

Non-Markovian quantum dynamics and the method of correlated projection superoperators

Heinz-Peter Breuer^{1, *}

¹*Physikalisches Institut, Universität Freiburg, Hermann-Herder-Strasse 3, D-79104 Freiburg, Germany*

(Dated: February 1, 2008)

Efficient methods for the description of the non-Markovian dynamics of open systems play an important role in many proposed applications of quantum mechanics. Here we review some of the most important tools that are based on the projection operator techniques of nonequilibrium statistical mechanics. The standard product-state projection is generalized to a new class of correlated projection superoperators that allow the treatment of strong memory effects, and lead to a non-Markovian generalization of the Lindblad equation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Relaxation and decoherence processes are key features of the dynamics of open quantum systems [1]. In the standard approach one tries to develop appropriate master equations for the open system's reduced density matrix ρ_S which is given by the partial trace taken over the environmental variables coupled to the open system. Invoking the weak-coupling assumption one can formulate in many cases of physical interest a Markovian quantum master equation for the reduced density matrix, expressing the dynamical laws for the irreversible motion of the open system.

However, the theoretical description of quantum mechanical relaxation and decoherence processes often leads to a non-Markovian dynamics which is determined by pronounced memory effects. Strong system-environment couplings [2, 3], correlations and entanglement in the initial state [4, 5], interactions with environments at low temperatures and with spin baths [6], finite reservoirs [7, 8], and transport processes in nano-structures [9] can lead to long memory times and to a failure of the Markovian approximation.

Here, we will review the most important features of a systematic approach to non-Markovian quantum dynamics which is known as projection operator technique [10, 11, 12, 13]. This technique is based on the introduction of a certain projection superoperator \mathcal{P} which acts on the states of the total system. The superoperator \mathcal{P} expresses in a formal mathematical way the idea of the elimination of degrees of freedom from the complete description of the states of the total system. Namely, if ρ is the full density matrix of the composite system, the projection $\mathcal{P}\rho$ serves to represent a certain approximation of ρ which leads to a simplified effective description of the dynamics through a reduced set of relevant variables.

With the help of the projection operator techniques one derives closed dynamic equations for the relevant variables $\mathcal{P}\rho$. We will discuss two different approximation schemes. The first one is based on the Nakajima-Zwanzig equation [10, 11] which represents an integrodifferential equation for $\mathcal{P}\rho$ with a certain memory kernel. The second scheme employs a time-convolutionless master equation for $\mathcal{P}\rho$, i.e. a time-local differential equation with a time-dependent generator [14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19]. These equations are used as starting point for the derivation of effective master equations through a systematic perturbation expansion.

In the standard approach to the dynamics of open systems one chooses a projection superoperator which is defined by the expression $\mathcal{P}\rho = \rho_S \otimes \rho_0$, where ρ_0 is some fixed environmental state. A superoperator of this form projects the total state ρ onto a tensor product state, i. e., onto a state without any statistical correlations between system and environment. Many examples for this product-state projection are known in the fields of quantum optics, decoherence, quantum Brownian motion, quantum measurement theory, and coherent and optimal quantum control. It is typically applicable in the case of weak system-environment couplings. The corresponding perturbation expansion is usually restricted to the second order (known as Born approximation), from which one derives, with the help of certain further assumptions, a Markovian quantum master equations in Lindblad form [20, 21, 22].

A possible approach to large deviations from Markovian behavior consists in carrying out the perturbation expansion to higher orders in the system-environment coupling. However, this approach is often limited by the increasing complexity of the resulting equations of motion. Moreover, the perturbation expansion may not converge uniformly in time, such that higher orders only improve the quality of the approximation of the short-time behavior, but completely fail in the long-time limit [23].

*Electronic address: breuer@physik.uni-freiburg.de

We will discuss here a further strategy for the treatment of highly non-Markovian processes which is based on the use of a correlated projection superoperator [24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29]. By contrast to the product-state projection, a correlated projection superoperator projects the total state ρ onto a system-environment state that contains statistical correlations between certain system and environment states. We will discuss a representation theorem for a large class of such projections which are appropriate for the application of the projection operator techniques, and develop a corresponding non-Markovian generalization of the Lindblad equation.

