

Influence Action and Decoherence of Hydrodynamic Modes

E. A. Calzetta * ¹ and B. L. Hu † ²

¹ *Department of Physics and IAFE, University of Buenos Aires, Argentina*

² *Department of Physics, University of Maryland,*

College Park, Maryland 20742-4111

(umdp 99-025, submitted to Physical Review D Sept. 27, 1998)

We derive an influence action for the heat diffusion equation and from its spectral dependence show that long wavelength hydrodynamic modes are more readily decohered. The result is independent of the details of the microscopic dynamics, and follows from general principles alone.

In the discussion of classical equations from quantum dynamics, Gell-Mann and Hartle [1] pointed out that for a large and possibly complex system the variables that will become classical ‘habitually’ are the local densities integrated over small volumes. To show that some variables become classical involves showing that they are readily decoherent and that they obey deterministic evolution equations. Hydrodynamic variables such as energy, momentum and number are of such characters because they are conserved quantities. Interesting work has been done in recent years by Hartle, Halliwell and co-workers [2] in applying the decoherent history approach [3] to systems consisting of large numbers of particles with histories consisting of projections onto local densities. The task is to show that these histories decohere and that their probabilities are peaked about hydrodynamic equations.

For a large system consisting of many particles of equal importance, such as the Boltzmann gas, the traditional environment-induced decoherence approach [4] assuming a distinguished system such as the quantum Brownian motion (QBM) [5] becomes inoperative. Among a number of alternatives, the present authors suggested using the correlation hierarchy to represent the complete system and aiming at the decoherence of histories defined in terms of (n-th order) correlation functions [6,7]. To investigate the decoherence of hydrodynamic variables in this vein, the task would be to study the hydrodynamic limit of the correlation hierarchy and show that such limit indeed possesses special decoherent characteristics to warrant emergent classicality. The first step has been a long standing issue in the foundation of statistical mechanics (see e.g., [8]); the second step in correlation decoherence is a new challenge.

We are not prepared to address the above problem as yet, but wish to offer an observation in this brief note on why hydrodynamic modes are most readily decohered from the viewpoint of the closed-time-path (CTP) [9,10] or influence functional [5] formalism. In our previous work we (as well as others) have shown the intimate relation between the CTP and the influence functional (IF) [11], and between the IF and the decoherence functional (DF) [6,12]. Because of the way it is set up, i.e., in terms of open systems with a clear system- environment split, the influence functional is usually incorrectly viewed as unsuitable for effectively closed (or effectively open) systems. By an effectively open system we mean systems where the environment is not clearly identifiable (as is in the QBM) but effectively exists and exerts an influence on the system just like an open system. The influence functional is equally applicable to these cases. ¹ There are many ways how an effectively open system can be defined, using a discrepancy between fast-slow variables, long-short wavelength excitations, or high-low energy scale, etc [14]. The thermodynamics-hydrodynamics regime (of a closed system like the Boltzmann gas) in question here belongs to this latter category [15]. Indeed, for our problem, there is an environment (from, say, the presence of other constituents or the short wavelength sector of the system) which defines the temperature but in the linear response regime no particular coupling or any of its microscopic features need be specified or will manifest. This is what makes our derivation possible, a point which will be made clear in our result.

To show the decoherent properties we need to first identify from the (coarse-grained, large scale) hydrodynamic equations the noise arising from and reflecting its microscopic constituents. We know that noise (in the environment, or effective environment) is instrumental to the decoherence of the system. ² We do this with the help of the fluctuation-dissipation relation (FDR) [16], which relates the dissipation in the long wavelength modes with their

*Electronic address: calzetta@df.uba.ar

†Electronic address: hub@physics.umd.edu

¹We can see this via its relation with the CTP effective action, which traditionally has been used for the derivation of evolutionary equations for particle processes, with no obvious introduction of an environment. But, as we pointed out earlier [13], the presence of a quantum field constitutes a de facto environment, and the equations are effective in the sense that radiative corrections have been included.

²Physically, nearly conserved quantities, and hydrodynamic modes in particular, are usually only weakly coupled to the rest of the universe – that is why they are nearly conserved. There is a delicate balance between having just enough noise to decoherence but not in excess so as to corrupt the deterministic (classical) path. See [1]

fluctuations. The FDR gives the auto-correlation of the noise. From this noise one can construct a Langevin equation governing the dissipation of thermodynamic perturbations (in our example the temperature) which describes the approach to thermal equilibrium. Added to this – that the influence action should give the Langevin dynamics upon variation-, we demand also that it should produce the finite temperature free energy density when time is continued into the imaginary domain (with periodicity given by the inverse temperature). These two conditions are enough to determine its structure. Finally, reinterpreting the influence action as essentially the logarithm of the decoherence functional, we are in a position to decide which modes of the temperature field are most readily decohered. As could be expected, these are the long wavelength, hydrodynamic modes.

