

# Quantum dynamics intervened by repeated nonselective measurements

Sergey N. Filippov<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Institutskii Per. 9, Dolgoprudny, Moscow Region 141700, Russia*

<sup>2</sup>*Institute of Physics and Technology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Nakhimovskii Pr. 34, Moscow 117218, Russia*

We derive the theory of open quantum system dynamics intervened by a series of nonselective measurements. We analyze the cases of time independent and time dependent Hamiltonian dynamics in between the measurements and find the approximate master equation in the stroboscopic limit. We also consider a situation, in which the measurement basis changes in time, and illustrate it by nonselective measurements in the basis of diabatic states of the Landau-Zener model.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum measurements are extensively used in practice to get the information about the system in interest (estimation [1], discrimination [2], comparison [3], tomography [4]), to modify the quantum state (conditional state preparation [5], quantum control [6–8]), and to probe parameters of physical fields (quantum sensing [9]). Quantum states are described by density operators that are positive semi-definite and have unit trace. In the process of a selective measurement, observation of outcome  $x$  results in transformation of the initial density operator  $\varrho$  into the conditional output state of the form

$$\varrho \rightarrow \varrho_x = \frac{\mathcal{I}_x[\varrho]}{\text{tr}[\mathcal{I}_x[\varrho]]}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{I}_x$  is a completely positive trace-decreasing map (quantum operation) [10]. Physically,  $p_x = \text{tr}[\mathcal{I}_x[\varrho]]$  is a probability of observing outcome  $x$ . The mapping  $x \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_x$  is usually referred to as an instrument. Disregarding measurement outcomes, we get a so-called nonselective measurement:

$$\varrho \rightarrow \Phi[\varrho] = \sum_x p_x \varrho_x = \sum_x \mathcal{I}_x[\varrho]. \quad (2)$$

Physical requirement  $\sum_x p_x = 1$  implies that  $\text{tr}[\sum_x \mathcal{I}_x[\varrho]] = \text{tr}[\varrho]$  for all density operators  $\varrho$ , i.e.  $\Phi$  is trace preserving.  $\Phi$  is also completely positive as a sum of completely positive maps, so  $\Phi$  is nothing else but a quantum channel [11]. Thus, a general nonselective measurement is merely a quantum channel. On the other hand, any quantum channel  $\Phi$  can be represented in the operator-sum form  $\Phi[\varrho] = \sum_m A_m \varrho A_m^\dagger$ , where  $\sum_m A_m^\dagger A_m = I$  (identity operator). Therefore, a quantum channel  $\Phi$  can be treated as a nonselective measurement with instrument operations  $\mathcal{I}_m[\varrho] = A_m \varrho A_m^\dagger$ .

If  $\mathcal{I}_x[\varrho] = \text{tr}[E_x \varrho] \omega_x$ , where  $x \rightarrow E_x$  is a positive operator-valued measure (POVM) with POVM elements  $E_x$ ,  $\{\omega_x\}$  is a set of density operators, then such a nonselective measurement describes a so-called measure-and-prepare procedure (a channel of Holevo form) [10, 11]. The corresponding channel  $\Phi$  is entanglement breaking in this case [11, 12].

Suppose that  $\{|k\rangle\}_{k=1}^d$  is an orthonormal basis in  $d$ -dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_d$  and  $\varrho$  is a density operator on  $\mathcal{H}_d$ . Consider a measurement with  $d$  outcomes and corresponding instrument  $\mathcal{I}_k[\varrho] = \langle k|\varrho|k\rangle|k\rangle\langle k|$ . Nonselective

realization of such a measurement leads to the following transformation of the density operator:

$$\varrho \rightarrow \Lambda[\varrho] = \sum_{k=1}^d \langle k|\varrho|k\rangle|k\rangle\langle k|. \quad (3)$$

Physically, such a process describes the complete dephasing in the basis  $\{|k\rangle\}_{k=1}^d$ . Denote  $\varrho_{kk'} = \langle k|\varrho|k'\rangle$  matrix elements of the density operator  $\varrho$ , then  $\langle k|\Lambda[\varrho]|k\rangle = \varrho_{kk}$  and  $\langle k|\Lambda[\varrho]|k'\rangle = 0$  if  $k \neq k'$ . As a result, quantum coherence in the state  $\Lambda[\varrho]$  is completely destroyed. It is Eq. (3), which is usually referred to as nonselective measurement in the literature [6–8]. In what follows, we also focus on nonselective measurement channels  $\Lambda$  of the form (3).

