

Phase-space measurements, decoherence and classicality

DORJE C. BRODY^{1,2}, EVA-MARIA GRAEFE³, AND RISHINDRA MELANATHURU³

¹*School of Mathematics and Physics, University of Surrey, Guildford GU2 7XH, UK*

²*Institute of Industrial Science, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo 153-0041, Japan*

³*Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, London SW7 2BZ, UK*

The emergence of classical behaviour in quantum theory is often ascribed to the interaction of a quantum system with its environment, which can be interpreted as environmental monitoring of the system. As a result, off-diagonal elements of the density matrix of the system are damped in the basis of a preferred observable, often taken to be the position, leading to the phenomenon of decoherence. This effect can be modelled dynamically in terms of a Lindblad equation driven by the position operator. Here the question of decoherence resulting from a monitoring of position *and* momentum, i.e. a phase-space measurement, by the environment is addressed. There is no standard quantum observable corresponding to the detection of phase-space points, which is forbidden by Heisenberg's uncertainty principle. This issue is addressed by use of a coherent-state-based positive operator-valued measure (POVM) for modelling phase-space monitoring by the environment. In this scheme, decoherence in phase space implies the diagonalisation of the density matrix in both position and momentum representations. This is shown to be linked to a Lindblad dynamics where position and momentum appear as two independent Lindblad operators.

The notion of decoherence plays an important role in modern quantum theory for characterising the emergence of classicality [1–5]. Heuristically, the phenomena can be described as the decay of the off-diagonal elements of the density matrix in the basis of a preferred observable selected by the system-environment interaction. The dynamics of the state can be modelled dynamically in terms of a Lindblad equation generated by that observable. For example if the initial state of the system is a superposition of a particle being “here *and* there” and if the preferred observable is the position of the particle, then after decoherence we have a mixed state that represents the particle being “here *or* there” [6]. In the literature there has been an emphasis on this position-space decoherence, physically motivated by the scattering of a quantum particle by air molecules, through which the position of the particle is in effect being monitored [7].

Classical physics, based on Hamiltonian mechanics, on the other hand, is modelled on phase space, not merely on position space. Indeed, classically, a particle moving in two different directions at the same time is equally unlikely as a particle being in two different positions at the same time. Yet, a position-space decoherence can maintain momentum coherence, as illustrated in Figure 1 in terms of the negativity of the Wigner functions. Further, in the case of a cloud of quantum particles the exchange of momentum through scattering can also be important, and one would expect decoherence in both position and momentum. However, the problem is that one cannot simultaneously determine the position and the momentum with an arbitrary precision in quantum mechanics — at best, if both were measured together [8], the measurement accuracy will be bounded by the Heisenberg relation. Paraphrasing the problem, while decoherence means diagonalisation of the density matrix in the basis

of a preferred observable, when there are two incompatible preferred observables involved, it is not clear in which basis should the density matrix decohere.

Here we address this issue by considering a coherent-state-based positive operator-valued measure (POVM) for phase-space measurements [9, 10], and identify its effect on decoherence. Such a measurement has the property that outcomes are phase-space points, while the state of the system, after an outcome is recorded, is a coherent state centred at that point. Starting from an arbitrary given initial state, we show that after a single POVM measurement, quantum features of the initial state are washed out in the sense that the Wigner function as well as the associated P -function (cf. [11, 12]) become positive. We then derive the effect of a repeated phase-space measurement on the density matrix, which shows that in a phase-space decoherence not only the off diagonal elements decay but also the diagonal elements are damped and converge toward a Gaussian distribution with ever increasing width, both in position-space and momentum-space representations. Thus a phase-space decoherence provides a democratic representation of position and momentum. We then show that a Lindblad equation, where position and momentum appear as two independent Lindblad operators, unravels the phase-space POVM measurements. The construction of a Lindbladian dynamical model that unravels a POVM measurement in itself has hitherto remained an open challenge (cf. [13]). Hence our results can be used as a basis for further investigations into developing models that unravel non-orthogonal measurements.