Our general argument complements the explicit models presented in Ref. [2]. Rather than explicitly constructing a nearly conserved quantity and showing its decoherence, we emphasize the generic properties leading to the classicality of the hydrodynamic modes. As we shall see, decoherence of the hydrodynamic modes is, at least for systems close to equilibrium, essentially a consequence of the Second Law and the Einstein relation, which is a fluctuation-dissipation relation for linear responses.³

To focus on the basic issues, we shall look into the simplest case, that of a nonrelativistic, heat conducting medium with no matter motion. We shall consider a linear perturbation δT in the temperature field from some background, uniform temperature T_0 . As is well known, the perturbation will regress to equilibrium, and this process is described by a Langevin equation. We assume that the only relevant thermodynamic variable is the local temperature $T = T_0 + \delta T(\vec{x}, t)$, everything else having been coarse grained. The local temperature is associated to the variation in energy density u in the usual way

$$du(\vec{x}) = c(T) dT(\vec{x}) \quad (1)$$

where $c = c(T)$ is the specific heat. The relevant conservation law is the First Law of Thermodynamics (we use the convention that positive heat means flow into the body, see [18]), $u_{,t} = -\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{q}$, where \vec{q} is the heat flux. Near equilibrium the heat flux is given by Fourier's Law (which is enough in the non relativistic theory) $\vec{q} = -D\vec{\nabla}T$, where D is the heat diffusion constant [19]. Since we only consider the linear response, we may work with a single Fourier mode $\delta T_k(t)$. The macroscopic evolution equation is

$$c_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\delta T_k) + D_0 k^2(\delta T_k) = 0 \quad (2)$$

where $c_0 = c(T_0)$, and similarly $D_0 = D(T_0)$. Roughly speaking, we can use k^2 to gauge conservation, with better conservation for smaller wavenumbers.

Near equilibrium, the local temperature will undergo spontaneous fluctuations, with a Gaussian probability density $\rho \sim \exp -\beta_0 \Delta F$, where $\beta_0 = 1/T_0$, and $\Delta F = \Delta U - T_0 \Delta S$ is the free energy, ΔU , ΔS being the total energy and entropy change associated to the fluctuation. It is crucial for our argument that the free energy depends on the global temperature T_0 , rather than on the local temperature $T = T_0 + \delta T(\vec{x}, t)$. For a system in canonical equilibrium at temperature T_0 , the probability of a microscopic configuration adding up to a local temperature fluctuation $\delta T(\vec{x}, t)$ is $\exp -\beta_0 U$, while the number of such configurations is $\exp S$, so, after normalizing by the factor $\exp \beta_0 F_0$, where $F_0 = U_0 - T_0 S_0$ is the equilibrium free energy, we obtain the total probability as given. We obtain the same result if we apply Einstein's formula to the closed system made up of our system and the heat reservoir.

We wish to compute the change in the free energy as a result of a temperature fluctuation. Mathematically it is important to keep in mind the distinction between an extensive quantity and its density, on one hand, and the variational derivative of the former and the ordinary derivatives of the latter, on the other. For example, define $U = \int d^d x u(\vec{x})$ then Eq. (1) can be read as

$$\frac{\delta U}{\delta T(\vec{x})} = \left. \frac{\partial u}{\partial T} \right|_{T=T(\vec{x})} = c[T(\vec{x})] \quad (3)$$

where δ denotes a variational derivative, ∂ a partial one.

³We do not claim that the consistent histories approach in any way forces us to consider histories defined in terms of hydrodynamical variables; certainly other consistent sets are also possible, maybe some even contradictory to the hydro histories [17]. We only wish to point out that the good properties of histories defined in terms of nearly conserved quantities vis a vis decoherence are not an accident, but rather follow from the phenomenology of macroscopic behavior, as encoded in the Laws of Thermodynamics. As such this kind of histories constitutes an *interesting* classical domain [6]; whether we should use this domain to describe our actual experience is a matter of physics, not formalism.

The variations of the different quantities are constrained by thermodynamic laws; for example, we have

$$ds(\vec{x}) = \frac{du(\vec{x})}{T(\vec{x})}$$

where s is the entropy density. Combining these we obtain the identity relating the first variations of energy and entropy

$$\left. \frac{\delta S}{\delta T(\vec{x})} \right|_{T=T_0} = \frac{1}{T_0} \left. \frac{\delta U}{\delta T(\vec{x})} \right|_{T=T_0} \quad (4)$$

which in particular implies that the first variation of the free energy vanishes in equilibrium, as expected.

