

How pure can we go with adiabatic state manipulation?

Raul A. Santos,¹ Alex Kamenev,^{2,3} and Yuval Gefen⁴

¹*Phasecraft Ltd.*

²*School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455, USA*

³*William I. Fine Theoretical Physics Institute, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455, USA*

⁴*Department of Condensed Matter Physics, The Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 76100, Israel*

(Dated: June 5, 2024)

Dissipative systems with decoherence free subspaces, a.k.a. dark spaces (DSs), can be used to protect quantum information. At the same time, dissipation is expected to give rise to coherent information degradation outside the DS. Employed to support quantum information platforms, DSs can be adiabatically modified in a way that resembles adiabatic control of coherent systems. Here we study the slow evolution of a purely dissipative system with a spectral gap γ , characterized by a strong symmetry, under a cyclic protocol with period T . Non-adiabatic corrections to the state evolution give rise to decoherence: the evolution within the instantaneous DS is described by a time-local effective Liouvillian operator that leads to purity degradation over a period, of order $1/\gamma T$. We obtain a closed form of the latter to order $1/(\gamma T)^2$. Our analysis underlines speed limitations in quantum information processing in the absence of corrective measures.

The density matrix of a quantum state, averaged over stochastic fluctuations reflecting the quantum nature of the dynamics, evolves according to Lindblad equation. The latter could result from drive-and-dissipation dynamics¹, or from (passive) measurement-induced platforms², and may be used to steer a system towards a desired target state. When the steady state of the Lindblad dynamics is multiply degenerate one refers to it as a dark space (DS) that can serve as a basis for quantum computation^{3,4}. As discussed in^{5,6}, in an open system the nature of the steady states and their ability to serve as generalized quantum bits are determined by the symmetry of the system, which can appear in a weak or a strong sense⁵. While a weak symmetry renders a state in the DS a classical register, a strong symmetry facilitates the realization of a qubit. Evidently, this requires quantum coherence in the underlying protected subspace.

Dark spaces (also known as decoherence-free spaces) are thus clear candidates for a quantum information processing platform⁷, and indeed have been realised in experiments⁸. The questions raised and answered in the present manuscript are two-fold: (i) how to manipulate the DS of a system to achieve an arbitrary on-demand state within the DS, and (ii) what are the limits on the quality of such manipulations, i.e. the purity of the accessible states. The reason why the first question is non-trivial is that by the very definition of a DS it is immune against external signals. We show that state manipulation may be achieved by an adiabatic cyclic rotation of the DS within the larger Hilbert space of the system. Upon such rotation DS states undergo a (in general non-Abelian) Berry rotation⁹, which may be engineered to lead to a desired outcome. We note that adiabatic manipulations have been reported for single and multi-particle¹⁰⁻¹⁴ platforms.

The second question concerns limitations on the precision of such (nearly) adiabatic manipulations. Within

unitary quantum dynamics an adiabatic evolution may be contaminated by Landau-Zener transitions into undesired states. The probability of such events is known to be exponentially small in the adiabatic parameter^{15,16}, i.e. product of the spectral gap, γ , and a characteristic time scale, T , of the adiabatic signal. What is the analog of such a Landau-Zener escape for the dissipative Lindbladian evolution? Does it, e.g., suppress the purity of the states, and how does such a suppression scale with the adiabatic parameter? We show here that the Berry phase rotation is always associated with the purity degradation. Moreover, the latter scales only *algebraically* (as the minus first power) with the adiabatic parameter, γT .

The protocols studied in this work involve closed cycle rotations of the DS, by time-dependent Lindbladians, \mathcal{L}_t , with $\mathcal{L}_0 = \mathcal{L}_T$, where T is the period of the DS rotation. We focus on purely dissipative systems with the spectral gap $\sim \gamma$. The existence of a DS is guaranteed by an instantaneous strong symmetry. The cyclic variation of the DS is intimately related to the notion of Abelian and non-Abelian geometric phases^{17,18}, and has been extended beyond the adiabatic regime⁴. Here we find that non-adiabatic corrections to the DS evolution give rise to the purity degradation of the order $1/(\gamma T)$. To derive this result we show that the slow evolution within the DS, to the order $1/(\gamma T)$, may be described by an effective Markovian evolution and derive the corresponding Lindbladian operator.

We are interested in studying a Markovian evolution of the reduced density matrix, described the Lindblad equation

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \mathcal{L}_t[\rho] = \gamma \left(L_t \rho L_t^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{L_t^\dagger L_t, \rho\} \right), \quad (1)$$

with the quantum jump operator L_t , which is slowly varying in time. Here the rate γ fixes the size the spectral gap of the Lindbladian. Such an evolution can be gen-

erated by, e.g., a protocol of weak measurements where the direction of measurement is changed continuously, in the limit of infinitesimal steps^{19–22}. To be specific, we assume that in the “laboratory frame” the jump operator is given by a time-dependent unitary rotation of a certain fixed “rotating frame” jump operator L , i.e.

$$L_t = U_t^\dagger L U_t, \quad (2)$$

where U_t is periodic in time with the period T , $U_{t+T} = U_t$, and $U_0 = U_T = 1$. Moreover, we assume that there is a d -dimensional dark space in the rotating frame, spanned by d states $|m\rangle$ that are annihilated by L ,

$$L|m\rangle = 0 = \langle m|L^\dagger, \quad m \in (1, \dots, d). \quad (3)$$

i.e. the system possesses a strong symmetry⁵.