Clearly, two nonselective measurements  $\Lambda$  performed one after another do not change the system state, i.e.

$$\Lambda \circ \Lambda = \Lambda. \quad (4)$$

If the duration between nonselective measurements is not equal to zero, then the system state evolves in time. Although nondiagonal elements  $\varrho_{kk'}$  vanish after each nonselective measurement, diagonal elements  $\varrho_{kk}$  have enough time to change. Repeated nonselective measurements can be used in quantum control of system evolution. For instance, appropriately choosing the time moments of nonselective measurements one can accelerate the probability of Landau-Zener transitions [8]. Apparently, if measurements are performed with high repetition rate, the system becomes frozen (in analogy with the conventional Zeno effect [13]).

The goal of this paper is to derive an approximate master equation, which describes the system evolution intervened by a large number of repeated nonselective measurements. Such a master equation describes the evolution of the diagonal density operator, which effectively simulates the actual density operator at the moments just after nonselective measurements.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we derive a stroboscopic limit of quantum evolution and the governing master equation for a general case of nonselective measurements. In Sec. III, we consider the situation, where the measurement basis changes in time. In Sec. IV, we apply the derived theory to Landau-Zener transitions intervened by nonselective measurements. In Sec. V, brief conclusions are given.

## II. MASTER EQUATION FOR QUANTUM DYNAMICS WITH REPEATED NONSELECTIVE MEASUREMENTS

In the absence of measurements, a general quantum open system dynamics is described by a convolutionless master equation

$$\frac{d\rho(t)}{dt} = L(t)[\rho(t)], \quad (5)$$

where  $L(t)$  is a time-dependent generator [14]. A formal solution of this equation is  $\rho(t) = T_{\leftarrow} \exp\left(\int_{-\infty}^t L(t')dt'\right) \rho(-\infty)$ , where  $T_{\leftarrow}$  is the Dyson time-ordering operator. In the case of unitary evolution with the Hamiltonian  $H(t)$ ,  $L(t)[\cdot] = -i[H(t), \cdot]$ . Hereafter we assume the Planck constant to be equal to 1.

To get the characteristic timescale  $\frac{1}{\gamma(t)}$  of changes in the state  $\rho(t)$ , we extract the characteristic strength of the generator  $L(t)$  by formula

$$L(t) = \gamma(t)\mathcal{L}(t), \quad (6)$$

where the map  $\mathcal{L}(t)$  is dimensionless and its Schatten norm  $\|\mathcal{L}(t)\|_{1 \rightarrow 1} = 1$ .

Suppose that the evolution (5) is intervened by nonselective measurements (3), which are performed at sequential time moments  $t_1, \dots, t_N$ . In the time interval  $(t_n, t_{n+1})$  the exact dynamics with such nonselective measurements defines the dynamical map

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(t) &= T_{\leftarrow} \exp\left(\int_{t_n}^t L(t')dt'\right) \circ \Lambda \circ \dots \\ &\circ \Lambda \circ T_{\leftarrow} \exp\left(\int_{-\infty}^{t_1} L(t')dt'\right), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$\rho(t) = \Phi(t)[\rho(-\infty)]$ . We assume that the initial state  $\rho(-\infty)$  is an eigenstate of  $\Lambda$ , i.e.  $\Lambda[\rho(-\infty)] = \rho(-\infty)$  (otherwise, one can count time from the instance of the first measurement), so one can formally perform the nonselective measurement at time  $t_0 = -\infty$ . At time moments  $t = t_n$  the transformation  $\Phi_t$  maps any operator into  $\text{supp}\Lambda$ , so the output is diagonal in the basis  $\{|k\rangle\}_{k=1}^d$ . Since we are interested in the derivation of master equation for the diagonal density operator, we consider only time moments  $t_n$  and consider the map  $\tilde{\Phi}(t)$  by  $\Lambda\Phi(t)\Lambda$ . Using property (4) and formula (6), we get

$$\tilde{\Phi}(t_n) = \prod_{m=1}^n \Lambda \circ T_{\leftarrow} \exp\left(\int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} \gamma(t')\mathcal{L}(t')dt'\right) \circ \Lambda. \quad (8)$$