For the second variation we get

$$\frac{\delta^2 F}{\delta T(\vec{x}) \delta T(\vec{y})} = \frac{\delta^2 U}{\delta T(\vec{x}) \delta T(\vec{y})} - T_0 \frac{\delta^2 S}{\delta T(\vec{x}) \delta T(\vec{y})} \quad (5)$$

But

$$\frac{\delta^2 S}{\delta T(\vec{x}) \delta T(\vec{y})} = \frac{\delta}{\delta T(\vec{x})} \left[\frac{\delta S}{\delta T(\vec{y})} \right] = \frac{\delta}{\delta T(\vec{x})} \left[\frac{1}{T(\vec{y})} \frac{\delta U}{\delta T(\vec{y})} \right] \quad (6)$$

so the second variation of the free energy is

$$\frac{\delta^2 F}{\delta T(\vec{x}) \delta T(\vec{y})} = \frac{1}{T_0} \frac{\delta U}{\delta T(\vec{y})} \delta(\vec{x} - \vec{y}) = \frac{1}{T_0} \left. \frac{\partial u}{\partial T} \right|_{T=T_0} \delta(\vec{x} - \vec{y}) = \frac{c_0}{T_0} \delta(\vec{x} - \vec{y}) \quad (7)$$

and the change in free energy due to this temperature fluctuation is finally

$$\Delta F = \int d^d x \left\{ \frac{c_0}{2T_0} (\delta T)^2 + \dots \right\} \quad (8)$$

It follows that in equilibrium each mode δT_k has a gaussian probability distribution, with $\langle (\delta T_k)^2 \rangle = T_0^2/c_0$. As a check, the rms value of the energy fluctuation is

$$\langle (\Delta U)^2 \rangle = \int d^d x d^d y \langle \Delta u(\vec{x}) \Delta u(\vec{y}) \rangle = C_0 T_0^2 \quad (9)$$

where $C = Vc$ is the heat capacity, as it should [20].

As reasoned above, the fluctuation-dissipation relation requires that Equation (2) be supplemented by a noise source on the right hand side, to support these fluctuations. The microscopic equation of motion is then

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\delta T_k) + \frac{D_0 k^2}{c_0} (\delta T_k) = \xi_k \quad (10)$$

where the ξ_k 's are white noise with correlation $2\Gamma_k$:

$$\langle \xi_k(t_1) \xi_k(t_2) \rangle = 2\Gamma_k \delta(t_1 - t_2); \quad \Gamma_k = \frac{D_0 k^2 T_0^2}{c_0^2} \quad (11)$$

We wish to write down a CTP effective action or influence action \mathcal{A}_{IF} (related to the influence functional \mathcal{F} by $\mathcal{F} \equiv e^{i\mathcal{A}_{IF}}$) designed to reproduce Eq. (10). \mathcal{A}_{IF} is a functional of two (rather than one, as in an ordinary action functional) thermal histories $(\delta T)^1$ and $(\delta T)^2$; this is such as to enable us to formulate a non time-reversal-invariant causal theory within a variational principle [10]. The symmetry property $\mathcal{A}_{IF}[(\delta T)^1, (\delta T)^2] = -\mathcal{A}_{IF}[(\delta T)^2, (\delta T)^1]^*$ implies that the real (imaginary) part is odd (even) in $(\delta T)^1 - (\delta T)^2$. \mathcal{A}_{IF} must have the structure

$$\mathcal{A}_{IF}[(\delta T)^1, (\delta T)^2] = \frac{1}{2} \int d^d k dt dt' [\delta T_k](t) \mu_k(t, t') \{\delta T_k\}(t') + \frac{i}{2} \int d^d k dt dt' [\delta T_k](t) \nu_k(t, t') [\delta T_k](t') \quad (12)$$

where μ_k and ν_k are the dissipation and noise kernels, respectively, and $[\cdot], \{\cdot\}$ around a quantity denote taking the difference and sum of the CTP (1, 2) components. This functional leads to the equations of motion (see [5])

$$\int dt' \mu_k(t, t') \delta T_k(t') = \xi_k(t); \quad \langle \xi_k(t) \xi_k(t') \rangle = \nu_k(t, t') \quad (13)$$