In the laboratory frame the dark space is slowly rotated and is instantaneously spanned by the vectors $|m_t\rangle = U_t^\dagger|m\rangle$. If not for this slow rotation, the system would end up in one of the states (pure or mixed) within the dark space at long times, where the evolution would stop completely. Because of the slow rotation, the system has to constantly catch up to the instantaneous dark space, undergoing a fast dissipative evolution towards it. As a result, the state of the system within the dark space keeps slowly evolving at all times.

Our goal is to study such a residual slow evolution of the $d \times d$ dimensional projection of the full density matrix onto the rotated dark space. To this end we first pass to the rotated frame, where the rotated density matrix $\rho(t) = U_t \varrho(t) U_t^\dagger$ obeys the following evolution equation

$$\frac{d\rho}{d\tau} = -i \frac{1}{\gamma T} [H_\tau, \rho] + \left(L \rho L^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{L^\dagger L, \rho\} \right), \quad (4)$$

where we switched to the dimensionless time $\tau = \gamma t \in [0, \gamma T]$, where $\gamma T \gg 1$. Here the effective adiabatic Hermitian Hamiltonian

$$H_\tau = i\gamma T (\partial_\tau U) U_\tau^\dagger \quad (5)$$

is generated. Note that besides the effective unitary evolution in Eq. (4), our dynamics is controlled by a Lindbladian, that we denote by $\mathcal{L}[\rho]$. It provides the aforementioned fast evolution towards the DS. The effective Hamiltonian (5) provides a small, $1/(\gamma T) \ll 1$, correction to this fast dissipative evolution. Since the system fast evolves towards the DS, we now introduce DS projector

$$P_0 = \sum_{m=1}^d |m\rangle \langle m|, \quad (6)$$

and the projected $d \times d$ effective density matrix within the DS, defined as $\rho_0(\tau) = P_0 \rho(\tau) P_0$.

Projecting Eq. (4) (as discussed below) onto the instantaneous (continuously rotating) DS, we find remarkably that up to order $1/(\gamma T)^2$, the evolution of the projected density matrix is Markovian and its averaged time evolution is given by an effective Lindbladian. We notice that

the latter statement is rather non-trivial. Even more so, we have found an explicit analytic recipe to generate effective jump operators underlying the evolution within the DS. Our findings are summarized (see A for a complete derivation) by the evolution equation for the DS projected density matrix $\rho_0(\tau)$

$$\frac{d\rho_0}{d\tau} = -\frac{i}{\gamma T} [H_\tau^0, \rho_0] + \frac{1}{(\gamma T)^2} \left(\ell_\tau \rho_0 \ell_\tau^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{ \ell_\tau^\dagger \ell_\tau, \rho_0 \} \right), \quad (7)$$

with $H_\tau^0 = P_0 H_\tau P_0$, and $\ell_\tau = P_0 L X_\tau P_0$, where

$$\begin{aligned} X_\tau &= \int_0^\tau ds e^{\frac{1}{2} L^\dagger L (s-\tau)} (1 - P_0) H_s P_0, \\ &= 2(L^\dagger L)^{-1} (1 - P_0) H_\tau P_0 + \mathcal{O}((\gamma T)^{-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Here $(L^\dagger L)^{-1}$ is the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse of $L^\dagger L$ ²³.

Equation (7) for the evolution of the projected density matrix constitutes the main result of this letter. It states that to the leading order in $1/(\gamma T)$ such an evolution is unitary (see also Ref. 9). In other words, a state of the system within the DS undergoes a unitary evolution, acquiring a non-Abelian Berry phase²⁴, and preserving the state’s purity. Yet, since the dissipative evolution towards the instantaneous DS is involved, there must be some purity degradation. The latter is described by $1/(\gamma T)^2$ Lindbladian term in Eq. (7).

Taking an initial state $\varrho(0)$ (in the laboratory frame) fully within the DS, at the end of the cycle (and up to first order in $1/\gamma T$) the density matrix is,

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho(T) &= V_{\gamma T}^\dagger \varrho(0) V_{\gamma T} \\ &+ \frac{V_{\gamma T}^\dagger}{(\gamma T)^2} \left[\int_0^{\gamma T} d\tau \left(l_\tau \varrho(0) l_\tau^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{ l_\tau^\dagger l_\tau, \varrho(0) \} \right) \right] V_{\gamma T}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the non-Abelian Berry phase

$$V_\tau = \mathcal{T} \exp \left\{ -\frac{i}{\gamma T} \int_0^\tau ds H_s^0 \right\} \quad (11)$$

is given by the time ordered exponential of the effective Hamiltonian H_0 ²⁴, and $l_\tau = V_\tau^\dagger \ell_\tau V_\tau$. Up to the order $1/\gamma T$ the purity degradation of the initial density matrix of purity $\text{Tr}(\varrho^2(0)) = \Gamma_0$ is given by

$$\text{Tr}(\varrho^2(T)) = \Gamma_0 - \frac{2}{(\gamma T)^2} \int_0^{\gamma T} ds \text{Tr} [\varrho(0), l_s^\dagger] l_s \varrho(0). \quad (12)$$

This shows that purity degradation is *not* exponentially small in γT (as could be expected by a naive analogy with Landau-Zener physics in coherent dynamics), but is rather of order $(\gamma T)^{-1}$. It may be decreased by taking a

longer operation cycle (i.e. increase T), yet this decrease is rather slow.

