

Decoherence or the Loschmidt echo

Bernardo Casabone,¹ Ignacio García-Mata,^{2,*} and Diego A. Wisniacki¹

¹*Departamento de Física, FCEyN, UBA, Pabellón 1 Ciudad Universitaria, C1428EGA Buenos Aires, Argentina*

²*Departamento de Física, Lab. TANDAR, Comisión Nacional de Energía Atómica,
Av. del Libertador 8250, C1429BNP Buenos Aires, Argentina*

(Dated: April 20, 2019)

The Loschmidt echo and the purity are two quantities that can provide invaluable information about the evolution of a quantum system. While the Loschmidt echo typically characterizes instability and sensitivity to perturbations, purity measures the loss of coherence produced by an environment coupled to the system. For classically chaotic systems both quantities display a number of – supposedly universal – regimes that can lead on to think of them as equivalent quantities. We present numerical evidence of the fundamental differences between them.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Yz, 03.67.-a, 05.45.Mt

Some of the latest breakthroughs in theoretical and experimental quantum physics have permitted among other things to explore and manipulate new states of matter – like Bose-Einstein condensates – and also manipulate small numbers of atoms or ions making it possible to test some of the assertions of relatively new areas of research like quantum information. Two of the main problems that affect the achievement of such advances are uncontrolled coupling to an environment and irreversibility caused by sensitivity to small perturbations of the quantum evolution.

The presence of a coupling to an external bath introduces decoherence [1]. By definition decoherence washes out interference terms due to quantum superposition. One way of characterizing the decrease of the interference terms caused by decoherence is by measuring the purity of the system as a function of time. For classically chaotic systems it was conjectured [2] and numerically shown [2, 3] that for a certain range of values, the exponential decay of purity is independent of the coupling strength and is characterized by the Lyapunov exponent of the classical counterpart. Complementarily, to characterize irreversibility and instability arising from the chaotic nature of systems the Loschmidt echo (LE) – also known as fidelity – has been used [4, 5, 6]. The idea is to study the overlap as a function of time of two states evolving with slightly different evolution operators characterized by some perturbation parameter Σ . As a function of time there are three well identified regimes: parabolic or Gaussian for very short times; exponential for intermediate times followed by a saturation depending on the Hilbert space size. Here we concentrate on the Σ dependence for the exponential decay regime. This regimes are obtained after performing an average, that can be done either over an ensemble of perturbations or of initial states. The averaging performed to compute the Loschmidt echo can be treated in analogy to the effects of decoherence and it is claimed – or expected [7] – that at least for classically chaotic systems, since they exhibit the same decay rates, they provide *essentially* the same information.

In the present contribution the aforementioned quantities are explored for systems with discrete Hilbert space, and which have a classically chaotic counterpart. We present nu-

merical evidence that, contrary to previous assumptions [7, 8], there are significant differences between the behaviors of the LE and the purity. *Both* in the small perturbation regime as well as for larger perturbations. While for small perturbations the LE shows the expected quadratic regime we show that the decay rate of the purity, as a function of coupling strength, depends –strongly– on the type of environment affecting the system. Furthermore, in the strong perturbation regime, the LE presents an oscillatory behavior that can mask the Lyapunov decay [9, 10]. A measurement of the fidelity decay in these regimes can thus give results that are far from the expected. Besides, the Lyapunov decay for the purity is only observed for special types of environment.

The systems we consider are quantum maps on the torus. The quantized torus has associated an N dimensional Hilbert space with Planck constant $\hbar = 1/2\pi N$, and the position basis $\{q_i\}_0^{N-1}$ and momentum basis $\{p_i\}_0^{N-1}$ are related by the discrete Fourier transform (DFT). We consider quantum maps U whose classical counterpart are chaotic. For simplicity, we use maps that can be implemented as two kicks

$$U = e^{i2\pi NT(p)} e^{-i2\pi NV(q)}, \quad (1)$$

which can be efficiently implemented using the DFT (through the fast Fourier transform) and many of which have been implemented experimentally – e.g [11] – and have efficient quantum algorithms – e.g. [12]. The corresponding classical map is

$$\begin{aligned} p' &= p - \frac{dV(q)}{dq} \\ q' &= q - \frac{dT(p')}{dp'} \pmod{1}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

In particular for numerical calculations we use the perturbed cat map

$$\begin{aligned} p' &= p + aq + 2\pi k(\cos[2\pi q] - \cos[4\pi q]) \\ q' &= q + bp' \pmod{1}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

with a, b integers. This map is chaotic with largest Lyapunov exponent $\lambda \approx \ln((2 + ab + \sqrt{ab(4 + ab)})/2)/2$, for $k \ll 1$.