The present paper is organised as follows. After a brief discussion on properties of a position-based Lindblad equation for position-space decoherence, we review the notion of phase-space measurement using POVMs.




FIG. 1: *Snapshots of the Wigner function evolved under the Lindblad evolution (1) for $\gamma = 0.2$. False colour plot of the Wigner functions at times $t = 0$, $t = \pi/4$, and $t = 8\pi$ (from left to right). The top row show the time evolution of the Wigner function of an initial “cat” state in position. The middle row corresponds to an initial state that is a superposition of coherent states centred at two different momenta, and the bottom row shows the dynamics with an additional harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian with $\omega = 1 = m$ for the same initial state as in the middle row.*

By considering the case in which a measurement is performed but the outcome not recorded (i.e. environmental monitoring), we are able to read off the impact of phase-space decoherence. We work out the effect of a repeated POVM measurement on an arbitrary initial density matrix, expressed in the position representation. By transforming to the corresponding Wigner function on phase space, we show that after a single POVM measurement, both the Wigner function and the P -function become positive. We then present a Lindblad equation that unravels the phase-space POVM measurement, and solve this in terms of the Wigner function. We conclude with a remark on how our approach can be extended to investigate phase-space decoherence for spin systems.

Let us begin by discussing some features of decoherence induced by a monitoring of the position of a quantum particle by its environment. The idea is that if the position of the system is measured but the outcome not recorded, then the probability distribution turns classical. For example, for an initial pure state $\psi(x) = \langle x|\psi\rangle$, the unrecorded monitoring of the position turns the state into a mixed state with density matrix $\rho(x, y) = \langle x|\hat{\rho}|y\rangle = |\psi(x)|^2\delta(x - y)$, in which all quantum coherences are removed. This is the asymptotic state for the evolution generated by a Lindblad equation

$$\partial_t \hat{\rho} = \gamma (\hat{q}\hat{\rho}\hat{q} - \frac{1}{2}(\hat{q}^2\hat{\rho} + \hat{\rho}\hat{q}^2)), \quad (1)$$

where $\gamma > 0$. In position representation the solution is $\rho_t(x, y) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\gamma(x-y)^2 t} \rho_0(x, y)$, showing an exponential damping of the off-diagonal elements of the density matrix, which asymptotically approaches the fully decohered state. Figure 1 depicts three examples of cat states evolved with a position-space Lindblad dynamics, in Wigner representation $W(x, p)$, defined as the the inverse Weyl transform of the density matrix:

$$W(x, p) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \rho(x + \nu, x - \nu) e^{-2ip\nu} d\nu. \quad (2)$$

The Wigner function is a useful tool in the analysis of the quantum-to-classical transition, due to its negativity signalling quantum features. In the first column depicting the initial states, the typical interference patterns of cat states are clearly visible. The top row depicts snapshots of the time-evolved Wigner function under pure position-space decoherence of an initial cat state superposing two different positions after a relatively short time ($t = \pi/4$, middle) and a long time ($t = 8\pi$, right), showing the familiar decay of the interference fringes. When the initial state is a superposition of coherent states centred at two different momenta (middle panels), a position-based decoherence maintains quantum interference. If the Lindbladian dynamics is superposed with an underlying unitary motion that mixes position and momentum, such as a quantum harmonic oscillator (bottom panels), then owing to the mixing a position-based decoherence will eliminate decoherence in both directions.

In what follows we shall investigate the generalisation of these behaviours using a decoherence based on phase-space measurement. For this purpose, let us begin by considering a normalised coherent state $|z\rangle$ defined as an eigenstate of the harmonic oscillator annihilation operator: $\hat{a}|z\rangle = z|z\rangle$. The coherent states are in one-to-one correspondence with points of classical phase space via the identification $z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(x + ip)$. (We work in scaled units with $\hbar = 1$, and where x and p have the same dimension.) In terms of the harmonic oscillator energy eigenstates $\{|n\rangle\}$ the coherent state $|z\rangle$ admits a series expansion

$$|z\rangle = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\bar{z}z} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^n}{\sqrt{n!}} |n\rangle. \quad (3)$$

Coherent states form a resolution of the identity,

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int |z\rangle\langle z| d^2z = \hat{\mathbb{1}}, \quad (4)$$

where $d^2z = i dz \wedge d\bar{z} = dx dp$. Hence, they can be used to form a positive operator-valued measure over the classical phase space [14].