To derive these results we employ geometric singular perturbation theory²⁵ and the center manifold techniques^{26–28}. We summarize the main idea here and refer to the Appendix A for details of the derivation and a more general result.

The instantaneous dark space of (1) is generated by the states $U_\tau^\dagger|m\rangle$ which change in time. Based on this insight it is convenient to define the operator $S_\tau = P_0 U_\tau$ that defined the map

$$Q_\tau[\rho] = S_\tau^\dagger \rho S_\tau \quad (13)$$

that takes a density matrix ρ and maps it to the instantaneous dark space of (1). Note that this map is *not* a trace preserving map, as components of the density matrix ρ outside the dark space are annihilated by Q_τ . We concentrate on density matrices whose initial state is fully in the dark space so $\rho(0) = P_0 \rho(0) P_0$. The map Q restricted to this subspace is trace preserving and completely positive. We denote by \mathcal{H}_{ins} the Hilbert space spanned by the operators $S_\tau^\dagger|m\rangle\langle n|S_\tau$.

We would like to eliminate the fast relaxation dynamics and describe the evolution within an slow submanifold \mathcal{H}_{slow} which is contained in the full Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . We can achieve this by considering a map K_τ between the instantaneous Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{ins} and \mathcal{H} as a series in terms of the small expansion parameter $\epsilon = (\gamma T)^{-1}$. Figure 1 illustrates this map, which can be written as

$$K_\tau = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \epsilon^n K_{\tau,n}, \quad (14)$$

and is in general is time dependent. This implies the relations $\rho = K_\tau(\rho_{ins})$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\rho}{d\tau} &= \frac{d}{d\tau} K_\tau[\rho_{ins}] \\ &= \mathcal{L}[K_\tau[\rho_{ins}]] - i\epsilon[H(\tau), K_\tau[\rho_{ins}]] \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $\rho_{ins} \in \mathcal{D}_{ins} \subset \mathcal{H}_{ins}$ and \mathcal{D}_{ins} is the subspace of \mathcal{H}_{ins} that contains positive definite operators with unit trace. The evolution of a state ρ_{ins} in the instantaneous dark space can be written as well as a series in ϵ

$$\frac{d\rho_{ins}}{d\tau} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \epsilon^n \mathcal{L}_{eff,n}[\rho_{ins}]. \quad (16)$$

The main result of this work is to show that the super-operators $\mathcal{L}_{eff,1}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{eff,2}$ are of Lindblad type and given by the right hand side of (7).

Using (1) together with (16) and the linearity of all the operators we find the following recursion relations by matching powers of ϵ

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} K_{\tau,0}[\rho_{ins}] = \mathcal{L}[K_{\tau,0}[\rho_{ins}]], \quad (17)$$




FIG. 1. Structure of the linear maps between the different subspaces of the total Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . The convex subspace \mathcal{D} is the space where the full density matrix is defined. Within \mathcal{H} , we identify the slow instantaneous Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{ins} and the submanifold \mathcal{D}_{ins} where the density matrices are defined. The dark space \mathcal{H}_0 is defined as the states that are annihilated by the jump operators L . The linear map K_τ translates between the slow Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{ins} and the dark space \mathcal{H}_0 .

for $n = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\tau} K_{\tau,n}[\rho_{ins}] + \sum_{m=1}^n K_{\tau,n-m}[\mathcal{L}_{eff,m}[\rho_{ins}]] \\ = \mathcal{L}[K_{\tau,n}[\rho_{ins}]] - i[H_\tau, K_{\tau,n-1}[\rho_{ins}]], \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

for $n \geq 1$. These equations can be solved iteratively, starting from a solution for the map $K_{\tau,0}$. To determine the density matrix up to order ϵ , we need to find a solution for the map K_τ and ρ_{ins} up to order ϵ . Hence we have to consider Eq. (16) up to order ϵ^2 , which once integrated over the period will give a correction of order ϵ . Starting from $K_{\tau,0}[\dots] = S(\dots)S^\dagger$, which is the inverse of map (13) we solve the equation for $K_{\tau,1}$. This solution allows us to find $\mathcal{L}_{eff,1}$, which in turn is used to solve the recurrence relation Eq. (16) up to order ϵ^2 . Collecting all the terms up to that order, gives Eq. (7). Detailed solution of these equations up to order ϵ in presented in Appendix A.

To illustrate the results, let us consider the evolution of a spin 3/2 system, similar to the one used by Wilczek and Zee^{24,29} in the context of the non-Abelian berry phases. The system has a 4-dimensional Hilbert space, and a 2-dimensional dark space within it. Unlike Refs. [24 and 29], we consider a pure Lindbladian evolution with a time dependent jump operator:

$$L_t = \sqrt{\gamma} e^{-i\phi S_z} e^{-i\theta S_y} S_x \left(S_z^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) e^{i\theta S_y} e^{i\phi S_z}, \quad (19)$$

where $S_a, a = x, y, z$ are 4×4 spin $3/2$ operators, and (θ, ϕ) are smooth functions of time such that $(\theta, \phi)(T) = (\theta, \phi)(0) + 2\pi(m_\theta, m_\phi)$ with m_θ, m_ϕ integers. The dark space of this system is spanned by the rotated states $|\pm(t)\rangle = e^{-i\phi S_z} e^{-i\theta S_y} |\pm \frac{1}{2}\rangle$, where $S_z |\pm \frac{1}{2}\rangle = \pm \frac{1}{2} |\pm \frac{1}{2}\rangle$, that satisfy $L_t |\pm(t)\rangle = 0$. The effective Hamiltonian is $H = i\gamma T (\partial_\tau U) U^\dagger$, where $U = e^{i\theta S_y} e^{i\phi S_z}$. Explicitly, this corresponds to

$$H = -\gamma T \left(\frac{d\theta}{d\tau} S_y + (\cos \theta S_z - \sin \theta S_x) \frac{d\phi}{d\tau} \right). \quad (20)$$