II. THE STANDARD PROJECTION OPERATOR METHOD

We investigate an open quantum system S that is coupled to some environment E . The corresponding Hilbert spaces are denoted by \mathcal{H}_S and \mathcal{H}_E , respectively. The state space of the composite system is thus given by the tensor product space

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_E. \quad (1)$$

The states of the composite system are represented by density matrices ρ on \mathcal{H} satisfying the physical conditions of the positivity and the normalization:

$$\rho \geq 0, \quad \text{tr} \rho = 1, \quad (2)$$

where tr denotes the trace taken over the total state space \mathcal{H} . The partial traces over \mathcal{H}_S and \mathcal{H}_E will be denoted by tr_S and tr_E .

A. Nakajima-Zwanzig projection operator technique

A central goal of the theory is to develop efficient strategies for the description of the behavior of the reduced density matrix which is determined by the partial trace over the environmental state space,

$$\rho_S = \text{tr}_E \rho. \quad (3)$$

The basic idea of the projection operator techniques is to regard the operation of taking the partial trace over E formally as a map \mathcal{P} defined by

$$\mathcal{P}\rho = (\text{tr}_E \rho) \otimes \rho_0. \quad (4)$$

For a fixed environmental state ρ_0 this defines a linear transformation which maps any density operator ρ on the total state space \mathcal{H} to a density operator $\mathcal{P}\rho$ on \mathcal{H} and has the property of a projection operator:

$$\mathcal{P}^2 = \mathcal{P}. \quad (5)$$

Being a map acting on operators, \mathcal{P} is often called a projection superoperator. The complementary projection is defined by

$$\mathcal{Q} = I - \mathcal{P}, \quad (6)$$

I being the identity map. Note that according to Eq. (4) the reduced system's state is obtained from the projection $\mathcal{P}\rho$ by taking the partial trace over the environment:

$$\rho_S = \text{tr}_E \{\mathcal{P}\rho\}. \quad (7)$$

The Hamiltonian of the composite system is of the form

$$H = H_0 + H_I, \quad (8)$$

where H_0 denotes the unperturbed part, usually given by the sum of a system Hamiltonian H_S and an environmental Hamiltonian H_E , and H_I represents the interaction. In many cases it is convenient to formulate the dynamics in the interaction picture with respect to H_0 in which the density matrix $\rho(t)$ of the total system is governed by the von Neumann equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho(t) = -i[H_I(t), \rho(t)] \equiv \mathcal{L}(t)\rho(t). \quad (9)$$

The operator

$$H_I(t) = e^{iH_0 t} H_I e^{-iH_0 t} \quad (10)$$

represents the Hamiltonian in the interaction picture and $\mathcal{L}(t)$ the corresponding Liouville superoperator.

The Nakajima-Zwanzig (NZ) projection operator technique yields a closed equation of motion for the relevant part $\mathcal{P}\rho(t)$ of the density matrix and, hence, for the reduced density matrix $\rho_S(t)$. To simplify the presentation we assume that the condition

$$\mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}(t_1)\mathcal{L}(t_2)\dots\mathcal{L}(t_{2n+1})\mathcal{P} = 0 \quad (11)$$

holds true. This condition is in fact satisfied in many applications. Moreover, we suppose that the initial state satisfies $\mathcal{P}\rho(0) = \rho(0)$. The projection $\mathcal{P}\rho(t)$ is then governed by a homogeneous integrodifferential equation, the Nakajima-Zwanzig equation:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{P}\rho(t) = \int_0^t dt_1 \mathcal{K}(t, t_1)\mathcal{P}\rho(t_1). \quad (12)$$

The memory kernel $\mathcal{K}(t, t_1)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{K}(t, t_1) = \mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}(t) \text{T exp} \left[\int_{t_1}^t dt_2 \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}(t_2) \right] \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}(t_1)\mathcal{P}, \quad (13)$$

where T denotes the chronological time ordering.

The memory kernel $\mathcal{K}(t, t_1)$ is in general a very complicated superoperator whose determination is in most cases as complicated as the solution of the full system's dynamics. Therefore, one usually tries to determine it by a perturbation expansion in powers of the strength of the system-environment coupling. The lowest order contribution is given by the second-order equation of motion:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{P}\rho(t) = \int_0^t dt_1 \mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}(t)\mathcal{L}(t_1)\mathcal{P}\rho(t_1). \quad (14)$$

Higher orders are obtained with the help of the general expression (13) for the memory kernel.