We assume that the nonselective measurements are performed in such a way that  $\int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} \gamma(t')dt' \ll 1$ . In this case the map  $T_{\leftarrow} \exp\left(\int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} L(t')dt'\right)$  is close to the identity transformation  $\text{Id}$  and  $\|T_{\leftarrow} \exp\left(\int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} L(t')dt'\right) - \text{Id}\|_{1 \rightarrow 1} \ll 1$ . Roughly speaking, the system cannot evolve too far from the diagonal state between the measurements. Such a regime corresponds to a sufficiently high repetition

rate of measurements ( $\sim |t_m - t_{m-1}|^{-1}$ ) as compared to the characteristic frequency of system evolution  $\gamma(t)$ . If this is the case, then with the accuracy up to the second order of  $\int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} \gamma(t')dt'$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\Lambda \circ T_{\leftarrow} \exp\left(\int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} \gamma(t')\mathcal{L}(t')dt'\right) \circ \Lambda \\ &\approx \Lambda + \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} dt' \gamma(t')\Lambda\mathcal{L}(t')\Lambda \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} dt' \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} dt'' \gamma(t')\gamma(t'')\Lambda T_{\leftarrow} \mathcal{L}(t')\mathcal{L}(t'')\Lambda \\ &\approx \Lambda \circ T_{\leftarrow} \exp\left[\int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} dt' \gamma(t')\Lambda\mathcal{L}(t')\Lambda \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} dt' \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} dt'' \gamma(t')\gamma(t'') \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \left(\Lambda\mathcal{L}(t')\mathcal{L}(t'')\Lambda - \Lambda\mathcal{L}(t')\Lambda\mathcal{L}(t'')\Lambda\right)\right] \circ \Lambda \\ &= \Lambda \circ T_{\leftarrow} \exp\left[\int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} dt' L_{\text{eff}}(t')\right] \circ \Lambda, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where the effective generator  $L_{\text{eff}}(t')$  preserves the diagonal structure of the density operator and reads

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\text{eff}}(t') &= \gamma(t')\Lambda\mathcal{L}(t')\Lambda \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} dt'' \gamma(t')\gamma(t'') \left(\Lambda\mathcal{L}(t')\mathcal{L}(t'')\Lambda - \Lambda\mathcal{L}(t')\Lambda\mathcal{L}(t'')\Lambda\right) \\ &= \Lambda L(t')\Lambda + \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} dt'' \left(\Lambda L(t')L(t'')\Lambda - \Lambda L(t')\Lambda L(t'')\Lambda\right) \\ &= \Lambda L(t') \left[\text{Id} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} dt'' \left(L(t'') - \Lambda L(t'')\Lambda\right)\right] \Lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Therefore, the transformation  $\rho(t_{m-1}) \rightarrow \rho(t_m)$  of the density operator  $\rho(t)$  from one time moment  $t_{m-1}$  of nonselective measurement to the next time moment  $t_m$  of nonselective measurement is approximately given by the master equation

$$\frac{d\rho(t)}{dt} = L_{\text{eff}}(t)[\rho(t)]. \quad (11)$$

If the measurements are performed stroboscopically after equal time periods  $\tau$  and the generator  $L = \gamma\mathcal{L}$  is time independent, then we obtain the effective dynamical semigroup generator

$$L_{\text{eff}} = \gamma\Lambda\mathcal{L}\Lambda + \frac{\gamma^2\tau}{2} \left(\Lambda\mathcal{L}^2\Lambda - \Lambda\mathcal{L}\Lambda\mathcal{L}\Lambda\right). \quad (12)$$

This form of the generator naturally appears in the so-called stroboscopic limit  $\gamma\tau \rightarrow 0$  and  $\gamma^2\tau \rightarrow \text{const} \neq 0$  [15].