Its DS projection $H^0 = P_0 H_\tau P_0$ with $P_0 = \frac{1}{2} (\frac{9}{4} - S_z^2)$ is

$$H^0 = -\theta' \sigma_y - \phi' \left(\frac{1}{2} \cos \theta \sigma_z - \sin \theta \sigma_x \right), \quad (21)$$

where $\sigma_{x,y,z}$ are the Pauli matrices in the $|\pm \frac{1}{2}\rangle$ subspace and $(\theta', \phi') = \frac{d}{ds}(\theta, \phi)$, $s = t/T$.

The effective quantum jump operator in this subspace is

$$\ell_\tau = P_0 L \int_0^\tau ds e^{\frac{1}{2} L^\dagger L (s-\tau)} (1 - P_0) H_s P_0 = a_\tau \mathbf{1} + i b_\tau \sigma_z$$

with

$$a_\tau = \frac{3}{2} \int_0^\tau ds e^{\frac{3}{2}(s-\tau)} \phi' \sin \theta; \quad b_\tau = \frac{3}{2} \int_0^\tau ds e^{\frac{3}{2}(s-\tau)} \theta'. \quad (22)$$

The evolution in the $|\pm \frac{1}{2}\rangle$ subspace for this system is given by the effective Lindbladian

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\tau^{\text{DFS}}[\rho_0] &= -\frac{i}{\gamma T} [H^0, \rho_0] \\ &+ \frac{1}{(\gamma T)^2} (i a_\tau b_\tau [\sigma_z, \rho_0] + b_\tau^2 (\sigma_z \rho_0 \sigma_z - \rho_0)), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Starting from a pure density matrix in the $|\pm \frac{1}{2}\rangle$ DS, parameterised by $\rho_0(0) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \vec{n}_0 \cdot \vec{\sigma})$, with $\vec{n}_0 = (n_0^x, n_0^y, n_0^z)$ a unit vector ($\vec{n}_0^2 = 1$), we find that, to

the leading order in $1/(\gamma T)$, the DS density matrix experiences the non-Abelian rotation, parameterized by $n_\tau^\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \{ \sigma_a V_\tau (\vec{n}_0 \cdot \vec{\sigma}) V_\tau^\dagger \}$ and V_τ – the Berry rotation, Eq. (11). However, to the next order the purity (and thus the length of the \vec{n}_T vector) is suppressed by the factor $\Gamma_T \equiv \text{Tr}(\rho_T^2)$, given by

$$\Gamma_T = 1 - \frac{2}{(\gamma T)^2} \int_0^{\gamma T} d\tau b_\tau^2 ((n_\tau^x)^2 + (n_\tau^y)^2). \quad (24)$$

In the simplest case of $\theta = 2\pi \frac{t}{T}$, this leads to

$$\Gamma_T = 1 - 4\pi^2 \frac{1 + (n_0^y)^2}{\gamma T} + O\left(\frac{1}{(\gamma T)^2}\right). \quad (25)$$

Notice that in this latter simple scenario there is no Berry phase accumulated over the cycle. Yet, the purity is degraded.

In the adiabatic limit, it is known²⁴ that the non-Abelian Berry phase, acquired over a closed cycle, is independent of the basis chosen to span the Hilbert space. This occurs because different basis choices correspond to gauge transformations of the non-Abelian Berry curvature, whose action cancels on a closed loop. Since the definitions of the projected Hamiltonian, H_0 , and the effective jump operator, ℓ_τ , rely on a specific basis within the DS, they both are sensitive to the change of gauge. One may wonder thus if, e.g., the purity degradation is a gauge invariant quantity. In Appendix B we show that this is indeed the case.

The main message of this letter may be summarized as a “glass half filled”. Indeed, one can achieve an arbitrary non-Abelian rotation within the DS by performing its proper rotation in the larger Hilbert space. This is certainly a valuable asset for quantum manipulations. On the flip side, the non-adiabatic, purity-degrading effects are only algebraically (not exponentially) suppressed by the adiabatic parameter. This imposes rather stringent requirements on the rates of such operations.

We are grateful to Yosi Avron and Victor Albert for illuminating discussions. The work was supported by the NSF Grants No. DMR-2037654 and DMR-2338819. Y.G. was supported by the DFG grant EG 96/13-1 and NSF-BSF 2023666, and is the incumbent of InfoSys Chair (at IISc).

¹ C-E Bardyn, M A Baranov, C V Kraus, E Rico, A İmamođlu, P Zoller, and S Diehl, “Topology by dissipation,” *New Journal of Physics* **15**, 085001 (2013).

² Sthitadhi Roy, J. T. Chalker, I. V. Gornyi, and Yuval Gefen, “Measurement-induced steering of quantum systems,” *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 033347 (2020).

³ L.-A. Wu, P. Zanardi, and D. A. Lidar, “Holonomic quantum computation in decoherence-free subspaces,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 130501 (2005).

⁴ G. F. Xu, J. Zhang, D. M. Tong, Erik Sjöqvist, and L. C.

Kwek, “Nonadiabatic holonomic quantum computation in decoherence-free subspaces,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 170501 (2012).