B. Time-convolutionless projection operator technique

There exists an alternative expansion technique based on the projection superoperator \mathcal{P} which is known as time-convolutionless (TCL) projection operator method. By contrast to the NZ approach, the TCL method leads to an equation of motion for the relevant part of the density matrix which represents a time-local differential equation of the general form

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{P}\rho(t) = \mathcal{K}(t)\mathcal{P}\rho(t). \quad (15)$$

Here, $\mathcal{K}(t)$ is a time-dependent superoperator, called the TCL generator. It should be stressed that the TCL equation (15) describes non-Markovian dynamics, although it is local in time and does not involve an integration over the system's past. In fact, the TCL equation takes into account all memory effects through the explicit time-dependence of the generator $\mathcal{K}(t)$.

To obtain the time-local form of the TCL equation one eliminates the dependence of the future time evolution on the system's history through the introduction of the backward propagator into the Nakajima-Zwanzig equation. This enables one to express the density matrix at previous times $t_1 < t$ in terms of the density matrix at time t and to derive an exact time-local equation of motion. We remark that the backward propagator and, hence, also the TCL generator may not exist, typically at isolated points of the time axis. This may happen for very strong system-environment couplings and/or long integration times; an example is discussed in [1].

Again, one can develop a systematic perturbation expansion for the TCL generator which takes the form $\mathcal{K}(t) = \mathcal{K}_2(t) + \mathcal{K}_4(t) + \dots$. The various orders of this expansion can be expressed through the ordered cumulants [30, 31, 32, 33] of the Liouville superoperator $\mathcal{L}(t)$. For instance, the contributions of second and fourth order to the TCL generator are given by [1]

$$\mathcal{K}_2(t) = \int_0^t dt_1 \mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}(t)\mathcal{L}(t_1)\mathcal{P},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_4(t) = & \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \int_0^{t_2} dt_3 \\ & \times \left[\mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}(t)\mathcal{L}(t_1)\mathcal{L}(t_2)\mathcal{L}(t_3)\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}(t)\mathcal{L}(t_1)\mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}(t_2)\mathcal{L}(t_3)\mathcal{P} \right. \\ & \left. - \mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}(t)\mathcal{L}(t_2)\mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}(t_1)\mathcal{L}(t_3)\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}(t)\mathcal{L}(t_3)\mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}(t_1)\mathcal{L}(t_2)\mathcal{P} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In second order the TCL master equation takes the form

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{P}\rho(t) = \int_0^t dt_1 \mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}(t)\mathcal{L}(t_1)\mathcal{P}\rho(t), \quad (16)$$

which should be contrasted to the NZ equation (14).

It is important to realize that the NZ and the TCL technique lead to equations of motion with entirely different structures and that, therefore, also the mathematical structure of their solutions are quite different in any given order [34]. It is difficult to formulate general conditions that allow to decide for a given model whether the NZ or the TCL approach is more efficient. The assessment of the quality of the approximation obtained generally requires the investigation of higher orders of the expansion, or else the comparison with numerical simulations or with certain limiting cases that can be treated analytically. It turns out that in many cases the degree of accuracy obtained by both methods are of the same order of magnitude. In these cases the TCL approach is of course to be preferred because it is technically much simpler to deal with.

In the NZ equation (12) as well as in the TCL equation (15) we made use of the initial condition $\mathcal{P}\rho(0) = \rho(0)$. According to the definition (4) of the projection \mathcal{P} this condition is equivalent to the assumption that $\rho(0)$ represents an uncorrelated tensor product initial state, $\rho(0) = \rho_S(0) \otimes \rho_0$. For a correlated initial state one has to add a certain inhomogeneity to the right-hand side of the NZ or the TCL equation which involves the initial conditions through the complementary projection $\mathcal{Q}\rho(0) = (I - \mathcal{P})\rho(0)$. A general method for the treatment of such correlated initial states within the TCL technique is described in [1]; for a recent study on their influence in weakly coupled systems see also Refs. [35, 36].

C. Markovian limit and quantum dynamical semigroups

With the standard projection defined in Eq. (4), the TCL equation (16) is equivalent to the following master equation for the reduced density matrix,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_S(t) = - \int_0^t dt_1 \text{tr}_E \{ [H_I(t), [H_I(t_1), \rho_S(t) \otimes \rho_0]] \}. \quad (17)$$