The obtained form of the effective generator becomes particularly easy in the case of Hamiltonian dynamics,

when  $L[\cdot] = \gamma\mathcal{L}[\cdot] = -i\gamma[h, \cdot]$ . Using notation  $h_{kk'}$  for matrix elements  $\langle k|h|k'\rangle$ , we get

$$\Lambda\mathcal{L}\Lambda[X] = -i \sum_{k,l=1}^d \langle k|X|k\rangle \langle l|[h, |k\rangle\langle k||l\rangle|l\rangle\langle l| = 0, \quad (13)$$

$$\Lambda\mathcal{L}\Lambda\mathcal{L}\Lambda[X] = \Lambda\mathcal{L}[\Lambda\mathcal{L}\Lambda[X]] = 0, \quad (14)$$

$$\Lambda\mathcal{L}^2\Lambda[X] = - \sum_{k \neq k'} |h_{kk'}|^2 \left( \{|k\rangle\langle k|, X\} - 2|k'\rangle\langle k|X|k\rangle\langle k'|\right) \quad (15)$$

and find out that the effective dynamical semigroup generator (12) has the celebrated Gorini-Kossakowski-Sudarshan-Lindblad form [16, 17]:

$$L_{\text{eff}}[X] = \gamma^2\tau \sum_{k \neq k'} |h_{kk'}|^2 \left( |k'\rangle\langle k|X|k\rangle\langle k'| - \frac{1}{2} \{|k\rangle\langle k|, X\} \right). \quad (16)$$

The transition operators  $h_{k'k}|k'\rangle\langle k|$ ,  $k \neq k'$  are the Lindblad operators, which are responsible for the redistribution of the diagonal elements of the density operator. The evolution of diagonal elements  $\varrho_{kk}$  of the density operator has the simple form of the classical Pauli equation:

$$\frac{\partial \varrho_{kk}(t)}{\partial t} = \sum_{k' \neq k} (W_{k' \rightarrow k} \varrho_{k'k'}(t) - W_{k \rightarrow k'} \varrho_{kk}(t)), \quad (17)$$

where  $W_{k' \rightarrow k} = \gamma^2\tau|h_{kk'}|^2$  and  $\sum_{k' \neq k} W_{k \rightarrow k'} = \gamma^2\tau (\langle k|h^2|k\rangle - \langle k|h|k\rangle^2)$ . Eq. (17) shows that the quantum system under repeated nonselective measurements with  $\gamma\tau \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\gamma^2\tau \rightarrow \text{const}$  evolves like a classical statistical system. Noting that  $W_{k' \rightarrow k} = W_{k \rightarrow k'}$ , we get

$$\frac{\partial \varrho_{kk}(t)}{\partial t} = \sum_{k' \neq k} W_{k' \rightarrow k} (\varrho_{k'k'}(t) - \varrho_{kk}(t)), \quad (18)$$

so the fixed point of the derived dynamical map is the maximally mixed state  $\varrho = \frac{1}{d}I$ .

Returning to the discussion of general formula (10), the second term in the right hand side of Eq. (10) is of the order  $\gamma(t') \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} \gamma(t'') dt'' \ll \gamma(t')$ . If one neglects this term and considers the Hamiltonian dynamics  $L(t)[\cdot] = \gamma(t)\mathcal{L}(t)[\cdot] = -i\gamma(t)[h(t), \cdot]$ , then  $L_{\text{eff}}(t) = \Lambda L(t)\Lambda = 0$  and the usual Zeno effect is reproduced [13], i.e. the dynamics of the density operator becomes effectively frozen. Taking into account the second term in the right hand side of Eq. (10), one can see the deviation from the trivial dynamics, with the characteristic timescale of the change in the density operator being  $(\gamma(t') \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} \gamma(t'') dt'')^{-1} \gg \frac{1}{\gamma(t')}$ .

In the case of purely dissipative dynamics  $L(t)[X] = \gamma(t)\mathcal{L}(t)[X]$ ,  $\mathcal{L}(t)[X] = A(t)XA^\dagger(t) - \frac{1}{2}\{A^\dagger(t)A(t), X\}$ , the first term  $\Lambda L(t)\Lambda$  in Eq. (10) already gives nonzero contribution to  $L_{\text{eff}}(t)$ . Neglecting the second term in Eq. (10), we get

$$\frac{\partial \varrho_{kk}(t)}{\partial t} = \gamma(t) \sum_{k' \neq k} \left( |\langle k|A(t)|k'\rangle|^2 \varrho_{k'k'}(t) - |\langle k'|A(t)|k\rangle|^2 \varrho_{kk}(t) \right). \quad (19)$$

Thus, the dissipative dynamics intervened by nonselective measurements also results in the classical Pauli equation for diagonal elements of the density matrix.