⁵ Simon Lieu, Ron Belyansky, Jeremy T. Young, Rex Lundgren, Victor V. Albert, and Alexey V. Gorshkov, “Symmetry breaking and error correction in open quantum systems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 240405 (2020).

⁶ R. A. Santos, F. İemini, A. Kamenev, and Y. Gefen, “A possible route towards dissipation-protected qubits using a multidimensional dark space and its symmetries,” *Nature*

- Communications* **11**, 5899 (2020).
- ⁷ Daniel A. Lidar, “Review of decoherence-free subspaces, noiseless subsystems, and dynamical decoupling,” in *Quantum Information and Computation for Chemistry* (John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2014) pp. 295–354.
- ⁸ Paul G. Kwiat, Andrew J. Berglund, Joseph B. Altepeter, and Andrew G. White, “Experimental verification of decoherence-free subspaces,” *Science* **290**, 498–501 (2000).
- ⁹ J. E. Avron, M. Fraas, G. M. Graf, and P. Grech, “Adiabatic theorems for generators of contracting evolutions,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **314**, 163–191 (2012).
- ¹⁰ K. Toyoda, K. Uchida, A. Noguchi, S. Haze, and S. Urabe, “Realization of holonomic single-qubit operations,” *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 052307 (2013).
- ¹¹ F. Leroux, K. Pandey, R. Rehbi, F. Chevy, C. Miniatura, B. Grémaud, and D. Wilkowski, “Non-abelian adiabatic geometric transformations in a cold strontium gas,” *Nature Communications* **9**, 3580 (2018).
- ¹² Seiji Sugawa, Francisco Salces-Carcoba, Yuchen Yue, Andika Putra, and I. B. Spielman, “Wilson loop and wilczek-zee phase from a non-abelian gauge field,” *npj Quantum Information* **7** (2021), 10.1038/s41534-021-00483-2.
- ¹³ Yunzhao Wang, Kyrylo Snizhko, Alessandro Romito, Yuval Gefen, and Kater Murch, “Observing a topological transition in weak-measurement-induced geometric phases,” *Phys. Rev. Res.* **4**, 023179 (2022).
- ¹⁴ Manuel F. Ferrer-Garcia, Kyrylo Snizhko, Alessio D’Errico, Alessandro Romito, Yuval Gefen, and Ebrahim Karimi, “Topological transitions of the generalized pancharatnam-berry phase,” (2022), arXiv:2211.08519 [quant-ph].
- ¹⁵ L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, *Quantum Mechanics: Non-Relativistic Theory*, Teoreticheskaya fizika (Elsevier Science, 2013).
- ¹⁶ Clarence Zener, “Non-adiabatic crossing of energy levels,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical and Physical Character* **137**, 696–702 (1932).
- ¹⁷ Paolo Zanardi and Mario Rasetti, “Holonomic quantum computation,” *Physics Letters A* **264**, 94–99 (1999).
- ¹⁸ Jiang Zhang, Thi Ha Kyaw, Stefan Filipp, Leong-Chuan Kwek, Erik Sjöqvist, and Dianmin Tong, “Geometric and holonomic quantum computation,” (2023), arXiv:2110.03602 [quant-ph].
- ¹⁹ Kyrylo Snizhko, Reinhold Egger, and Yuval Gefen, “Non-abelian geometric dephasing,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 060405 (2019).
- ²⁰ Kyrylo Snizhko, Reinhold Egger, and Yuval Gefen, “Non-abelian berry phase for open quantum systems: Topological protection versus geometric dephasing,” *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 085303 (2019).
- ²¹ Kyrylo Snizhko, Parveen Kumar, Nihal Rao, and Yuval Gefen, “Weak-measurement-induced asymmetric dephasing: Manifestation of intrinsic measurement chirality,” *Physical Review Letters* **127** (2021), 10.1103/physrevlett.127.170401.
- ²² Kyrylo Snizhko, Nihal Rao, Parveen Kumar, and Yuval Gefen, “Weak-measurement-induced phases and dephasing: Broken symmetry of the geometric phase,” *Physical Review Research* **3** (2021), 10.1103/physrevresearch.3.043045.
- ²³ A. Ben-Israel and T.N.E. Greville, *Generalized Inverses: Theory and Applications*, CMS Books in Mathematics (Springer, 2003).
- ²⁴ Frank Wilczek and A. Zee, “Appearance of gauge structure in simple dynamical systems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52**, 2111–2114 (1984).
- ²⁵ Neil Fenichel, “Geometric singular perturbation theory for ordinary differential equations,” *Journal of Differential Equations* **31**, 53–98 (1979).
- ²⁶ J. Carr, *Applications of Centre Manifold Theory*, Applied Mathematical Sciences (Springer New York, 2012).
- ²⁷ R. Azouit, A. Sarlette, and P. Rouchon, “Adiabatic elimination for open quantum systems with effective lindblad master equations,” in *2016 IEEE 55th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)* (2016) pp. 4559–4565.
- ²⁸ R. Azouit, F. Chittaro, A. Sarlette, and P. Rouchon, “Towards generic adiabatic elimination for bipartite open quantum systems,” *Quantum Science and Technology* **2**, 044011 (2017).
- ²⁹ A. Zee, “Non-abelian gauge structure in nuclear quadrupole resonance,” *Phys. Rev. A* **38**, 1–6 (1988).
- ³⁰ Man-Duen Choi, “Completely positive linear maps on complex matrices,” *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **10**, 285–290 (1975).