Specifically, if a system is initially in a state represented by a density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{\text{in}}$ and a phase-space point z is detected, then the result of the measurement is the

coherent state $|z\rangle$ centred at that point. The probability of detecting a phase-space event (cf. [15]) in the region A is then given by

$$\mathbb{P}(z \in A) = \int_A \text{tr} \left(\hat{\Pi}(z) \hat{\rho}_{\text{in}} \right) d^2z, \quad (5)$$

where $\hat{\Pi}(z) = (2\pi)^{-1} |z\rangle\langle z|$. Therefore, the ‘‘expectation’’ $Q(z) = \text{tr}(\hat{\Pi}(z) \hat{\rho}_{\text{in}})$ of the initial state $\hat{\rho}_{\text{in}}$ in the coherent state, known as the Husimi (pronounced Fushimi) density, defines a probability distribution over the phase space. It follows that if a phase-space measurement is performed but the outcome not recorded, then the state of the system decoheres into

$$\hat{\rho}_{\text{out}} = \int Q(z) \hat{\Pi}(z) d^2z. \quad (6)$$

In other words, the result of a phase-space decoherence is the average of the coherent state projectors over the phase space with the Husimi density function $Q(z)$.

Because the effect of decoherence is often captured in position space or in terms of the Wigner function [16, 17], let us transform the result (6) into these representations. Writing $\rho_{\text{in}}(x, y) = \langle x | \hat{\rho}_{\text{in}} | y \rangle$ for the position representation of the density matrix, we see that the Husimi density can be written in the form

$$Q(z) = \iint \rho_{\text{in}}(x, y) \langle y | \hat{\Pi}(z) | x \rangle dx dy. \quad (7)$$

Substituting (7) in (6) and making use of the position representation $\langle x | z \rangle = \pi^{-\frac{1}{4}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x-q)^2 + ip(x-q)}$ of the coherent state, we deduce, after a calculation involving Gaussian integrations, a simple formula that represents the effect of phase space decoherence in the form

$$\rho_{\text{out}}(x, y) = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x-y)^2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\lambda^2} \rho_{\text{in}}(x + \lambda, y + \lambda) d\lambda. \quad (8)$$

Hence in position space there is an overall Gaussian damping of the off-diagonal elements of the density matrix, while along each diagonal, elements are averaged with a Gaussian weight.

The effect of decoherence in (8) can be contrasted with that generated by a position monitoring (1), where we have $\rho_t(x, y) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\gamma(x-y)^2 t} \rho_0(x, y)$. Over a short time (say, $t = 1$), there is an identical Gaussian damping of the off-diagonal elements as in (8), whereas the Gaussian smoothing along the diagonals in (8) is a feature resulting from phase-space monitoring. Importantly, as expected the effect of a phase-space decoherence is identical in the position and the momentum representation, which can be easily seen for example by taking a double Fourier transform of (8). The same cannot be said for the coordinate-space decoherence modelled by the solution to the position-based Lindblad equation.

As a matter of interpretation, we can regard the state (6), or equivalently (8), as representing classicality that is more robust against environmental perturbation (cf. [18]), with a higher entropy than the initial state such that the expectation values of both the position and the momentum are identical to their initial values. On the other hand, owing to the lack of orthogonality in POVM measurements, $\hat{\rho}_{\text{out}}$ does not fulfil Zurek’s repeatability criterion [19], that repeated measurements give rise to the same outcome as the initial measurement. In practical terms, what this means is that the outcome state $\hat{\rho}_{\text{out}}$ of (6), or equivalently its position representation (8), need not be the terminal state of phase space decoherence: We can substitute $\rho_{\text{out}}(x, y)$ of (8) into $\rho_{\text{in}}(x, y)$ of its integrand, and repeat this procedure. Then after m iterations we find that

$$\rho^{(m)}(x, y) = \frac{e^{-\frac{m}{2}(x-y)^2}}{\sqrt{2\pi m}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{\lambda^2}{2m}} \rho_{\text{in}}(x + \lambda, y + \lambda) d\lambda. \quad (9)$$

