

# Quantum Conditions on Dynamics and Control in Open Systems

Lian-Ao Wu, Arjun Bharioke and Paul Brumer

*Center for Quantum Information and Quantum Control,  
and Chemical Physics Theory Group, Department of Chemistry,  
University of Toronto, 80 St. George Street, Toronto, Ontario M5S 3H6, Canada*

Quantum conditions on the control of dynamics of a system coupled to an environment are obtained. Specifically, consider a system initially in a system subspace  $H_0$  of dimensionality  $M_0$ , which evolves to populate system subspaces  $H_1, H_2$  of dimensionality  $M_1, M_2$ . Then there always exists an initial state in  $H_0$  that does not evolve into  $H_2$  if  $M_0 > dM_2$ , where  $2 \leq d \leq (M_0 + M_1 + M_2)^2$  is the number of operators in the Kraus representation. Note, significantly, that the maximum  $d$  can be far smaller than the dimension of the bath. If this condition is not satisfied then dynamics from  $H_0$  that avoids  $H_2$  can only be attained physically under stringent conditions. An example from molecular dynamics and spectroscopy, i.e. donor to acceptor energy transfer, is provided.

The study of open quantum systems[1, 2, 3] is of great current interest, a consequence of the desire to understand and manipulate devices that are reliant on quantum effects. Of particular interest is the control of such quantum systems, with coherent control[4, 5] being a most promising approach.

The essential principle of the coherent control of atomic and molecular processes relies on the creation of multiple interfering pathways to the same final state [4, 5]. Manipulation of laboratory parameters that affect these coherent pathways then allows direct control over the associated interference contributions, and hence control over the relative cross sections involved in the process. Numerous theoretical scenarios and experimental results, in a host of applications, have successfully demonstrated such control.

Despite the importance and generality of the field, there are remarkably few formal results that provide necessary and sufficient conditions under which complete control of the system dynamics is possible. These include theorems such as that of Huang-Tarn-Clark[6], a theorem by Ramakrisnan *et al.* on the dimensionality of the Lie Algebra induced by the interaction between the system and the control field [7], and a theorem by Shapiro and Brumer[8], where control was shown to depend on the dimensionality of the controlled subspaces. These theorems all deal with closed systems, i.e. those that are not in contact with an environment. Real quantum systems are, however, not isolated. They often interact with a surrounding environment, which is regarded as an uncontrolled system of arbitrarily large dimension. As a result the system is open to its environment, and proofs regarding control in open systems are becoming the focus of serious attention. For example, Reference [9] provides formal theorems on controllability in open system dynamics treated via the Kraus representation.

In this letter we significantly generalize a prior argument[8] for closed systems and obtain quantum control conditions in open systems. We show that the condition for a specific control problem in open systems is stronger than that in closed systems, but that the rela-

tive dimensionality of the different subspaces remains a crucial determinant of controllability. In addition, our approach gives the solution to the control problem when it is achievable, and provides a constructive method for extending various closed system proofs to the open system case.

To expose the difference between the open and closed cases, to adopt a common notation, and to provide a generalized formalism, we first reconsider the closed system[8]. Consider a system whose Hamiltonian eigenstates are partitioned into bases for three subspaces:  $H_0, H_1, H_2$ , of dimensionality  $M_0, M_1$  and  $M_2$ , respectively. Let the basis vectors  $|i, n_i\rangle$  span the subspace  $H_i$ , where  $i = 0, 1, 2$  labels the subspace and  $n_i = 1, \dots, M_i$  labels the states in  $H_i$ . The total dimension of the system is  $M = M_0 + M_1 + M_2$ . A superposition of basis vectors from  $H_0$  is chosen as the initial state. We assume that the system initially resides in  $M_0$  and that the state can flow into the other two subspaces under the dynamics. The question under consideration is: under what conditions can one prevent dynamics into the subspace  $H_2$ , by preparing states in  $H_0$  that go solely into  $H_1$ ? To resolve this problem, Ref. [8] considered linear superpositions of states in  $H_0$  and utilized interference between the resultant paths to  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  in order to control the dynamics.