### III. REPEATED NONSELECTIVE MEASUREMENTS IN DIFFERENT BASES

Suppose that nonselective measurements at time moments  $t_1, \dots, t_N$  are performed in different bases, then the corresponding map  $\Lambda$  is time dependent, i.e. nonselective measurement at time moment  $t_n$  results in a map  $\Lambda_n$ . Continuing the same line of reasoning as in the previous section, one can readily obtain the transformation  $\varrho(t_{m-1}) \rightarrow \varrho(t_m)$  and the effective generator describing it:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_m \circ T_{\leftarrow} \exp \left( \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} L(t') dt' \right) \circ \Lambda_{m-1} \\ = \Lambda_m \Lambda_{m-1} + T_{\leftarrow} \exp \left( \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} L_{\text{eff}}(t') dt' \right) - \text{Id}, \quad (20) \\ L_{\text{eff}}(t') = \Lambda_m L(t') \Lambda_{m-1} \\ + \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} dt'' \left( \Lambda_m L(t') L(t'') \Lambda_{m-1} \right. \\ \left. - \Lambda_m L(t') \Lambda_{m-1} \Lambda_m L(t'') \Lambda_{m-1} \right). \quad (21) \end{aligned}$$

Since measurement bases change in time, one should separately treat the term  $\Lambda_m \Lambda_{m-1}[X] = \sum_{k_m, k_{m-1}} |\langle k_m|k_{m-1}\rangle|^2 |k_m\rangle\langle k_{m-1}|X|k_{m-1}\rangle\langle k_m|$ . The map  $\Lambda_m \Lambda_{m-1}$  describes transition from a matrix diagonal in basis  $\{k_{m-1}\}$  to a matrix diagonal in basis  $\{k_m\}$ . In what follows, we will focus on transformations of diagonal elements of the density matrix  $\{\varrho_{kk}\}$ , where the basis changes in time accordingly. In such an approach, the map  $\Lambda_{m-1} \Lambda_m$  acts as follows:

$$\varrho' = \Lambda_{m-1} \Lambda_m [\varrho] \iff \varrho'_{k'k'} = \sum_k |\langle k'_m|k_{m-1}\rangle|^2 \varrho_{kk}, \quad (22)$$

where the latter formula describes the transformation of diagonal elements. Each matrix  $B^{(m, m-1)}$  with elements  $B_{k'k}^{(m, m-1)} = |\langle k'_m|k_{m-1}\rangle|^2$  is doubly stochastic and can be represented in the form

$$B^{(m, m-1)} = \exp \left( Q^{(m, m-1)} (t_m - t_{m-1}) \right), \quad (23)$$

where  $Q^{(m, m-1)}$  is the transition rate matrix satisfying conditions  $Q_{kk}^{(m, m-1)} = -\sum_{k' \neq k} Q_{k'k}^{(m, m-1)} = -\sum_{k' \neq k} Q_{kk'}^{(m, m-1)}$  and  $Q_{k'k}^{(m, m-1)} \geq 0$  if  $k \neq k'$ . Physically, the matrix  $Q$  shows how quickly the measurement basis  $\{|k(t)\rangle\}$  changes in time, namely,  $Q_{k'k}(t) \approx \left| \frac{\partial \langle k'(t)|k(t)\rangle}{\partial t} \right|^2 (t_m - t_{m-1})$  if  $k \neq k'$  and the measurements are performed quite often that linear approximation  $|k'(t_m)\rangle \approx |k'(t_{m-1})\rangle + (t_m - t_{m-1}) \frac{\partial |k'(t)\rangle}{\partial t} \Big|_{t=t_{m-1}}$  is valid.

Similarly, the transformation  $\varrho' = L_{\text{eff}}[\varrho]$  with  $L_{\text{eff}}$  in the form (21) can be equivalently described by such a matrix  $R^{(m, m-1)}$  that  $\varrho'_{k'k'} = \sum_k R_{k'k}^{(m, m-1)} \varrho_{kk}$ . Rewriting

Eq. (20) in the differential form for diagonal elements of the density operator, we get

$$\frac{\partial \varrho_{kk}(t)}{\partial t} = \sum_l \left( Q_{kl}(t) + R_{kl}(t) \right) \varrho_{ll}(t). \quad (24)$$