This equation provides an appropriate starting point for an approximation scheme which is known as Born-Markov approximation and which eventually leads to a Markovian quantum master equation in Lindblad form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\rho_S(t) &= \mathcal{K}\rho_S(t) \\ &= -i[H_S, \rho_S(t)] + \sum_{\lambda} \left(R_{\lambda}\rho_S(t)R_{\lambda}^{\dagger} - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ R_{\lambda}^{\dagger}R_{\lambda}, \rho_S(t) \right\} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Here, \mathcal{K} is a time-independent generator, the Lindblad generator, involving a Hermitian operator H_S and arbitrary system operators R_{λ} . Therefore, it generates state transformations of the form

$$\Phi_t : \rho_S(0) \mapsto \rho_S(t), \quad \Phi_t = e^{\mathcal{K}t}. \quad (19)$$

Φ_t is called a quantum dynamical map and the set of transformations

$$\{\Phi_t | t \geq 0\}$$

is referred to as quantum dynamical semigroup. Under certain technical conditions, it can be shown that the form of the Lindblad generator guarantees the preservation of the positivity and normalization of the density matrix, as well as

the complete positivity of the dynamical transformation Φ_t . Vice versa, any completely positive quantum dynamical semigroup has a generator of the form (18). This is the well-known Gorini-Kossakowski-Sudarshan-Lindblad theorem [20, 21].

The microscopic derivation of the master equation (18) from the TCL equation (17) requires the validity of several approximations, the most important one being the so-called Markov approximation. This approximation presupposes a rapid decay of the two-point correlation functions of those environmental operators that describe the system-environment coupling. More precisely, if τ_E describes the temporal width of these correlations and τ_R the relaxation time of the system, the Markov approximation demands that

$$\tau_E \ll \tau_R. \quad (20)$$

This means that the environmental correlation time τ_E is short compared to the open system's relaxation time τ_R .

The Markov approximation is justified in many cases of physical interest. Examples of application are the quantum optical master equation describing the interaction of radiation with matter, and the master equation for a test particle in a quantum gas [37, 38, 39]. However, strong couplings or interactions with low-temperature reservoirs can lead to large correlations resulting in long memory times and in a failure of the Markov approximation. In the following, the quantum dynamics of an open system is said to be non-Markovian if the time-evolution of its reduced density matrix cannot be described (to the desired degree of accuracy) by means of a closed master equation with a (possibly time-dependent) generator in Lindblad form.

If the two-point environmental correlation functions do not decay rapidly in time the second order of the expansion cannot, in general, be expected to give an accurate description of the dynamics. For instance, this situation arises for the spin star model discussed in Ref. [23], where the second-order generator of the master equation increases linearly with time such that the Born-Markov approximation simply does not exist.

More importantly, the standard Markov condition (20) alone does *not* guarantee, in general, that the Markovian master equation provides a reasonable description of the dynamics. This situation can occur for finite and/or structured reservoirs that cannot be represented by a Bosonic field or a collection of harmonic oscillator modes. In such cases a detailed investigation of the influence of higher-order correlations is indispensable in order to judge the quality of a given order. The model discussed in Ref. [25] represents an example for which the standard Markov condition *is* satisfied although the expansion based on the projection (4) completely fails if one truncates the expansion at any finite order. In such cases strong non-Markovian dynamics is induced through the behavior of higher-order correlation functions.

We conclude that in general one can judge the quality of a given projection superoperator and a given expansion technique that is based on it only by an investigation of the structure of higher orders. The standard projection and the corresponding Lindblad equation are not reliable if higher orders lead to contributions that are not bounded in time, signifying the non-uniform convergence of the perturbation expansion [25].

III. CORRELATED PROJECTION SUPEROPERATORS

The performance of the projection operator techniques depends of course on the properties of the microscopic model under study, in particular on the structure of the correlation functions of the model. However, it also depends strongly on the choice of the superoperator \mathcal{P} . Several extensions of the standard projection (4) and modifications of the expansion technique have been proposed in the literature (see, e.g., Refs. [40, 41, 42]).

The projection defined by Eq. (4) projects any state ρ onto a tensor product $\rho_S \otimes \rho_0$ that describes a state without statistical correlations between the system and its environment. Here, we introduce a more general class of projection superoperators that project onto correlated system-environment states and are therefore able to describe strong correlations and non-Markovian effects [24].

A. General conditions

We assume that our new class of maps \mathcal{P} represent superoperators with the property of a projection, i.e., $\mathcal{P}^2 = \mathcal{P}$. As a consequence, the whole machinery of the projection operator techniques described in Sec. II can be applied also to the new class of correlated maps.