Hence as the process of decoherence is repeated, in position space the off-diagonal elements of the density matrix are suppressed exponentially, at the rate given by the square of the distance $|x - y|$ away from the diagonal. Along each diagonal, the matrix elements are averaged with respect to a Gaussian density with the standard deviation increasing in m . In particular, if we let X denote a random variable with the density $\rho_{\text{in}}(x, x)$, and let $\{N_j\}$ be a set of independent and identically distributed Gaussian random variables with mean zero and variance one, then $\rho^{(m)}(x, x)$ represents the density function of the random variable $X + \sum_{j=1}^m N_j$. The entropy of the system will thus increase along the way without bound.

To investigate the effect of decoherence in phase space, we consider again the Wigner quasi-probability distribution over the phase space. (An alternative formulation is to employ the Bargmann-Husimi transform [20, 21], which will be developed elsewhere.) To this end we first express the initial density matrix in terms of the corresponding Wigner function using the Weyl transform

$$\rho_{\text{in}}(x, y) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W_{\text{in}} \left(\frac{x+y}{2}, \mu \right) e^{i\mu(x-y)} d\mu. \quad (10)$$

We substitute (10) in (9) to express $\rho_{\text{out}}^{(m)}$ in terms of the initial Wigner function, and then substitute the result in (2). After rearrangement of terms and performing one of the integrations, we deduce the effect of phase-space decoherence on the Wigner function due to m successive POVM measurements as

$$W_{\text{out}}^{(m)}(x, p) = \frac{1}{2\pi m} \iint_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{(p-k)^2}{2m}} e^{-\frac{(x-q)^2}{2m}} W_{\text{in}}(q, k) dq dk. \quad (11)$$

By setting $m = 1/2$, substituting (10) in (7), and performing a short calculation, it becomes evident that the

right side of (11) is nothing but the Husimi density function (7) of the initial density matrix. Because a Husimi density is always positive, it follows that quantum features of the initial state as represented by the negativity of the Wigner function is already eliminated by a half iteration. The positivity of the Wigner function, of course, is not a sufficient condition for classicality. For the latter, it is more common to require the Glauber-Sudarshan P -function to become positive [11, 12]. Because the Wigner function is the double-Gaussian convolution of the P -function of the form (11) with $m = 1/2$ [22], it follows that the P -function of $W^{(1)}$ is just $W^{(1/2)}$, which is positive. It follows that after a single POVM measurement on phase space, the P -function becomes positive, thus quantum features have been eliminated.

Our next task is to propose a dynamical model that gives rise to phase-space decoherence. We show that the Lindblad equation with two Lindblad operators, one the position $\hat{L}_1 = \sqrt{\gamma}\hat{x}$, and the other the momentum operator $\hat{L}_2 = \sqrt{\gamma}\hat{p}$, gives rise to the right dynamics for our purpose, in line with the interpretation that a Hermitian Lindbladian corresponds to a monitoring of the relevant observable. Thus consider a purely dissipative Lindblad evolution for the density matrix of the form (setting $\gamma = 1$ to avoid clutter)

$$\frac{\partial \hat{\rho}}{\partial t} = \hat{x}\hat{p}\hat{x} - \frac{1}{2}(\hat{x}^2\hat{\rho} + \hat{\rho}\hat{x}^2) + \hat{p}\hat{\rho}\hat{p} - \frac{1}{2}(\hat{p}^2\hat{\rho} + \hat{\rho}\hat{p}^2). \quad (12)$$