For pure states the LE is defined as

$$M(t) = |\langle \psi | U_\Sigma^{\dagger t} U^t | \psi \rangle|^2, \quad (4)$$

where Σ represents a perturbation from the original map. In Eq. (3) the perturbation strength is modified as $k' = (k + \Sigma)$. Eq. (4) is dubbed “echo” because it measures the overlap between a state evolved forwards up to time t with U and then backwards with the slightly perturbed operator U_Σ . It can also be seen as a measure of the separation of two, initially identical states, evolved forwards with two slightly different evolution operators. If the classical dynamics is chaotic, on average the LE $M(t)$ decays exponentially with a decay rate Γ_{LE} [6].




FIG. 1: Decay rate Γ of the LE as a function rescaled coefficient $\Sigma/\hbar$. The map is the quantum version of the perturbed cat [Eq. (3)] with $(\odot)$ $a = b = 2$; $(\bullet)$ $a = b = 4$. Other parameters are: $k = 0.0002$, $N = 2^{20}$, and 1024 randomly chosen initial states. The lines are: (dashed) $(\Sigma/\hbar)^2$. The horizontal dotted lines correspond to the lyapunov exponents of the corresponding maps: (below) $\lambda = \ln[3 + 2\sqrt{2}] \approx 1.76275$; (above) $\ln[9 + 4\sqrt{5}] \approx 2.88727$. The inset shows the same in log-log scale where the quadratic small- Σ regime is best appreciated.

In Fig. 1 we plot the decay rate Γ_{LE} as a function of the rescaled perturbation $\Sigma/\hbar$. For the averaging, we randomly pick uniformly distributed coherent –minimal uncertainty– states. We can see that for small perturbation strength the behavior is, as expected, $\Gamma_{LE} \propto \Sigma^2$ (FGR regime). For larger perturbation strengths, the decay rate is not as commonly predicted in the literature [see [13] and references therein] –with some exceptions, e.g. [14, 15]– perturbation independent behavior. We find oscillations behavior near the value λ , where λ is the Lyapunov exponent of the classical system. These oscillations can be understood through the local density of states (LDOS). For finite dimensional Hilbert space the LDOS grows quadratically with the perturbation up to a point where it starts to oscillate. If the mean value of the oscillatory part is comparable or smaller than the classical Lyapunov exponent, then the oscillatory behavior is reflected in the echo. If, on the contrary, the Lyapunov exponent is much smaller than the mean value of the oscillations of the LDOS, then no oscillations are appreciated in the LE [10]. The important thing to remark is that, after the FGR behavior, the decay of the LE is *not* perturbation independent. This can explain the difficulty to find the Lyapunov regime in echo experiments [16].

We now consider evolution in the presence of an environment. Interaction between system and environment produces global state which is non-separable, i.e. entangled. Once we trace out the environment degrees of freedom the evolution of the system becomes non-unitary with a consequent loss of coherence. One way to measure the effect of decoherence is through the purity [17] $P(t) = \text{tr}(\rho_t^2)$ with $P(t) = 1$ if ρ is pure and $P(t) = 1/N$ for a maximally mixed state.

Instead of studying the evolution of system plus environment and then tracing the environment out, we model directly the effect of the environment as a map of density matrices, or superoperator which, for Markovian environment and weak coupling, can be written in Kraus operator sum form [18]. The decoherence models we use can be expressed as a weighed sum of unitary operations

$$\rho' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{D}_\varepsilon(\rho) = \sum_{p,q=0}^{N-1} c_\varepsilon(q,p) T_{qp} \rho T_{qp}^\dagger \quad (5)$$