The approximate form of matrix  $R^{(m,m-1)}$  can be found in the case of unitary evolution with a time dependent Hamiltonian  $H(t)$ , when  $L[\cdot] = -i[H(t), \cdot]$ , such that vectors  $\{|k_{m-1}\rangle\}$  are eigenvectors of  $H(t_{m-1})$  and vectors  $\{|k_m\rangle\}$  are eigenvectors of  $H(t_m)$ . Then  $\Lambda_m L(t_{m-1}) \Lambda_{m-1} \approx 0$  and  $\Lambda_m L(t_m) \Lambda_{m-1} \approx 0$ , so for  $t \in (t_{m-1}, t_m)$  one can assume that  $\Lambda_m L(t') \Lambda_{m-1} \approx 0$ . Similarly,  $\Lambda_m L(t'') \Lambda_{m-1} \Lambda_m L(t''') \Lambda_{m-1} \approx 0$ , and Eq. (21) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\text{eff}}(t') &\approx \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} dt'' \Lambda_m L(t') L(t'') \Lambda_{m-1} \\ &\approx \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} dt'' \Lambda_m L^2(t'') \Lambda_{m-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Using formula (17), we see that the effective Lindbladian induces evolution of diagonal elements in the form  $\frac{\partial \varrho_{kk}(t)}{\partial t} = \sum_{l \neq k} R_{kl}(t) (\varrho_{ll}(t) - \varrho_{kk}(t))$ , where  $R_{kl}(t) = \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} |\langle k_m | H(t'') | l_{m-1} \rangle|^2 dt''$ ,  $l \neq k$ . Exploiting the approximation  $|k(t_m)\rangle \approx |k(t_{m-1})\rangle + (t_m - t_{m-1}) \frac{\partial |k(t)\rangle}{\partial t} \Big|_{t=t_{m-1}}$ , we evaluate

$$R_{kl}(t) \approx \left| \frac{\partial \langle k(t) |}{\partial t} |l(t)\rangle \right|^2 E_l^2(t) (t_m - t_{m-1})^3, \quad (26)$$

where  $E_l(t)$  is the eigenvalue of  $H(t)$  corresponding to eigenvector  $|l(t)\rangle$ . Combining results of this section, at time interval  $t \in (t_{m-1}, t_m)$  Eq. (24) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \varrho_{kk}(t)}{\partial t} &= \sum_{l \neq k} \left| \frac{\partial \langle k(t) |}{\partial t} |l(t)\rangle \right|^2 \left( 1 + E_l^2(t) (t_m - t_{m-1})^2 \right) \\ &\quad \times (t_m - t_{m-1}) (\varrho_{ll}(t) - \varrho_{kk}(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

provided the measurements are performed often enough that the linear approximation  $|k'(t_m)\rangle \approx |k'(t_{m-1})\rangle + (t_m - t_{m-1}) \frac{\partial |k'(t)\rangle}{\partial t} \Big|_{t=t_{m-1}}$  remains valid.

#### IV. LANDAU-ZENER TRANSITIONS WITH NONSELECTIVE MEASUREMENTS

Consider a two-level system with the orthonormal basis  $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ . Let the system occupy the state  $|0\rangle$  at time  $t = -\infty$ , i.e.  $\varrho(-\infty) = |0\rangle\langle 0|$ . The time-dependent Hamiltonian of Landau-Zener model reads

$$H(t) = \Delta \sigma_x + \epsilon t \sigma_z, \quad (28)$$

where  $\Delta, \epsilon > 0$ ,  $\sigma_x = |0\rangle\langle 1| + |1\rangle\langle 0|$ , and  $\sigma_z = |0\rangle\langle 0| - |1\rangle\langle 1|$ . Solution of the equation  $\frac{d\varrho(t)}{dt} = -i[H(t), \varrho(t)]$  can be found analytically [18]. Equation

$$\langle 0 | \varrho(+\infty) | 0 \rangle = \exp\left(-\frac{\pi \Delta^2}{\epsilon}\right) \quad (29)$$

represents the Landau-Zener formula for transition probability from the lower energy level at  $t = -\infty$  (state  $|0\rangle$ ) to the higher energy level at  $t = +\infty$  (state  $|0\rangle$ ) [19, 20]. If the rate  $\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $\langle 0 | \varrho(+\infty) | 0 \rangle \rightarrow 1$ , which describes the situation of a sudden change of the Hamiltonian, when the system state does not have enough time to evolve. If the rate  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , then  $\langle 0 | \varrho(+\infty) | 0 \rangle \rightarrow 0$ , which describes the adiabatic regime with constant population of the ground state.