Appendix A: Solution of Eq. 17

1. Zero order expansion of the evolution equation

To obtain the zeroth order map from the slow instantaneous manifold to the dark space, we note that at the end of the cycle, the driving unitary $U_{\gamma T} = U_0 = 1$ and the instantaneous manifold coincides with \mathcal{H}_0 . From Eq. (4) it follows that an initial density matrix fully within the dark space satisfies, at lowest order in $\epsilon = (\gamma T)^{-1}$

$$\frac{d\rho}{d\tau} = -i\epsilon[P_0 H_\tau P_0, \rho] \quad (\text{A1})$$

where P_0 is given by Eq. 6. At the end of the period, the density matrix is

$$\rho(\gamma T) = V\rho(0)V^\dagger + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon) \quad (\text{A2})$$

with V given by

$$V = \mathcal{T} \exp\left(-\frac{i}{\gamma T} \int_0^{\gamma T} d\tau P_0 H_\tau P_0\right), \quad (\text{A3})$$

and $\rho(0) \in \mathcal{H}_0$ the initial density matrix. This motivates the introduction of the map $K_{\tau,0} : \mathcal{H}_{ins} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0$ given by the inverse of (13) i.e.

$$K_{\tau,0}[*] \equiv S_\tau(*)S_\tau^\dagger, \quad (\text{A4})$$

with $S_\tau = P_0 U_\tau$. Note that $S_\tau S_\tau^\dagger = P_0$, while $S_\tau^\dagger S_\tau$ is a projector onto \mathcal{H}_{ins} acting as the identity within that space.

In what follows, to unclutter notation we will write $S_\tau = S$, keeping in mind that S is also time dependent.

2. First order correction to the map K_τ

The first order correction is found through Eq. (18) for $n = 1$. Using the form (A4) for $K_{\tau,0}[\rho_{ins}]$, this becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\tau}(K_{\tau,1}[\rho_{ins}] + S\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff},1}[\rho_{ins}]S^\dagger) &= -i[H_\tau, S\rho_{ins}S^\dagger] \\ &+ L(K_{\tau,1}[\rho_{ins}])L^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\{L^\dagger L, K_{\tau,1}[\rho_{ins}]\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

To continue, we introduce the following ansatz for the structure of the map $K_{\tau,1}$

$$K_{\tau,1}[\rho_{ins}] = -i[C_\tau, S\rho_{ins}S^\dagger]. \quad (\text{A6})$$

and solve for the operator C_τ appearing on the commutator on the right hand side. Inserting this in Eq. (A5), it becomes

$$\begin{aligned} S\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff},1}[\rho_{ins}]S^\dagger - i\left[\frac{dC_\tau}{d\tau}, S\rho_{ins}S^\dagger\right] + i[H_\tau, S\rho_{ins}S^\dagger] \\ - \frac{i}{2}\{L^\dagger LC_\tau S\rho_{ins}S^\dagger - S\rho_{ins}S^\dagger C_\tau L^\dagger L\} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

where we have used that $LS = S^\dagger L^\dagger = 0$. We look for an equation for C_τ where C_τ is an hermitian linear operator. After a bit of straightforward algebra from here we find an equation for the first correction $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff},1}$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff},1}[\rho_{ins}] = i\left[S^\dagger\left(\frac{dC_\tau}{d\tau} - H_\tau\right)S, \rho_{ins}\right]. \quad (\text{A8})$$

Replacing this back on (A7) we find

$$RS\rho_{ins}S^\dagger + S\rho_{ins}S^\dagger R^\dagger = 0 \quad (\text{A9})$$

where

$$R = i\left[P_\perp\left(\frac{dC_\tau}{d\tau} - H_\tau\right)P_0 + \frac{1}{2}L^\dagger LC_\tau\right] \quad (\text{A10})$$

and $P_\perp = 1 - P_0$.

To satisfy Eq. (A9) for any density matrix, R has to vanish identically. This condition provides the following equations for C_τ

$$P_\perp\frac{dC_\tau}{d\tau}P_0 + \frac{L^\dagger L}{2}P_\perp C_\tau P_0 = P_\perp H_\tau P_0, \quad (\text{A11})$$

$$P_0\frac{dC_\tau}{d\tau}P_\perp + P_0 C_\tau P_\perp\frac{L^\dagger L}{2} = P_0 H_\tau P_\perp, \quad (\text{A12})$$

defining $P_\perp C_\tau P_0 = X$, we can solve for X_τ and find

$$X_\tau = \int_0^\tau ds e^{\frac{1}{2}L^\dagger L(s-\tau)} P_\perp H_s P_0, \quad (\text{A13})$$

and $C_\tau = X_\tau + X_\tau^\dagger$, where we have used the initial condition $C_0 = 0$ corresponding to an initial density matrix fully in \mathcal{H}_0 .

We can further simplify this expression using the adiabatic condition $\left\|\frac{d}{d\tau}H_\tau\right\| = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ (here $\|A\|$ is the operator norm of A) to

$$\begin{aligned} C_\tau &= 2(L^\dagger L)^{-1}P_\perp H_\tau P_0 + 2P_0 H_\tau P_\perp (L^\dagger L)^{-1} \\ &+ \mathcal{O}\left(\left\|\frac{d}{d\tau}H_\tau\right\|\right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A14})$$

where $(L^\dagger L)^{-1}$ is the Moore-Penrose inverse.