where T_{qp} are the translation operators on the torus, $c_\varepsilon(q,p)$ is a function of q and p and ε characterizes the strength. The Kraus form implies complete positivity and the trace is preserved if $\sum_{q,p} c_\varepsilon(q,p) = 1$. Furthermore, as T_{qp} are unitary, the identity is preserved, i.e. the map $\mathbf{D}_\varepsilon$ is unital. Although position and momentum operators are not well defined in discrete Hilbert space, translations can be defined as cyclic shifts [19]. In Ref. [20] it is shown that a variety of noise superoperators can be implemented in the form of Eq. (5). The interpretation is simple: with probability $c_\varepsilon(q,p)$ every possible translation in phase space is applied to ρ (incoherently). The complete map with decoherence takes place then in two steps, the unitary followed by the nonunitary part $\rho' = \mathbf{D}_\varepsilon(U\rho U^\dagger)$. This is an approximation that works exactly in some cases, e.g. a billiard that has elastic collisions on the walls and diffusion in the free evolution between collisions.

To model diffusive decoherence we can define

$$c_\varepsilon(q,p) = \frac{1}{A} \exp \left[-\frac{q^2 + p^2}{2 \left(\frac{N\varepsilon}{2\pi} \right)^2} \right], \quad (6)$$

periodized to fit the torus boundary conditions. We will call this model Gaussian diffusion model (GDM). The decoherent effect of GDM is evident: suppose we have a Shrödinger cat state that exhibits interference fringes in the Wigner function. Eq. (5) written for the Wigner function of ρ results

$$W'(Q,P) = \sum_{q,p} c_\varepsilon(q,p) W(Q - q, P - p). \quad (7)$$

Then this incoherent sum of slightly displaced Wigner functions, with Gaussian weight, progressively washes out fast oscillating terms leaving only the classical part. Thus acts decoherence. The GDM is approximately equivalent to a thermal bath in the weak coupling limit. For a continuous Hilbert space, in the master equation formalism, the evolution equation of the Wigner is of Fokker-Planck type [2, 21, 22], with diffusion coefficient D proportional to $(N\varepsilon/2\pi)^2$.




FIG. 2: $-\ln(\text{tr}(\rho^2))$ computed for the perturbed cat map of Eq. (3) with $a = b = 2$ and $N = 2000$ for GDM with different values of ε . From bottom to top: $\varepsilon = 0.0001, \dots, 0.01$. The horizontal (dot-dash) line is $\ln(N)$ while the slope of the dashed line is $\lambda = \ln[3 + 2\sqrt{2}]$.

In continuous Hilbert space and in the presence of GDM type decoherence, the behavior of the purity as a function of the decoherence strength ε [for small ε] is equivalent to that of the LE as a function Σ [7, 8], i.e. the decay rate Γ_ε depends quadratically for small ε . After a critical value it becomes independent of the environment and results $\Gamma_\varepsilon = \lambda$ [2, 8].

Looking at Fig. 2 we could conclude this is indeed the case for finite dimensional systems as well. The purity decays exponentially with a decay rate increasing with ε up to a certain point where it saturates at the Lyapunov exponent. However the small ε regime is quite different as can be observed in Fig. 3. For the GDM [Fig. 3, top] if ε is very small, of order $1/N$ then the probability of applying any translation is negligibly small. Thus for $\varepsilon \lesssim 1/N$ there is no decoherence and the purity remains constant and equal to unity. For larger decoherence strengths, the purity decays exponentially but the dependence of Γ_ε is not quadratic. We remark that all the calculations done for the purity do not need any kind of averaging. Figs. 2 and 3 were obtained using a *single* Gaussian initial state.

We can derive an approximate analytic expression for the small ε regime. If we assume $\partial_t \text{tr} \rho^2 \equiv \Delta \text{tr}(\rho_{n+1})^2 = \text{tr}(\rho_{n+1}^2) - \text{tr}(\rho_n^2) = -\Gamma_\varepsilon \text{tr}(\rho_n^2)$, then from Eqs. (5) and (6), if $\varepsilon \ll 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho' \approx & c_\varepsilon(0,0)\rho + c_\varepsilon(0,1)T_{0,1}\rho T_{0,1}^\dagger + c_\varepsilon(1,0)T_{1,0}\rho T_{1,0}^\dagger \\ & + c_\varepsilon(-1,0)T_{-1,0}\rho T_{-1,0}^\dagger + c_\varepsilon(0,-1)T_{0,-1}\rho T_{0,-1}^\dagger. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