Suppose the process of the evolution is intervened by repeated nonselective measurements in the basis of instantaneous eigenvectors of  $H(t)$  (also referred to as diabatic states):

$$|\varphi_0(t)\rangle = \frac{\left(\sqrt{\Delta^2 + (\epsilon t)^2} - \epsilon t\right) |0\rangle - \Delta |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2\sqrt{\Delta^2 + (\epsilon t)^2} \left(\sqrt{\Delta^2 + (\epsilon t)^2} - \epsilon t\right)}}, \quad (30)$$

$$|\varphi_1(t)\rangle = \frac{\Delta |0\rangle + \left(\sqrt{\Delta^2 + (\epsilon t)^2} - \epsilon t\right) |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2\sqrt{\Delta^2 + (\epsilon t)^2} \left(\sqrt{\Delta^2 + (\epsilon t)^2} - \epsilon t\right)}}. \quad (31)$$

More precisely, at time moment  $t_m$  one performs the nonselective measurement in the basis  $|0_m\rangle = |\varphi_0(t_m)\rangle$ ,  $|1_m\rangle = |\varphi_1(t_m)\rangle$ . Our goal is to minimize the transition rate via selective measurements, i.e. to preserve system in the ground state.

Using Eq. (27), we get the effective dynamics of population of diabatic level 1 between  $(m-1)$ -th and  $m$ -th measurements:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \varrho_{11}(t)}{\partial t} &= \left| \frac{\partial \langle \varphi_1(t) |}{\partial t} |\varphi_0(t)\rangle \right|^2 \left( 1 + E_0^2(t) (t_m - t_{m-1})^2 \right) \\ &\quad \times (t_m - t_{m-1}) (\varrho_{00}(t) - \varrho_{11}(t)). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Direct calculation yields  $E_0^2(t) = \Delta^2 + (\epsilon t)^2$  and

$$\left| \frac{\partial \langle \varphi_1(t) |}{\partial t} |\varphi_0(t)\rangle \right|^2 = \frac{\epsilon^2 \Delta^2}{4(\Delta^2 + (\epsilon t)^2)^2}. \quad (33)$$

Taking into account that  $\varrho_{00}(t) = 1 - \varrho_{11}(t)$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \varrho_{11}(t)}{\partial t} &= \frac{\epsilon^2 \Delta^2 (t_m - t_{m-1})}{4(\Delta^2 + (\epsilon t)^2)} \\ &\quad \times \left( \frac{1}{\Delta^2 + (\epsilon t)^2} + (t_m - t_{m-1})^2 \right) (1 - 2\varrho_{11}(t)). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

The obtained equation is valid if  $t_m - t_{m-1} \ll (\Delta^2 + (\epsilon t)^2) / \epsilon \Delta$ . Periods between selective measurements can be rather long if  $t \rightarrow -\infty$  or  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ . Therefore, the moments of nonselective measurements can be chosen within the range  $t_m, t_{m-1} \in [-2\Delta/\epsilon, 2\Delta/\epsilon]$ . Basically, the application of nonselective measurements beyond that interval would not substantially affect the population dynamics.

Consider the regime  $\epsilon \gg \Delta^2$ , when the probability to remain in the ground state  $\varrho_{00}(+\infty)$  tends to 0, whereas the transition probability  $\varrho_{11}(+\infty)$  tends to 1. Let us



demonstrate that the transition probability can be effectively suppressed by a finite number of nonselective measurements. For instance, distribute  $2N + 1$  measurements uniformly within the interval  $[-2\Delta/\epsilon, 2\Delta/\epsilon]$ , so  $t_m - t_{m-1} = \frac{4\Delta}{\epsilon 2N}$ , then integration of Eq. (34) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_{11}(+\infty) &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 - \exp \left( -\frac{\pi(8\Delta^4 + \epsilon^2 N^2)}{2\epsilon^2 N^3} \right) \right] \\ &\approx \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 - \exp \left( -\frac{\pi}{2N} \right) \right] \approx \frac{\pi}{4N}, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where approximations are made under condition  $N \gg 1$ .