Using the evolution operator,  $U$  we have:

$$|\psi\rangle = U |\psi_0\rangle \quad (1)$$

where  $|\psi_0\rangle$  is the initial superposition in  $M_0$  and  $|\psi\rangle$  denotes the final state. With  $U$  represented as an  $M \times M$  dimensional matrix, and  $|\psi\rangle$  expressed as an  $M$  column matrix we can examine the number of simultaneous equations that need to be solved for  $|\psi\rangle$  to have zero population in the rows corresponding to  $H_2$ . Using this approach, Ref. [8] obtained conditions on the relative dimensionality of the different spaces by requiring

$$\langle 2, k_2 | U |\psi_0\rangle = 0 \quad (2)$$

for all states  $k_2$  in  $H_2$ . Specifically, they showed that if  $M_0 > M_2$ , it is always possible to prevent transi-

tions from  $H_0$  into  $H_2$ . By contrast, a large number of difficult-to-satisfy linear dependence conditions are required to prevent transitions if  $M_0 \leq M_2$ . Significantly, the result only depends on the dimensionality  $M_0$  and  $M_2$  of these two subspaces.

Consider then the same system, but where it is now open to an environment, which can be either finite or infinite dimensional, and that may, or may not, be in the presence of external fields. As is typically the case, we assume that the system can be addressed (e.g. via laser excitation) to prepare the initial state, but that the environment remains unaffected. Further, we assume that the initial system-bath density matrix  $\rho_{tot}(0) = \rho(0) \otimes \rho_B(0)$  is a separable product of the initial system  $\rho(0)$ , usually a pure state that can be selectively prepared, and initial bath  $\rho_B(0)$  density matrix[10]. The open system after evolution can be characterized by an  $M \times M$  reduced density matrix  $\rho$ , defined as  $\rho = \text{Tr}_B \rho_{tot}$ , where  $\rho_{tot}$  is the final time total system-bath density matrix and  $\text{Tr}_B$  indicates a trace over the bath. Focusing on the reduced density matrix (i.e.  $\rho_{tot}$  traced over the bath) allows us to continue to use the concept of dimensionality in an open system. In general, the reduced density matrix evolves according to a linear transformation

$$\rho = \sum_{\alpha, \beta} A^\alpha \rho(0) B^\beta \quad (3)$$

For instance, in the case of natural quantum evolution, denoting the propagator for the full (system + bath) as  $U$ , we have that

$$\rho_{tot} = U \rho_{tot}(0) U^\dagger = U \rho(0) \otimes \rho_B(0) U^\dagger, \quad (4)$$

where we have used the separability of  $\rho_{tot}$  at time zero. In general  $\rho_B(0) = \sum_{a,b} p_{ab} |a\rangle \langle b|$ , where  $|a\rangle$  and  $|b\rangle$ , and the  $|e\rangle$  below, are eigenstates of the bath Hamiltonian. By tracing Eq. (4) over the bath coordinates, we have that

$$\rho = \sum_{e,a,b} A^{a,e} \rho(0) B^{a,b,e} \quad (5)$$

with  $A^{a,e} = \langle e|U|a\rangle$  and  $B^{a,b,e} = p_{ab} \langle b|U^\dagger|e\rangle$ .

Under the assumption of complete positivity [11], Eq. (3) simplifies and the reduced density matrix evolves according to the operator-sum representation (i.e. the canonical Kraus representation), which is generic physically for the initial product density matrix [3]:

$$\rho = \sum_{\alpha=1}^d E^\alpha \rho(0) E^{\alpha\dagger} \quad (6)$$

Here the sum over Kraus operators[11]  $E^\alpha$  is such that  $\sum_{\alpha=1}^d E^{\alpha\dagger} E^\alpha \leq I$ . Specifically,  $\sum_{\alpha=1}^d E^{\alpha\dagger} E^\alpha = I$  for trace-preserving quantum operations and  $\sum_{\alpha=1}^d E^\alpha E^{\alpha\dagger} < I$  for non-trace-preserving quantum operations such as quantum measurements. Note,

significantly, that the operator-sum representation has at most  $M^2$  Kraus operators, i.e.,  $2 < d \leq M^2$  and that the operators are fixed by the given system, bath and any incident external fields.

We continue below to consider the general form [Eq. (3)], but subsequently focus on evolution under the Kraus representation.