Within the projection operator techniques the projection $\mathcal{P}\rho$ should represent a suitable approximation of ρ . We therefore require that for any physical state ρ the projection $\mathcal{P}\rho$ is again a physical state, i. e., a positive operator with unit trace. This means that \mathcal{P} is a positive and trace preserving map, namely

$$\rho \geq 0 \implies \mathcal{P}\rho \geq 0, \quad \text{tr}\{\mathcal{P}\rho\} = \text{tr}\rho. \quad (21)$$

Our class of projection operators is assumed to consist of maps of the following general form,

$$\mathcal{P} = I_S \otimes \Lambda. \quad (22)$$

Here, I_S denotes the unit map acting on operators on \mathcal{H}_S , and Λ is a linear map that transforms operators on \mathcal{H}_E into operators on \mathcal{H}_E . A projection superoperator of this form leaves the system S unchanged and acts nontrivially only on the variables of the environment E . As a consequence of the positivity of \mathcal{P} and of condition (22) the map Λ must be N_S -positive, where N_S is the dimension of \mathcal{H}_S . In the following we use the stronger condition that Λ is completely positive, because completely positive maps allow for a simple mathematical characterization (see Sec. III B).

Let us discuss the physical implications of these conditions. According to Eqs. (5) and (22) the map Λ must itself be a projection, namely $\Lambda^2 = \Lambda$. Moreover, since \mathcal{P} is trace-preserving, the map Λ must also be trace-preserving. Hence, we find that Λ represents a completely positive and trace-preserving map (CPT map, or quantum channel) which operates on the variables of the environment and has the property of a projection. The action of \mathcal{P} may also be interpreted as that of a generalized quantum measurement which is carried out on the environment. A further physically reasonable consequence of the positivity of Λ and of Eq. (22) is that \mathcal{P} maps product states to product states, and, more generally, separable (classically correlated) states to separable states. This means that the application of \mathcal{P} does not create entanglement between the system and its environment.

Using Eq. (22) and the fact that Λ is trace-preserving we get

$$\rho_S \equiv \text{tr}_E \rho = \text{tr}_E \{\mathcal{P}\rho\}. \quad (23)$$

This relation connects the density matrix of the reduced system with the projection of a given state ρ of the total system. It states that, in order to determine ρ_S , we do not really need the full density matrix ρ , but only its projection $\mathcal{P}\rho$. Thus, $\mathcal{P}\rho$ contains the full information needed to reconstruct the reduced system's state.

B. Representation theorem

What is the explicit structure of the projection superoperators satisfying the basic conditions formulated above? This question is answered by a representation theorem [24] which states that \mathcal{P} fulfills the condition of Sec. III A if and only if it can be written in the form

$$\mathcal{P}\rho = \sum_i \text{tr}_E \{A_i \rho\} \otimes B_i, \quad (24)$$

where $\{A_i\}$ and $\{B_i\}$ are two sets of linear independent Hermitian operators satisfying the relations

$$\text{tr}_E \{B_i A_j\} = \delta_{ij}, \quad (25)$$

$$\sum_i (\text{tr}_E B_i) A_i = I_E, \quad (26)$$

$$\sum_i A_i^T \otimes B_i \geq 0. \quad (27)$$

Equation (25) guarantees that \mathcal{P} is a projection superoperator, Eq. (26) ensures that \mathcal{P} is trace-preserving, and Eq. (27) is equivalent to the condition of complete positivity (T denotes the transposition).

The standard projection (4) that projects onto an uncorrelated tensor product state is obviously of the form of Eq. (24). In fact, if we take a single $A = I_E$ and a single $B = \rho_0$ the conditions (25), (26), and (27) are trivially satisfied and Eq. (24) obviously reduces to Eq. (4). Of course, a projection $\mathcal{P}\rho$ of the form of Eq. (24) does not in general represent a simple product state. We therefore call such \mathcal{P} correlated projection superoperators. They project onto states that contain statistical correlations between the system S and its environment E . In the following we will consider the case that one can find a representation of the projection with positive operators

$$A_i \geq 0, \quad B_i \geq 0. \quad (28)$$

Equation (27) is then trivially satisfied. Without restriction we may assume that the B_i are normalized to unit trace,

$$\text{tr}_E B_i = 1, \quad (29)$$

such that condition (26) reduces to the simple form

$$\sum_i A_i = I_E. \quad (30)$$

Under these conditions \mathcal{P} projects any state ρ onto a state which can be written as a sum of tensor products of positive operators. In the theory of entanglement (see, e.g., the recent review [43]) such states are called separable or classically correlated. Using a projection superoperator of this form, one thus tries to approximate the total system's states by a classically correlated state. The general representation of Eq. (24) includes the case of projection superoperators that project onto inseparable, entangled quantum states. We will not pursue here this possibility further, and restrict ourselves to positive A_i and B_i in the following.