This implies that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff},1}[*] = -i[S^\dagger H_\tau S, *] \quad (\text{A15})$$

and up to first order in ϵ the map K_τ between the instantaneous space \mathcal{H}_{ins} and \mathcal{H} is

$$K_\tau[*] = K_{\tau,0}[*] + \epsilon K_{\tau,1}[*] = S(*)S^\dagger - i\epsilon[C_\tau, S(*)S^\dagger]. \quad (\text{A16})$$

To determine the density matrix up to order ϵ , we need the map above and ρ_{ins} up to that order. This means that we have to consider the equation for $\frac{d\rho_{ins}}{d\tau}$ up to order ϵ^2 , which once integrated over the period will give a correction of order ϵ . Consequently, that we have to solve the recurrence equation (18) at order ϵ^2

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\tau}(K_{\tau,2}[\rho_{ins}] + S\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff},2}[\rho_{ins}]S^\dagger) &= \mathcal{L}[K_{\tau,2}[\rho_{ins}]] \\ &- [H_\tau, [C_\tau, S\rho_{ins}S^\dagger]]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A17})$$

3. ϵ^2 correction and the long time Krauss operators of \mathcal{L}

So far we have considered the projection maps P_0, P_\perp , which are completely positive only in the restricted to the subspace where they acts as the identity. In contrast, the Lindbladian \mathcal{L} defines a completely positive trace preserving (CPTP) map for any time and any density matrix ρ through $e^{t\mathcal{L}}[\rho]$. At infinite time, this takes any density matrix operator in \mathcal{D} and maps it into the subspace \mathcal{D}_0 . It is convenient to define the map $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_0$ as

$$\mathcal{R}[\rho] \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{t\mathcal{L}}[\rho]. \quad (\text{A18})$$

Choi's theorem³⁰ tells us that any CPTP map can be written as a sum of Krauss operators, so in particular we have

$$\mathcal{R}[\rho] = \sum_\mu M_\mu \rho M_\mu^\dagger, \quad (\text{A19})$$

with Krauss operators M_μ satisfying $\sum_\mu M_\mu^\dagger M_\mu = 1$. It follows from the definition that $P_0 \mathcal{R}[\rho] = \mathcal{R}[\rho] P_0 = \mathcal{R}[\rho]$.

Applying the map \mathcal{R} on (A17) and solving for $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff},2}$ using that $P_0 \mathcal{R}[*P_0] = P_0(*)P_0$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff},2}[\rho_{ins}] &= S^\dagger \mathcal{R}[H_\tau S\rho_{ins}S^\dagger C_\tau + C_\tau S\rho_{ins}S^\dagger H_\tau] S \\ &- S^\dagger H_\tau C_\tau S\rho_{ins} - \rho_{ins} S^\dagger C_\tau H_\tau S \\ &- S^\dagger \mathcal{R}\left(\frac{d}{d\tau}(K_{\tau,2}[\rho_{ins}])\right) S \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A20})$$

We can show that imposing a Lindblad form for $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff},2}$ fixes the map $K_{\tau,2}$. First, let's note that for any operator O , $\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{L}[O]] = 0$, which implies that $\mathcal{R}[LOL^\dagger] = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}[L^\dagger LO + OL^\dagger L]$ by linearity of the map \mathcal{R} . Taking $O \equiv C_\tau S \rho_{ins} S^\dagger C_\tau$, and using Eqs. (A11,A12), $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff},2}$ simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff},2}[\rho_{ins}] &= S^\dagger \mathcal{R}[A] S + S^\dagger \mathcal{R}[LC_\tau S \rho_{ins} S^\dagger C_\tau L^\dagger] S \\ &\quad - S^\dagger H_\tau C_\tau S \rho_{ins} - \rho_{ins} S^\dagger C_\tau H_\tau S \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A21})$$

with

$$A = \frac{dC_\tau}{d\tau} S \rho_{ins} S^\dagger C_\tau + C_\tau S \rho_{ins} S^\dagger \frac{dC_\tau}{d\tau} - \frac{d}{d\tau}(K_{\tau,2})[\rho_{ins}].$$

Using the definition of the map \mathcal{R} in terms of the Krauss operators in Eq. (A19), we find the effective quantum jump operators

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}[LC_\tau S \rho_{ins} S^\dagger C_\tau L^\dagger] &= \sum_\mu M_\mu LC_\tau S \rho_{ins} S^\dagger C_\tau L^\dagger M_\mu^\dagger \\ &\equiv \sum_\mu l_{\mu,\tau} \rho_{ins} l_{\mu,\tau}^\dagger. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A22})$$

From the properties of the Krauss operator, the jump operators $l_{\mu,\tau} = M_\mu LC_\tau S$ satisfy $\sum_\mu l_{\mu,\tau}^\dagger l_{\mu,\tau} = S^\dagger C_\tau L^\dagger LC_\tau S$, while using Eqs. (A11,A12), we can also show that

$$S^\dagger \hat{H}_\tau C_\tau S = S^\dagger \frac{dC_\tau}{d\tau} C_\tau S + S^\dagger C_\tau \frac{L^\dagger L}{2} C_\tau S, \quad (\text{A23})$$

$$S^\dagger C_\tau \hat{H}_\tau S = S^\dagger C_\tau \frac{dC_\tau}{d\tau} S + S^\dagger C_\tau \frac{L^\dagger L}{2} C_\tau S. \quad (\text{A24})$$

These results allow us to reveal the form of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff},2}$ as a Lindblad operator