Comparing Equations (13) to (10) and (11), we conclude the influence functional should have the form

$$\mathcal{A}_{IF} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^d k dt ([\delta T_k] A_k) \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{D_0 k^2}{c_0} \right\} \{\delta T_k\} + i \int d^d k dt \frac{D_0 k^2 T_0^2}{c_0^2} (A_k [\delta T_k])^2 \quad (14)$$

In principle, A_k could be any nonsingular operator, but it is simplest to assume it is local and time independent. We determine A_k by requesting that, for time independent configurations, the real part of the CTP effective action, when rotated into imaginary time and integrated from 0 to $-i\beta_0$, should reduce to $i\beta_0 (F[(\delta T)^1] - F[(\delta T)^2])$, where F is the free energy Eq. (8). Thus

$$A_k = \frac{c_0^2}{D_0 k^2 T_0} = \frac{T_0}{\Gamma_k} \quad (15)$$

Finally using the relation between the influence or CTP functional \mathcal{F} and the decoherence functional \mathcal{D} [6,11], we get for the DF:

$$|\mathcal{D}[(\delta T)^1, (\delta T)^2]|^2 \sim \exp \left\{ - \int d^d k dt \frac{2c_0^2}{D_0 k^2} [\delta T_k]^2 \right\} \quad (16)$$

We see that indeed the long wavelength modes are the most efficiently decohered, in agreement with the espoused ideas that maximal decoherence would pertain to the conserved quantities [1]. In particular, we recover the awaited result that conserved quantities are exactly decohered.

It is of interest that we have been able to write down the influence (or CTP effective) action without seemingly making any assumption concerning the structure and dynamics of the environment. In reality, there is of course an environment which provides the finite temperature background. However, here we study only weak perturbations in the linear response regime, and for weak linear couplings the transport functions are independent of the microscopic details of the environment. This subtle yet important observation was made in a footnote of the paper by Feynman and Vernon which captures the microscopic theoretical basis for linear response theory.

In conclusion, our result suggests that decoherence of the hydrodynamic modes is, at least for systems close to equilibrium, essentially a consequence of the Second Law, the Fourier Law, and the Fluctuation-Dissipation Theorem.

Acknowledgements This work began when both authors were at the Santa Fe Workshop on nonequilibrium phase transitions and concluded at the Third Peyresq Meeting on Cosmology. We thank Drs. Emil Mottola and Edgard Gunzig for providing us with a pleasant work environment and to Dr. J. J. Halliwell for multiple discussions. EC is partially supported by CONICET, UBA and Fundación Antorchas (Argentina). BLH is supported in part by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under grant PHY 98-00967. This collaboration is partially supported by CONICET and NSF grant INT 95-09847 under the Scientific and Technological Exchange Program between Argentina and U.S.A.

- [1] M. Gell-Mann and J. B. Hartle, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 3345 (1993).
[2] J. B. Hartle, R. Laflamme and D. Marolf, Phys. Rev. **D51**, 7007 (1995); T. Brun and J. J. Halliwell, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 2899 (1996); J. J. Halliwell, quant-ph/9805062; C. Anastopoulos, gr-qc/9805074
[3] R. B. Griffiths, J. Stat. Phys. **36**, 219 (1984); Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2201 (1993).
R. Omnés, J. Stat Phys. **53**, 893, 933, 957 (1988); Ann. Phys. (NY) **201**, 354 (1990); Rev. Mod. Phys. **64**, 339 (1992); *The interpretation of quantum mechanics*, (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1994).
M. Gell-Mann and J. B. Hartle, in *Complexity, Entropy and the Physics of Information*, ed. by W. H. Zurek (Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1990); in *Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on the Foundations of Quantum Mechanics in the Light of New Technology*, eds S. Kobayashi, H. Ezawa, Y. Murayama and S. Nomura (Physical Society of Japan, Tokyo, 1990); Phys. Rev. **D47**, 3345 (1993). J. B. Hartle, "Quantum Mechanics of Closed Systems" in *Directions in General Relativity* Vol. 1, eds B. L. Hu, M. P. Ryan and C. V. Vishveswara (Cambridge Univ., Cambridge, 1993); "Quasi-Classical Domains in a Quantum Universe", gr-qc/9404017.