C. Correlated initial states

As mentioned already in Sec. IIB a homogeneous NZ or TCL equation of motion presupposes a tensor product initial state if one uses the standard projection superoperator (4). However, this is no longer true for the correlated projection defined by Eq. (24). In fact, the general condition for the absence of an inhomogeneous term in the NZ equation (12) or the TCL equation (15) is given by

$$\mathcal{P}\rho(0) = \rho(0). \quad (31)$$

According to Eq. (24) this condition is equivalent to the assumption that $\rho(0)$ takes the form

$$\rho(0) = \sum_i \rho_i(0) \otimes B_i, \quad (32)$$

where

$$\rho_i(0) = \text{tr}_E\{A_i\rho(0)\} \geq 0. \quad (33)$$

Equation (32) represents in general a correlated initial state. Hence, a great advantage of the correlated projection superoperators is given by the fact that they allow the treatment of correlated initial states by means of a homogeneous NZ or TCL equation [24].

D. Conservation laws

A crucial step in applications of the correlated projection operator technique is the construction of an appropriate projection superoperator \mathcal{P} . An important strategy for this construction is to take into account the known conserved quantities of the model under study.

Suppose C is a conserved observable. A good choice for the projection superoperator \mathcal{P} will then be a projection that leaves invariant the expectation value of C , i.e. that satisfies the relation

$$\text{tr}\{C\rho\} = \text{tr}\{C(\mathcal{P}\rho)\}. \quad (34)$$

To bring this relation into a more convenient form we introduce the adjoint \mathcal{P}^\dagger of the projection superoperator \mathcal{P} . The adjoint map is defined with the help of the Hilbert-Schmidt scalar product

$$(X, Y) = \text{tr}\{X^\dagger Y\} \quad (35)$$

for the space of operators acting on the state space of the total system through the relation

$$(X, \mathcal{P}Y) = (\mathcal{P}^\dagger X, Y).$$

This allows us to write Eq. (34) in the form $\text{tr}\{C\rho\} = \text{tr}\{(\mathcal{P}^\dagger C)\rho\}$. Requiring this to hold for all states ρ we get the relation

$$\mathcal{P}^\dagger C = C. \quad (36)$$

The adjoint of the projection (24) is obtained by interchanging the role of A_i and B_i . Hence, condition (36) can be written explicitly as

$$\mathcal{P}^\dagger C = \sum_i \text{tr}_E\{B_i C\} \otimes A_i = C. \quad (37)$$

This equation represents a condition for the projection superoperator \mathcal{P} on the basis of a known conserved quantity of the underlying model. It ensures that the projection superoperator leaves invariant this quantity and that the effective description respects the corresponding conservation law.

IV. GENERALIZATION OF THE LINDBLAD EQUATION

Once a projection superoperator has been chosen the projection $\mathcal{P}\rho(t)$ of the time-dependent total system's state $\rho(t)$ is, according to Eq. (24), uniquely determined by the dynamical variables

$$\rho_i(t) = \text{tr}_E\{A_i\rho(t)\}. \quad (38)$$

To be specific we assume in the following that the index i takes on the values $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Since we require that the A_i are positive, the $\rho_i(t)$ are positive operators. From Eq. (23) we find the connection to the reduced density matrix,

$$\rho_S(t) = \sum_i \rho_i(t), \quad (39)$$

and the normalization condition takes the form

$$\text{tr}_S \rho_S(t) = \sum_i \text{tr}_S \rho_i(t) = 1. \quad (40)$$

Hence, we see that the reduced system's state is uniquely determined by a set of n (unnormalized) density operators $\rho_i(t)$.