Let us solve this equation by transforming to the Wigner representation, in which the equation becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial W}{\partial t} = & x \star W \star x - \frac{1}{2}(x \star x \star W + W \star x \star x) \\ & + p \star W \star p - \frac{1}{2}(p \star p \star W + W \star p \star p), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where \star denotes the Moyal product [23]. Due to the linearity of \hat{L}_1, \hat{L}_2 in \hat{p} and \hat{x} , (13) simplifies to

$$\frac{\partial W}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial p^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial x^2}. \quad (14)$$

This can be solved by transforming to the Fourier space. Specifically, writing

$$\chi(q, k) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint e^{-iqx} e^{-ikp} W(x, p) dx dp, \quad (15)$$

(14) transforms into

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \chi_t(q, k) = -\frac{1}{2}(q^2 + k^2) \chi_t(q, k), \quad (16)$$

the solution of which is given by

$$\chi_t(q, k) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}(k^2 + q^2)t} \chi_0(q, k). \quad (17)$$

Performing an inverse Fourier transform, we thus find the solution to (14) as

$$W_t(x, p) = \frac{1}{2\pi t} \iint_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{(p-k)^2}{2t}} e^{-\frac{(x-q)^2}{2t}} W_0(q, k) dq dk. \quad (18)$$




FIG. 2: *Density plot of the Wigner function under the Lindblad evolution for phase-space decoherence.* All parameters and initial conditions are the same as in Figure 1, except for the dynamical evolution generated by the Lindblad equation (12), with $\gamma = 0.1$.

For integer values of $t = m$ the solution indeed corresponds to (11).

In Figure 2 we show the dynamical behaviour of the Wigner function associated with solutions to the Lindblad equation for phase-space decoherence, to be contrasted with Figure 1. For an arbitrary initial state, interference fringes are eliminated across the whole of the phase space. The top panels show the time evolution (from left to right) of the Wigner function of an initial “cat” state for two different positions. For a superposition of coherent states centred at two different momenta (middle panels), a phase-space decoherence eliminates interference. When the Lindbladian dynamics is superposed with an underlying unitary motion generated by a harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian (bottom panels), the behaviour of the position-space decoherence in Figure 1 is very similar to that of a full phase-space decoherence in Figure 2. This can be understood by considering the Lindblad equation in a moving frame where the harmonic oscillator motion is translated into a time-dependence in the Lindbladians, which leaves the phase-space decoherence Lindblad equation invariant, but which dynamically oscillates between position and momentum decoherence in the position-space decoherence model.

So far we have taken a democratic approach in position and momentum variables. We can, however, reinstate some of the physical parameters by introducing a variable $\sigma = \sqrt{\hbar}/\omega$ in terms of the Planck constant and the frequency of the harmonic oscillator to redefine our coherent state $|z\rangle$ leading to a stronger decoherence effect in either position or momentum.

In summary, we have constructed a scheme for modelling decoherence in phase space by use of a coherent-state-based POVM. Our model shows that under phase-space decoherence the density matrix of the system is diagonalised in both the position and the momentum representations, such that the diagonal elements are also smoothed with respect to a standard Gaussian measure. The expectation values of both position and momentum operators are conserved during the decoherence process. We have presented an explicit dynamical model for phase space decoherence in the form of a simple Lindblad equation (12) that is analytically solvable. The solution in terms of the Wigner function shows that starting from an arbitrary initial state, after a single POVM measurement the Wigner function and even the associated P-function of the resulting state become strictly positive. The construction of a Lindbladian model for a POVM measurement in itself has hitherto remained an open question, to which our result may provide useful insights.

We conclude by remarking that the method employed here will prove useful in other studies on the emergence of classicality, for example, for spin systems for which the corresponding coherent states are well understood [24]. Indeed, for spin systems we can model phase-space decoherence by constructing POVM measurements using the SU(2) coherent states [25]. It appears that the effect of such decoherence can be unravelled dynamically using a Lindblad equation generated by the three angular momentum operators \hat{S}_x , \hat{S}_y , and \hat{S}_z — details of which will be developed elsewhere.

DCB acknowledges support from EPSRC (grant EP/X019926/1) and the John Templeton Foundation (grant 62210). The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the John Templeton Foundation. EMG acknowledges support from the Royal Society (Grant. No. URF/R/201034). RM is funded through an Imperial College President's PhD Scholarship.