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff},2}[\rho_{ins}] = \sum_\mu S^\dagger l_{\mu,\tau} \rho_{ins} l_{\mu,\tau}^\dagger S - \frac{1}{2} \{l_{\mu,\tau}^\dagger l_{\mu,\tau}, \rho_{ins}\}, \quad (\text{A25})$$

provided that the map $K_{\tau,2}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} S^\dagger \mathcal{R} \left(\frac{dC_\tau}{d\tau} S(*) S^\dagger C_\tau + C_\tau S(*) S^\dagger \frac{dC_\tau}{d\tau} \right) S \\ + S^\dagger \mathcal{R} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{dC_\tau^2}{d\tau}, S(*) S^\dagger \right\} - \frac{d}{d\tau}(K_{\tau,2})[*] \right) S = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A26})$$

for any density matrix in \mathcal{H}_{ins} . Solving for the equation above leads to the map

$$K_{\tau,2}[*] = C_\tau S(*) S^\dagger C_\tau - \frac{1}{2} \{C_\tau^2, S(*) S^\dagger\}. \quad (\text{A27})$$

which is also of Lindblad type.

Collecting the previous results we finally arrive at the main result of this work. The evolution equation for the

density matrix in \mathcal{H}_{ins} up to ϵ^2 is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\rho_{ins}}{d\tau} &= -i\epsilon[P_0 H_\tau P_0, \rho_{ins}] \\ &\quad + \epsilon^2 \left(\sum_\mu \ell_{\mu,\tau} \rho_{ins} \ell_{\mu,\tau}^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{ \ell_{\mu,\tau}^\dagger \ell_{\mu,\tau}, \rho_{ins} \} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A28})$$

with $\ell_{\mu,\tau} = P_0 M_\mu LC_\tau P_0$ and $C_\tau = X_\tau + X_\tau^\dagger$ with

$$X_\tau = \int_0^\tau ds e^{\frac{1}{2}L^\dagger L(s-\tau)} P_\perp H_s P_0. \quad (\text{A29})$$

. We can further simplify this based on the assumption that L is such that no other fixed point exists in the dynamics. This implies that $L = P_0 LP_\perp$, and the component $P_\perp LP_\perp = 0$ (otherwise there will be an orthogonal subspace to P_0 left invariant by L). In this case

$$\ell_\mu = P_0 M_\mu LC_\tau P_0 = P_0 M_\mu P_0 LP_\perp C_\tau P_0 \quad (\text{A30})$$

$$= \begin{cases} P_0 LP_\perp C_\tau P_0, & \text{for } \mu = 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A31})$$

where in the last equality we have used that the projection of the Krauss operator in the dark space is just P_0 for one of the Krauss operators, while the rest have components $P_0 M_\mu P_\perp$ and $P_\perp M_\mu P_0$.

Appendix B: Gauge invariance of the DS

Let's define the non-Abelian gauge field $A_\mu^0 = iP_0(\partial_\mu U)U^\dagger P_0$, where $x^\mu = x^\mu(\tau)$ are the parameters of L_τ that vary over time. The effective Hamiltonian H_0 is then given by $H_0 = \gamma T \sum_\mu A_\mu^0 \frac{dx^\mu}{d\tau}$. One can rotate states within the dark space with a unitary matrix ω , such that

$$L_\tau = U_\tau^\dagger L U_\tau = U_\tau^\dagger \omega^\dagger (\omega L \omega^\dagger) \omega U_\tau. \quad (\text{B1})$$

The rotated operator $L^\omega = \omega L \omega^\dagger$ annihilates the original dark space iff $[\omega, P_0] = 0$. Using this new basis, one obtains another Hamiltonian $H_0^\omega = \gamma T \sum_\mu (A_\mu^0)^\omega \frac{dx^\mu}{d\tau}$, where

$$(A_\mu^0)^\omega = \omega^0 A_\mu^0 \omega^{\dagger 0} + i(\partial_\mu \omega^0) \omega^{\dagger 0}, \quad (\text{B2})$$

and $\omega^0 = P_0 \omega P_0$. This corresponds to the non-Abelian gauge transformation of the gauge field A_μ^0 . Such gauge transformation is inconsequential for the non-Abelian Berry phase defined on a closed loop in the parameter space. As we show below, this transformation affects the effective quantum jump operators. The latter transform covariantly, implying that any quantity defined as a trace of products of the jump operators is gauge invariant. Indeed, the gauge transformation above induces a change

of the effective quantum jump operators as

$$\begin{aligned}
X_\tau^\omega &= \int_0^\tau ds e^{\frac{1}{2}L^\dagger L^\omega(s-\tau)} (1 - P_0) H_s^\omega P_0 \\
&= \int_0^\tau ds \omega e^{\frac{1}{2}L^\dagger L(s-\tau)} \omega^\dagger (1 - P_0) (\omega H \omega^\dagger + i\gamma T (\partial_s \omega) \omega^\dagger) P_0 \\
&= \omega X_\tau \omega^\dagger,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have discarded terms of order $1/(\gamma T)$ and used that $[\omega_\tau, P_0] = 0$ implies $(1 - P_0)(\partial_\mu \omega) \omega^\dagger P_0 = 0$. From here we have $\ell_\tau^\omega = P_0 L^\omega \omega X_\tau \omega^\dagger P_0 = \omega \ell_\tau \omega^\dagger$. This implies that under gauge transformations, the effective quantum jump operator transforms covariantly, as expected.