Our formulation leads to a natural question, namely what is the analog of the Lindblad equation (18) in the case of a correlated projection superoperator? To answer this question we first observe that the time-evolution leads to a transformation of the form

$$\{\rho_i(0)\} \mapsto \{\rho_i(t)\}, \quad (41)$$

transforming any initial set of positive operators $\rho_i(0) \geq 0$ into another set of positive operators $\rho_i(t) \geq 0$ at time $t > 0$. This transformation can conveniently be described with the help of an auxiliary n -dimensional Hilbert space \mathbf{C}^n and a fixed orthonormal basis $\{|i\rangle\}$ for this space. Then we can identify the collection of densities $\rho_i(t)$ with a density matrix $\varrho(t)$ on the extended space

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}} = \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathbf{C}^n \quad (42)$$

through the relation

$$\varrho(t) = \sum_i \rho_i(t) \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|. \quad (43)$$

This density matrix can be regarded as a block diagonal matrix

$$\varrho(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_1(t) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_2(t) & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \rho_n(t) \end{pmatrix} \quad (44)$$

with blocks $\rho_i(t)$ along the main diagonal. Moreover, the reduced density matrix $\rho_S(t)$ is obtained by the partial trace of $\varrho(t)$ taken over the auxiliary space.

In close analog to Eq. (19) the dynamics may now be viewed as a transformation

$$V_t : \varrho(0) \mapsto \varrho(t) \quad (45)$$

that preserves the block diagonal structure. It is important to emphasize that V_t is *not* a quantum dynamical map in the usual sense because it is *not* an operation on the space of states of the reduced system, but rather a map on the extended state space. In fact, the transition from $\varrho(0)$ to the reduced density matrix $\rho_S(0) = \sum_i \rho_i(0)$ is connected with a loss of information on the initial correlations, such that from the mere knowledge of $\rho_S(0)$ the dynamical behavior cannot be reconstructed.

It may be shown that V_t can be extended to a completely positive map for operators on \mathcal{H}_{ext} . Hence, we can construct an embedding of the dynamical transformation into a Lindblad dynamics on the extended state space. This

is achieved by the requirement that there exist a Lindblad generator \mathcal{K} acting on operators of the extended state space which preserves the block diagonal structure:

$$\mathcal{K} \left(\sum_i \rho_i \otimes |i\rangle\langle i| \right) = \sum_i \mathcal{K}_i(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_n) \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|, \quad (46)$$

such that the time-evolution can be represented in the form

$$\sum_i \rho_i(t) \otimes |i\rangle\langle i| = e^{\mathcal{K}t} \left(\sum_i \rho_i(0) \otimes |i\rangle\langle i| \right). \quad (47)$$

One can show that a Lindblad generator \mathcal{K} with this property exists if and only if the densities $\rho_i(t)$ obey the master equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} \rho_i(t) = -i [H^i, \rho_i(t)] + \sum_{j\lambda} \left(R_\lambda^{ij} \rho_j(t) R_\lambda^{ij\dagger} - \frac{1}{2} \{ R_\lambda^{ji\dagger} R_\lambda^{ji}, \rho_i(t) \} \right). \quad (48)$$

The H^i are Hermitian operators on \mathcal{H}_S , while the R_λ^{ij} may be arbitrary operators on \mathcal{H}_S . The details of the proof of this statement can be found in Ref. [24].

Equation (48) represents the desired non-Markovian generalization of the Lindblad equation (18) for the case of a classically correlated projection superoperator. This equation has many physical applications. In fact, master equations of the form of Eq. (48) have been derived by several authors and applied to various models featuring pronounced non-Markovian effects [24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29].

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have reviewed the theoretical treatment of non-Markovian quantum dynamics within the framework of the projection operator techniques. It has been shown that an efficient description of strong non-Markovian effects is made possible through the construction of correlated projection superoperators \mathcal{P} . The central idea behind this construction is to take into account large system-environment correlations by an extension of the set of dynamical variables. In fact, employing a correlated projection superoperator instead of a product-state projection, one enlarges the set of dynamical variables from the reduced density matrix ρ_S to a collection of densities ρ_i describing system states that are correlated with certain environmental states.

General physical conditions for a large class of correlated projection superoperators have been formulated, demanding essentially that \mathcal{P} can be expressed in terms of a projective quantum channel that operates on the environmental variables. These conditions lead to a representation theorem for correlated projection superoperators and to a non-Markovian generalization of the Lindblad equation that is capable of modelling long memory times and large initial correlations, while preserving the physical conditions of positivity and normalization.

The method developed here has many applications to physically relevant models featuring non-Markovian dynamics. The investigated class of projections does not exhaust all possibilities. Future investigations should include the formulation of further classes of correlated projections, the study of time-dependent generators, as well as the application of correlated maps that project onto nonseparable, entangled quantum states.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Francesco Petruccione, Daniel Burgarth, Jan Fischer, Jochen Gemmer, Mathias Michel, and Bassano Vacchini for many fruitful discussions.