Note first that Eq. (3) means that the operator  $\rho(0)$  can be linearly transformed into the operator  $\rho$ . If we denote the operation connecting the matrix  $\rho(0)$  to  $\rho$  by  $V$ , then  $V$ , in a particular representation, is a matrix with four subscripts. That is,

$$\rho_{ts} = \sum_{t's'} V_{ts't's'} \rho_{t's'}(0)$$

where  $t$  or  $s$  denotes the indices  $(i, n_i)$  of the basis vectors  $|i, n_i\rangle$ . Rewriting  $\rho$  as  $M^2$  dimensional column vector denoted  $\tilde{\rho}$ , Eq. (6) can be equivalently rewritten as:

$$\tilde{\rho} = \tilde{V} \tilde{\rho}(0) \quad (7)$$

where the explicit form of the  $M^2 \times M^2$  matrix  $\tilde{V}$  is

$$\tilde{V} = \sum_{\alpha, \beta} A^\alpha \otimes B^\beta$$

Equation (7) is seen to have the same form as Eq. (1), allowing the approach used earlier for a closed system to be extended to open systems. Consider then an initial reduced density matrix that is in  $H_0$ , i.e.

$$\rho(0) = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{M_0} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\rho_{M_0}$  is an  $M_0 \times M_0$  matrix. In order to prevent dynamics from going into  $H_2$ , we require

$$\rho_{(2,k_2)(2,k_2)} = 0 \quad (8)$$

For the case of interest the Kraus representation applies so that a propagated initial pure state  $\rho_{M_0} = |\psi_0\rangle \langle \psi_0|$ , becomes

$$\rho_{(2,k_2)(j,n_j)} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^d \langle 2, k_2 | E^\alpha | \psi_0 \rangle \langle \psi_0 | E^{\alpha\dagger} | j, n_j \rangle$$

Given that the diagonal element  $\rho_{(2,k_2)(2,k_2)}$  is  $\sum_{\alpha=1}^d |\langle 2, k_2 | E^\alpha | \psi_0 \rangle|^2$ , satisfying  $\rho_{(2,k_2)(2,k_2)} = 0$  means requiring

$$\langle 2, k_2 | E^\alpha | \psi_0 \rangle = 0 \quad (9)$$

This being the case, demanding zero population in  $H_2$  also implies that all elements  $\rho_{(2,k_2)(j,n_j)}$ , which include coherences with the  $H_2$  Hilbert subspace, are also zero.

Equation (9) has a nontrivial solution if  $M_0 > dM_2$ , and control via initial state preparation is achievable no

matter what the form or dynamics of the  $d$ -dimensional Kraus operators. Further, this equation provides the initial state that allows for the desired control. However, this control condition is, as expected, far more stringent in the open system than in the closed system case, where  $d = 1$ . Note, however, that the bath effects are still limited. The minimum  $d$  can be [12] as small as two, and the maximum  $d$  is  $M^2$ , which can be far smaller than the dimensionality of the bath.

If  $M_0 \leq dM_2$ , control via initial state preparation is also far more difficult in the open system than in the (already difficult) closed system case. Define a  $dM_2 \times M_0$  dimensional matrix  $W$  with matrix elements  $W_{(2k,\alpha),(0n)} = \langle 2, k | E^\alpha | 0, n \rangle$ . In the case where  $M_0 \leq dM_2$ , the rank of  $W$  is equal to  $M_0$  unless all  $M_0 \times M_0$  dimensional submatrices of  $W$  are singular. Hence, non-trivial solutions to Eq. (9) exist if  $\det(W_{M_0, M_0}^{(k)}) = 0$ , where  $(k)$  numbers all of the submatrices. This condition also implies that a set of columns of  $W$  are linearly dependent. Hence control is possible for a *specific* class of  $W$ , expected to be difficult to obtain physically,

Note that the definition of the subspaces  $H_i$  and associated dimensions  $M_i$  can, in some instances, also be manipulated. For example, in bound state systems (such as that in the example below) these subspaces can be defined by accessing only specific system eigenstates using a pulsed laser field. This facility might prove additionally useful in attempting to satisfy the  $M_0 > dM_2$  bound of this theorem.