[1] W. H. Zurek, Decoherence and the transition from quantum to classical, *Phys. Today* **44** (10), 36 (1991).
 [2] Zurek, W. H. (2002) Decoherence and the Transition from Quantum to Classical—Revisited. Los Alamos Science **27**.
 [3] E. Joos, H. D. Zeh, C. Kiefer, D. Giulini, J. Kupsch & I. O. Stamatescu, *Decoherence and the Appearance of a Classical World in Quantum Theory*, 2nd ed. (Springer, Berlin, 2003).
 [4] M. Schlosshauer, *Decoherence and the Quantum-to-Classical Transition* (Springer, Berlin, 2010).
 [5] W. H. Zurek, Quantum theory of the classical: einse-

lection, envariance, quantum Darwinism and extantons, *Entropy* **24**, 1520 (2022).
 [6] Diósi, L. & Halliwell, J. J. (1998) Coupling classical and quantum variables using continuous quantum measurement theory. *Physical Review Letters* **81**, 12846-2849.
 [7] M. Schlosshauer, Quantum decoherence, *Physics Reports* **831**, 1-57 (2019).
 [8] Arthurs, E. & Kelly, Jr., J. L. (1965) Simultaneous measurement of a pair of conjugate observables. *The Bell System Technical Journal* **44**, 725-729.
 [9] Davies, E. B. (1976) *Quantum Theory of Open Systems*. (London: Academic Press).
 [10] Peres, A. (2006) *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods*. (New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers).
 [11] Ryl, S., Sperling, J., Agudelo, E., Mraz, M., Köhnke, S., Hage, B., & Vogel, W. (2015) Unified nonclassicality criteria. *Physical Review A* **92**, 011801.
 [12] Bohmann, M., Agudelo, E., & Sperling, J. (2020) Probing nonclassicality with matrices of phase-space distributions. *Quantum* **4**, 343.
 [13] De Pasquale, A., Foti, C., Cuccoli, A., Giovannetti, V. & Verrucchi, P. (2019) Dynamical model for positive-operator-valued measures. *Physical Review A* **100**, 012130.
 [14] Ali, S. T., Antoine, J.-P. & Gazeau, J.-P. (2013) *Coherent States, Wavelets, and Their Generalizations*. (Berlin: Springer).
 [15] Brody, D. C. & Hughston, L. P. (2021) Quantum measurement of space-time events. *Journal of Physics A* **54**, 235304.
 [16] Davidovich, L. (1999) Decoherence, Wigner functions, and the classical limit of quantum mechanics in cavity QED. *AIP Conference Proceedings* **461**, 151-162.
 [17] Murakami, M., Ford, G. W. & O'Connell, R. F. (2003) Decoherence in phase space. *Laser Physics*, **13**, 180-183.
 [18] Brody, D.C. & Hughston, L.P. (2000) Classical fields as statistical states. *Twistor Newsletter* **45**, 40-43.
 [19] Zurek, W. H. (2018) Quantum theory of the classical: quantum jumps, Born's Rule and objective classical reality via quantum Darwinism. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, **A376**, 20180107.
 [20] Bargmann, V. (1961) On a Hilbert space of analytic functions and an associated integral transform. *Communications in Pure and Applied Mathematics* **14**, 187-214.
 [21] Husimi, K. (1940) Some formal properties of the density matrix. *Proceedings of the Physico-Mathematical Society of Japan* **22**, 264-314.
 [22] Diósi, L. & Kiefer, C. (2002) Exact positivity of the Wigner and P-functions of a Markovian open system. *Journal of Physics A* **35**, 2675-2683.
 [23] T. L. Curtright & C. K. Zachos (2012) Quantum mechanics in phase space. *Asia Pacific Physics Newsletter* **1**, 37-46.
 [24] A. M. Peremolov (1972) Coherent states for arbitrary Lie group. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **26**, 222-236.
 [25] Brody, D. C. & Hughston, L. P. (2015) Universal quantum measurements. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **624**, 012002.