-
- [1] H. P. Breuer, F. Petruccione: *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, Oxford 2007)
 - [2] F. Haake, R. Reibold: Phys. Rev. A **32**, 2462 (1985)
 - [3] B. L. Hu, J. P. Paz, Y. Zhang: Phys. Rev. D **45**, 2843 (1992)
 - [4] H. Grabert, P. Schramm, G.-L. Ingold: Phys. Rep. **168**, 115 (1988)
 - [5] P. Štelmachovič, V. Bužek: Phys. Rev. A **64**, 062106 (2001); Phys. Rev. A **67**, 029902(E) (2003)

- [6] J. Schliemann, A. Khaetskii, D. Loss: J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **15**, R1809 (2003)
- [7] J. Gemmer, M. Michel: Europhys. Lett. **73**, 1 (2006)
- [8] J. Gemmer, M. Michel, G. Mahler, *Quantum Thermodynamics*, Lecture Notes in Physics, vol 657 (Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York 2004)
- [9] M. Michel, G. Mahler, J. Gemmer: Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 180602 (2005)
- [10] S. Nakajima: Progr. Theor. Phys. **20**, 948 (1958)
- [11] R. Zwanzig: J. Chem. Phys. **33**, 1338 (1960)
- [12] F. Haake: *Statistical Treatment of Open Systems*, Springer Tracts in Modern Physics, vol 66 (Springer, Berlin 1973)
- [13] R. Kubo, M. Toda, N. Hashitsume: *Statistical Physics II. Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics* (Springer, Berlin 1991)
- [14] F. Shibata, Y. Takahashi, N. Hashitsume: J. Stat. Phys. **17**, 171 (1977)
- [15] S. Chaturvedi, F. Shibata: Z. Phys. B **35**, 297 (1979)
- [16] F. Shibata, T. Arimitsu: J. Phys. Soc. Jap. **49**, 891 (1980)
- [17] C. Uchiyama, F. Shibata: Phys. Rev. E **60**, 2636 (1999)
- [18] A. Royer: Phys. Lett. A **315**, 335 (2003)
- [19] H. P. Breuer: Phys. Rev. A **70**, 012106 (2004)
- [20] V. Gorini, A. Kossakowski, E. C. G. Sudarshan: J. Math. Phys. **17**, 821 (1976)
- [21] G. Lindblad: Commun. Math. Phys. **48**, 119 (1976)
- [22] H. Spohn: Rev. Mod. Phys. **52**, 569 (1980)
- [23] H. P. Breuer, D. Burgarth, F. Petruccione: Phys. Rev. B **70**, 045323 (2004)
- [24] H. P. Breuer: Phys. Rev. A **75**, 022103 (2007)
- [25] H. P. Breuer, J. Gemmer, M. Michel, Phys. Rev. E **73**, 016139 (2006)
- [26] A. A. Budini: Phys. Rev. A **74**, 053815 (2006)
- [27] A. A. Budini: Phys. Rev. E **72**, 056106 (2005)
- [28] M. Esposito, P. Gaspard: Phys. Rev. E **68**, 066112 (2003)
- [29] M. Esposito, P. Gaspard, Phys. Rev. E **68**, 066113 (2003)
- [30] R. Kubo: J. Math. Phys. **4**, 174 (1963)
- [31] A. Royer: Phys. Rev. A **6**, 1741 (1972)
- [32] N. G. van Kampen: Physica **74**, 215 (1974)
- [33] N. G. van Kampen: Physica **74**, 239 (1974)
- [34] A. Royer: Aspects of Open Quantum Dynamics. In: *Irreversible Quantum Dynamics*, Lecture Notes in Physics, vol 622, ed by F. Benatti, R. Floreanini (Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York 2003) pp 47-63
- [35] S. Tasaki et al: Annals of Physics **322**, 631 (2007)
- [36] K. Yuasa et al: Annals of Physics **322**, 657 (2007)
- [37] B. Vacchini: Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 1374 (2000)
- [38] B. Vacchini: J. Math. Phys. **42**, 4291 (2001)
- [39] K. Hornberger: Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 060601 (2006)
- [40] V. Romero-Rochin, I. Oppenheim: Physica A **155**, 52 (1989)
- [41] V. Romero-Rochin, A. Orsky, I. Oppenheim: Physica A **156**, 244 (1989)
- [42] V. Gorini, M. Verri, A. Frigerio: Physica A **161**, 357 (1989)
- [43] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, K. Horodecki: *Quantum entanglement*, arXiv:quant-ph/0702225