We want to take the square of the trace, so the first approximation we take is $\text{tr}(\rho T_{i,j} \rho T_{i,j}^\dagger)_{i,j=0,1} \approx \text{tr}(\rho^2)$, and we neglect higher order terms as well as higher order translations (even $T_{1(-1),1(-1)}$). Thus we have $\text{tr} \rho'^2 - \text{tr} \rho^2 \approx (c_\varepsilon(0,0)^2 + 4c_\varepsilon(0,1)^2 - 1)\text{tr} \rho^2$. Now, neglecting also higher order terms

in the normalization [remember that $\sum_{q,p} c_\varepsilon(q,p) = 1$], we get

$$\Delta \text{tr} \rho^2 \approx -4 \frac{\exp(-2\pi^2/(\varepsilon N)^2) + 4\exp(-2\pi^2/(\varepsilon N)^2)^2}{(1 + 4\exp(-2\pi^2/(\varepsilon N)^2) + \dots)^2} \text{tr} \rho^2 \quad (9)$$

[see Fig. 3, top panel, dashed line]. For small ε we can of course neglect the terms coming from periodic boundary conditions.

In order to attain the quadratic dependence of Γ_ε for small coupling, observed in continuous Hilbert space, $c_\varepsilon(q,p)$ should have tails that decay slower than Gaussian, i.e. long distance correlations in phase-space. We can for example take a well known decoherence channel for quantum information processing, the depolarizing channel (DC) [23], which is also a convex sum of unitaries and can be simply written in terms of translations in phase space [20]

$$\mathbf{D}_\varepsilon^{\text{DC}} = (1 - \varepsilon)\rho + \frac{\varepsilon}{N^2} \sum_{q,p \neq 0} T_{qp} \rho T_{qp}^\dagger \quad (10)$$

Following a similar reasoning as the one followed to obtain Eq. (9) we get, for $\varepsilon \ll 1$, $\Gamma_\varepsilon = 2\varepsilon$ [see Fig 3, middle]. The DPC is an extreme case to consider as phase space decoherence because it is highly non-local: with the same probability it implements every possible translation T_{qp} ($q, p \neq 0$). Therefore, there is no reason to expect a Lyapunov regime in this case. In fact for ε close to 1, the dynamics is dominated by the environment. The non-locality of DC has also devastating effects on the entangling power of the algorithms that implement chaotic maps [24].

To reproduce the FGR quadratic regime we thus need a decoherence model which is peaked at $c_\varepsilon(0,0)$ and which has polynomially decaying tails. We propose to take a Lorentzian

$$c_\varepsilon(q,p) = \frac{1}{\pi A} \sum_{j,k=-x}^x \frac{\frac{\varepsilon N}{2\pi}}{\left(\left(\frac{\varepsilon N}{2\pi}\right)^2 + (q - Nj)^2 + (p - Nk)^2\right)} \quad (11)$$

with A the proper normalization for $\sum_{q,p} c_\varepsilon(q,p) = 1$. We will call this case Lorentz decoherence model (LDM). The sum is done to account for the periodicity of the torus (theoretically $x \rightarrow \infty$, practically x is an integer much larger than 1). Long tail decoherence was also considered in Ref. [25] where it was shown that the decoherence rates can be tuned to power law decay in cold atom experiments.

In Fig. 3 [bottom], we show Γ_ε for the LDM. The quadratic dependence is clearly observed. As in the DC model the Lyapunov regime is not present. Larger ε implies longer Lorentzian tails which, when periodized sum up to non negligible non-local effects all over phase space. This is why for the LDM not only is the Lyapunov regime also not present but the decay rate of the purity continues to grow indefinitely. A combination of both GDM and LDM, so that the former dominates at larger ε and the latter dominates for smaller ε would yield both the FGR regime and the Lyapunov regime. Decoherence combining both Gaussian and Lorentzian processes was studied e.g. in [26].




FIG. 3: (Color online) Decay rate Γ of the purity as a function decoherence coefficient ε (in log-log scale) for noise models: (top) GDM; (middle) DC; (bottom) LDM. The map is the perturbed cat of Eq. (3) with $a = b = 1$ and $k = 0.01$, $N = 800$. The (dashed) lines for the GDM and DC are approximate ($\varepsilon \ll 1$) analytic calculations. The (dashed) line in the bottom panel, for LDM, is a numerical fit: (top) $\Gamma_\varepsilon = 4 \frac{\exp(-2\pi^2/(\varepsilon N)^2) + 4\exp(-2\pi^2/(\varepsilon N)^2)^2}{(1 + 4\exp(-2\pi^2/(\varepsilon N)^2) + \dots)^2}$; (middle) $\Gamma_\varepsilon = 2\varepsilon$; (bottom) $\Gamma_\varepsilon \propto \varepsilon^2$. The horizontal (red-dotted) line corresponds to $\lambda = \ln[(3 + \sqrt{5})/2]$.