- [4] W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. D24, 1516 (1981); D26, 1862 (1982); in *Frontiers of Nonequilibrium Statistical Physics*, ed. G. T. Moore and M. O. Scully (Plenum, N. Y., 1986); Physics Today **44**, 36 (1991); Prog. Theor. Phys. 89, 281 (1993). W. G. Unruh and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. D40, 1071 (1989). E. Joos and H. D. Zeh, Z. Phys. B59, 223 (1985); D. Giulini *et al*, *Decoherence and the Appearance of a Classical World in Quantum Theory* (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1996)
- [5] R. Feynman and F. Vernon, Ann. Phys. (NY) **24**, 118 (1963). R. Feynman and A. Hibbs, *Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals*, (McGraw - Hill, New York, 1965). A. O. Caldeira and A. J. Leggett, Physica **121A**, 587 (1983); H. Grabert, P. Schramm and G. L. Ingold, Phys. Rep. **168**, 115 (1988). B. L. Hu, J. P. Paz and Y. Zhang, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 2843 (1992); **D47**, 1576 (1993).
- [6] E. Calzetta and B. L. Hu, “Decoherence of Correlation Histories” in *Directions in General Relativity, Vol II: Brill Festschrift*, eds B. L. Hu and T. A. Jacobson (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993) gr-qc/9302013. E. Calzetta and B. L. Hu, “Correlations, Decoherence, Dissipation and Noise in Quantum Field Theory”, in *Heat Kernel Techniques and Quantum Gravity*, ed. S. A. Fulling (Texas A& M Press, College Station 1995) hep-th/9501040.
- [7] C. Anastopoulos, Phys. Rev. **D56**, 1009 (1997)
- [8] O. Lanford III, in *Dynamical systems, theory and applications* (Batelle Seattle 1974 Rencontres), edited by J. Moser (Springer - Verlag, Berlin, 1975); H. Spohn, in *Nonequilibrium phenomena I: The Boltzmann Equation*, edited by J. Lebowitz and E. Montroll (North - Holland, Amsterdam, 1983).
- [9] J. Schwinger, J. Math. Phys. **2** (1961) 407; P. M. Bakshi and K. T. Mahanthappa, J. Math. Phys. 4, 1 (1963), 4, 12 (1963); L. V. Keldysh, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **47**, 1515 (1964) [Engl. trans. Sov. Phys. JEPT **20**, 1018 (1965)]. G. Zhou, Z. Su, B. Hao and L. Yu, Phys. Rep. **118**, 1 (1985).
- [10] E. Calzetta and B. L. Hu, Phys. Rev. **D35**, 495 (1987); **D37**, 2878 (1988).
- [11] E. Calzetta and B. L. Hu, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 6636 (1994). Z. Su, L. Y. Chen, X. Yu and K. Chou, Phys. Rev. **B37**, 9810 (1988).
- [12] H. F. Dowker and J. J. Halliwell, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 1580 (1992). J. P. Paz and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 2728 (1993).
- [13] E. Calzetta and B. L. Hu, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 1795 (1997).
- [14] B. L. Hu and Y. Zhang, “Coarse-Graining, Scaling, and Inflation” Univ. Maryland Preprint 90-186 (1990); B. L. Hu, in *Relativity and Gravitation: Classical and Quantum* Proceedings of SILARG VII, Cocoyoc, Mexico, Dec. 1990. eds. J. C. D’ Olivo *et al* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1991); F. Lombardo and F. D. Mazzitelli, Phys. Rev. **D53**, 2001 (1996).
- [15] J. P. Boon and S. Yip, *Molecular Hydrodynamics* (Dover, New York, 1991).
- [16] A. Einstein, Ann. Phys. (4), **19**, 371 (1906), reprinted in *Investigations on the theory of the Brownian movement*, edited by R. Fürth (Dover, New York, 1956); A. Einstein, Phys. Zs. **18**, 121 (1917) (reprinted in *Sources of Quantum Mechanics*, edited by B. van der Waerden (Dover, New York, 1967); H. Callen and T. Welton, Phys. Rev. **83**, 34 (1951). M. S. Green, J. Chem. Phys. 19, 1036 (1951) R. Kubo, J. Phys. Soc. Japan 12, 570 (1957); Rep. Prog. Phys. 29, 255 (1966).
- [17] F. Dowker and A. Kent, Phys. Rev. Lett **75**, 3038 (1995); J. Stat. Phys. **82**, 1575 (1996); A. Kent, Phys. Rev. **A54**, 4670 (1996); Phys. Rev. Lett **78**, 2874 (1997); Phys. Rev. Lett **81**, 1982 (1998).
- [18] E. Fermi, *Thermodynamics* (Dover, New York, 1956).
- [19] S. de Groot and P. Mazur, *Non-Equilibrium Thermodynamics* (Dover, New York, 1984) [North-Holland, Amsterdam (1965)].
- [20] H. B. Callen, *Thermodynamics and An Introduction to Thermostatistics* (J. Wiley, New York, 1985); L. Landau and E. Lifshitz, *Statistical Physics* (part 1, 3rd edition) (Pergamon, Oxford,1980)