Alternatively, since the transition rate dominates around  $t = 0$ , one can distribute instances of nonselective measurements more often in the vicinity of  $t = 0$ , for instance,  $t_m = 2\Delta(m - N - 1)(m - N)/\epsilon N(N + 1)$ ,  $m = 1, \dots, 2N + 1$ . This distribution corresponds to substitution  $t_m - t_{m-1} = 2\Delta^2 t / (N + 1) (\Delta^2 + (\epsilon t)^2)$  in Eq. (34), which results in

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_{11}(+\infty) &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 - \exp \left( -\frac{(N + 1)^2 + \frac{4\Delta^4}{3\epsilon^2}}{2(N + 1)^3} \right) \right] \\ &\approx \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 - \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2N} \right) \right] \approx \frac{1}{4N}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

This means that one can preserve the population of the ground state not only in the case of slow rate  $\epsilon \ll \Delta^2$ , but also for a fast rate  $\epsilon \gg \Delta^2$  with the appropriate use of repeated nonselective measurements.

With the use of one nonselective measurement the transition rate can be diminished at least to one half [8]. We conjecture that with the use of  $N$  nonselective measurements the minimal transition probability in the regime  $\epsilon \gg \Delta^2$  diminishes as  $O(\frac{1}{N})$ .

## V. CONCLUSIONS

We have analyzed the quantum dynamics intervened by repeated projective rank-1 nonselective measurements. Such measurements make the density operator diagonal in the measurement basis. However, due to a possibility to evolve in between the measurements, quantum system does not remain frozen in general. We have derived the approximate master equation describing the evolution of diagonal elements of the density operator and demonstrated its relation with the classical Pauli equation in the so-called stroboscopic limit.

We have studied the case of repeated nonselective measurements, when measurement bases change with time. In the case of the unitary dynamics, when the measurement basis changes in time in accordance with the eigenvectors of instantaneous Hamiltonian, we find a simplified evolution equation. The developed theory is applied to the Landau-Zener model. We show that appropriate nonselective measurements can reduce the transition probability between the ground and excited state even in the case of the fast rate of Hamiltonian.

## Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to the anonymous referee for many valuable comments to improve the quality of the manuscript and, in particular, for suggestions of simpler forms of Eqs. (13)-(14). The study is supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research under Project No. 16-37-60070 mol-a-dk.

- 
- [1] M. G. A. Paris, *Int. J. Quant. Inf.* **7** (2009) 125.
  - [2] A. Chefles, *Contemporary Physics* **41** (2000) 401.
  - [3] S. N. Filippov and M. Ziman, *Phys. Rev. A* **85** (2012) 062301.
  - [4] V. Bužek *et al.*, *Annals of Physics* **266** (1998) 454.
  - [5] K. J. Resch, J. S. Lundeen, and A. M. Steinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88** (2002) 113601.
  - [6] A. Pechen *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. A* **74** (2006) 052102.
  - [7] F. Shuang *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. A* **78** (2008) 063422.
  - [8] A. Pechen and A. Trushechkin, *Phys. Rev. A* **91** (2015) 052316.
  - [9] C. L. Degen, F. Reinhard, and P. Cappellaro, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89** (2017) 035002.
  - [10] T. Heinosaari and M. Ziman, *The Mathematical Language of Quantum Theory* (Cambridge University Press, 2012).
  - [11] A. S. Holevo, *Quantum Systems, Channels, Information* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2012).
  - [12] M. Horodecki, P. W. Shor, and M. B. Ruskai, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **15** (2003) 629.
  - [13] B. Misra and E. C. G. Sudarshan, *J. Math. Phys.* **18** (1977) 756.
  - [14] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, 2002).
  - [15] I. A. Luchnikov and S. N. Filippov, *Phys. Rev. A* **95** (2017) 022113.
  - [16] V. Gorini, A. Kossakowski, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, *J. Math. Phys.* **17** (1976) 821.
  - [17] G. Lindblad, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **48** (1976) 119.
  - [18] A. Brataas and E. I. Rashba, *Phys. Rev. B* **84** (2011) 045301.
  - [19] L. Landau, *Phys. Z. Sowjetunion* **2** (1932) 46.
  - [20] C. Zener, *Proc. R. Soc. London A* **137** (1932) 696.