To summarize, the LE and the purity for systems with discrete Hilbert space has been analyzed. We have shown that though they can exhibit qualitative similarities, they are fundamentally very different: the small coupling regime for the purity is not quadratic but depends on the environment model. Moreover, while the large perturbation regime for the LE can present high amplitude oscillations around the classical Lyapunov exponent depending on the LDOS, for the purity it depends decidedly on the type of decoherence. Only decoherence that acts *locally* in phase space exhibits the – environment independent – Lyapunov regime. Thus, we remark that

the LE and the purity provide intrinsically different information. Our analysis is valid for discrete Hilbert space and is thus well suited for quantum information and simulation of chaotic systems where this two quantities are paramount.

The authors acknowledge financial support from CONICET (PIP-6137), UBACyT (X237) and ANPCyT. D.A.W. and I. G.-M. are researchers of CONICET. Discussions with M. Saraceno are thankfully acknowledged.

* Electronic address: garciama@tandar.cnea.gov.ar

- [1] W. H. Zurek, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 715 (2003).
- [2] W. H. Zurek and J. P. Paz, Phys. Rev. Lett **72**, 2508 (1994).
- [3] D. Monteoliva and J. P. Paz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3373 (2000).
- [4] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. A **30**, 1610 (1984).
- [5] R. A. Jalabert and H. M. Pastawski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2490 (2001).
- [6] Ph Jacquod, P. G. Silvestrov, and C. W. J. Beenakker, Phys. Rev. E **64**, 055203 (2001).
- [7] F. Cucchietti, D. Dalvit, J. Paz, and W. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 210403 (2003).
- [8] C. Petitjean and P. Jacquod, Phys. Rev. Lett **97**, 124103 (2006).
- [9] W. Wang, G. Casati, B. Li, and T. Prosen, Phys. Rev. E **71**, 037202 (2005).
- [10] N. Ares and D. A. Wisniacki, arXiv:0908.0702 (2009).
- [11] F. L. Moore, J. C. Robinson, C. F. Bharucha, B. Sundaram, and M. G. Raizen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4598 (1995).
- [12] B. Georgeot and D. L. Shepelyansky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5393 (2001); B. Lévy and B. Georgeot, Phys. Rev. E **70**, 056218 (2004).
- [13] T. Gorin, T. Prosen, T. Seligman, and M. Žnidarič, Physics Reports **435**, 33 (2006).
- [14] P. G. Silvestrov, J. Tworzydło, and C. W. J. Beenakker, Phys. Rev. E **67**, 025204 (2003).
- [15] W. Wang, G. Casati, and B. Li, Phys. Rev. E **69**, 025201 (2004).
- [16] M. F. Andersen, A. Kaplan, T. Grunzweig, and N. Davidson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 104102 (2006).
- [17] D. A. Wisniacki and F. Toscano, Phys. Rev. E **79**, 025203 (2009).
- [18] K. Kraus, *States, Effects and Operations* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983).
- [19] J. Schwinger, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. **46**, 570 (1960).
- [20] M. L. Aolita, I. Garcia-Mata, and M. Saraceno, Phys Rev A **70**, 062301 (2004).
- [21] W. T. Strunz and I. C. Percival, J. Phys. A: Mathematical and General **31**, 1801 (1998).
- [22] A. R. R. Carvalho, R. L. de Matos Filho, and L. Davidovich, Phys. Rev. E **70**, 026211 (2004).
- [23] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2000), ISBN 521635039.
- [24] I. Garcia-Mata, A. R. R. Carvalho, F. Mintert, and A. Buchleitner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 120504 (2007).
- [25] H. Schomerus and E. Lutz, Phys. Rev. Lett **98**, 260401 (2007).
- [26] B. Vacchini, Phys. Rev. Lett **95**, 230402 (2005).