atoms* (John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 1997) Chap. 4, pp. 253–359.
- [44] W. G. Unruh, in *Relativistic Quantum Measurement and Decoherence*, edited by H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2000) pp. 125–140.
- [45] R. Feynman and F. Vernon, *Annals of Physics* **24**, 118 (1963).
- [46] E. A. Calzetta and B.-L. B. Hu, *Nonequilibrium Quantum Field Theory*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics (Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- [47] C. Agón and A. Lawrence, *JHEP* **04**, 008.
- [48] C. Cohen-Tannoudji, J. Dupont-Roc, and G. Grynberg, Quantum electrodynamics in the coulomb gauge, in *Photons and Atoms* (John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 1997) Chap. 3, pp. 169–252.