These results allow numerous applications. Consider, for example, electronic energy transfer from donor to acceptor molecules, where both may be part of one larger molecule. These systems are ubiquitous, ranging from relatively small systems [13] to large structures such as carotenoid-to-bacteriochlorophyll energy transfer in photosynthesis [14]. The most interesting cases take place in condensed matter environments, i.e. open systems. Studies of the dynamics and spectroscopy of such systems can be carried out by laser excitation of the system from a lower electronic manifold (here  $H_0$ ) to the donor (here  $H_1$ ). Electronic energy transfer from the donor ( $H_1$ ) to the acceptor ( $H_2$ ) is then measured. Here, the subspaces  $H_i$ , and associated dimensions  $M_i$ , are determined by a combination of the molecular state densities and the width of the laser pulses that prepare a preliminary superposition of states on  $H_0$  and that subsequently excite the system into  $H_1$  and  $H_2$ .

In some systems of interest, excitation from  $H_0$  to the donor is contaminated by partial excitation of the acceptor as well, with a concomitant reduction in the quality of the data on the subsequent electronic energy transfer dynamics. A considerable improvement would result from being able to excite  $H_1$  with reduced population transfer to  $H_2$  from  $H_0$ . Results of the open system theorem indicate that this is (a) difficult to achieve physically if  $M_0 \leq dM_2$ , and (b) attainable if  $M_0 > dM_2$ . In the

latter case, one could ensure significantly reduced, and ideally zero, acceptor population at the target time. The extent to which this is achievable is dependent upon the particular system; specific systems of this type will be the subject of future study.

In summary, the quantum conditions obtained above are completely general, applying to both systems that are controlled, as well as to uncontrolled system evolution. The result establishes an important inequality between the dimension of the subspace  $M_2$  which we desire not to populate, the initial subspace  $M_0$  from which dynamics evolves, and the dimensionality of the Kraus representation. It is a dynamics-independent property of  $d$ -dimensional Kraus evolution. As long as the geometric condition  $M_0 \geq dM_2$  is satisfied, control via initial state preparation is achievable. Further, the fact that control can be achieved via initial state preparation, in the presence of an environment under the prescribed conditions, is useful for control applications in realistic systems.

Two supplementary remarks are in order. First, this theorem places emphasis on the importance of the dimensionality  $d$  of the Kraus representation, known to satisfy  $2 \leq d \leq (M_0 + M_1 + M_2)^2$ . Hence, these results should motivate further studies to determine the actual  $d$  for realistic systems. Second, we note that an analogous method to that described above can be used to extend other closed system proofs, such as those of Refs. [6] and [7], to open systems.

**Acknowledgments** We thank Professor R. Alicki for discussions on Kraus operators, and Professor G.D. Scholes for comments on donor-acceptor dynamics. This work was supported by NSERC Canada.

- 
- [1] R. Alicki and M. Fannes, *Quantum Dynamical Systems*, (Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2001)
  - [2] H. P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems*, (Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2002)
  - [3] K. Lendi, in F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, *Irreversible Quantum Dynamics*, (Springer, 2003)
  - [4] M. Shapiro and P. Brumer, *Principles of the Quantum Control of Molecular Processes* (Wiley, New York, 2003).
  - [5] S. A. Rice and M. Zhao, *Optical Control of Molecular Dynamics* (Wiley, New York, 2000).
  - [6] G. M. Huang, T. J. Tarn, and J. W. Clark, *J. Math. Phys.* **24**, 2608 (1983).
  - [7] V. Ramakrishna, M. V. Salapaka, M. Dahleh, H. Rabitz, and A. Peirce, *Phys. Rev. A* **51**, 960 (1995).
  - [8] M. Shapiro and P. Brumer, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **103**, 487 (1995).
  - [9] R. Wu, A. Pechen, C. Brif and H. Rabitz, *J. Phys. A* **40**, 5681 (2007).
  - [10] Here the notation  $\otimes$  denotes the direct product of two matrices. Specifically  $(A \otimes B)_{tst's'} = (A)_{tt'}(B)_{s's}$  for matrices  $A, B$ .
  - [11] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation*

*and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).

- [12] For the case of pure dephasing, R. Alicki has shown (private communication) that  $d$  can be as small as two.
- [13] X. Wang, D.H. Levy, M.B. Rubin and S. Speiser, J. Phys. Chem. A 104, 6558 (2000).
- [14] E.g., B.P. Krueger, G.D. Scholes, R. Jimenez and G.R. Fleming, J. Phys. Chem B, 102, 2284 (1998).