

# Shorcuts to adiabaticity with quantum non-demolition measurements

Raphaël Menu<sup>1</sup> and Giovanna Morigi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Theoretische Physik, Universität des Saarlandes, D-66123 Saarbrücken, Germany*

(Dated: April 1, 2025)

The realization of quantum adiabatic dynamics is at the core of implementations of adiabatic quantum computers. One major issue is to efficiently compromise between the long time scales required by the adiabatic protocol and the detrimental effects of the environment, which set an upper bound to the time scale of the operation. In this work we propose a protocol which achieves fast adiabatic dynamics by coupling the system to an external environment by the means of a quantum-non-demolition (QND) Hamiltonian. We analyse the infidelity of adiabatic transfer for a Landau-Zener problem in the presence of QND measurement, where the qubit couples to a meter which in turn quickly dissipates. We analyse the protocol's fidelity as a function of the strength of the QND coupling and of the relaxation time of the meter. In the limit where the decay rate of the ancilla is the largest frequency scale of the dynamics, the QND coupling induces an effective dephasing in the adiabatic basis. Optimal conditions for adiabaticity are found when the coupling with the meter induces dissipative dynamics which suppresses unwanted diabatic transitions.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Adiabatic quantum dynamics provide robustness against parameter fluctuations and are therefore considered a powerful resource for quantum computing [1]. This comes at the cost of the operation time, which shall be sufficiently long in order to preserve adiabaticity [2]. In closed and finite systems, the lower bound to the time is set by the smallest frequency gap. In realistic settings detrimental effects become increasingly important with time: their interplay with the time-dependent Hamiltonian dynamics leads to an optimal processing time as well as to a lower bound to the processing error [3].

Strategies for implementing relatively fast and efficient adiabatic transformations are being actively investigated. These include the application of optimal control theory [4–6] and the active use of projective measurements [7]. The ultimate goal is to identify a general concept which can allow one to arbitrarily reduce the error of protocols based on quantum adiabatic dynamics.

In this work we consider a paradigmatic model of quantum adiabatic dynamics, the Landau-Zener Hamiltonian of a two-level system, and analyse the adiabatic transfer in the presence of the coupling with a second quantum system, which we denote by meter. The coupling implements a so-called quantum non-demolition (QND) type of Hamiltonian [8, 9], where a measurement of the meter state projects the qubit onto an energy eigenstate. In our implementation, where the Hamiltonian parameters depend on time, the QND measurement projects the qubit onto an eigenstate of the instantaneous Hamiltonian, namely, an eigenstate of the adiabatic basis. We analyse the fidelity of adiabatic transfer at finite times when the coupled qubit-meter dynamics is memoryless. In this limit the effective qubit dynamics is described by a master equation including dephasing in the adiabatic basis and dissipation due to the diabatic effects. We show that the fidelity of the adiabatic transfer at finite times increases with the strength of the coupling with the meter.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we shortly review the properties of the adiabatic transfer probability of Landau-Zener Hamiltonian dynamics. We then introduce the QND coupling with the meter and in Sec. III we derive the qubit's master equation by eliminating the meter's degrees of freedom in the Born-Markov regime. We then analyse the fidelity of the adiabatic transfer as a function of the coupling to the meter. In Sec. IV we determine the fidelity of the adiabatic transfer taking into account the full quantum dynamics of the meter. In Sec. V we draw the conclusions and discuss perspectives of this work. The appendices provide details of the derivation of the quantum adiabatic master equation for a weak quantum non demolition interaction as well as the comparison between the quantum adiabatic master equation and the full system-meter dynamics.

## II. LANDAU-ZENER HAMILTONIAN AND QND MEASUREMENT

In this section we first review relevant properties of the Landau-Zener dynamics and then introduce the model at the center of our study, where the qubit is coupled to an environment with a quantum-non-demolition type of Hamiltonian.

### A. Landau-Zener Hamiltonian

The Landau-Zener model is an example of exactly solvable dynamics [10, 11] and a workhorse of studies on adiabaticity [2, 12]. It describes the dynamics of a two-level system with the algebra of a spin 1/2, whose Schrödinger equation is governed by the time-dependent Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{H}_S(t) &= \frac{\epsilon t}{2}\sigma_z + \frac{g}{2}\sigma_x \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} \epsilon t & g \\ g & -\epsilon t \end{pmatrix},\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

where the time  $t$  varies in the interval  $[t_1, t_2]$  with  $t_1 < 0 < t_2$ , parameter  $\epsilon$  is a constant that determines the sweeping rate of the Hamiltonian, and  $g$  lifts the degeneracy between the energy levels at the crossing point  $t = 0$ . For convenience we have set  $\hbar = 1$ , therefore in what follows energy and frequency are interchangeable.

Hamiltonian (1) is diagonal in the so-called adiabatic eigenbasis  $|\pm\rangle_t$ , which is connected to the basis  $\{|\uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow\rangle\}$  of the eigenstates of  $\sigma_z$  by the relations

$$\begin{aligned} |+\rangle_t &= +\cos(\theta(t)/2)|\uparrow\rangle + \sin(\theta(t)/2)|\downarrow\rangle \\ |-\rangle_t &= -\sin(\theta(t)/2)|\uparrow\rangle + \cos(\theta(t)/2)|\downarrow\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

with  $\tan\theta(t) = g/\epsilon t$  [13]. The corresponding eigenenergies in the adiabatic basis are  $E_{\pm}(t) = \pm\sqrt{g^2 + \epsilon^2 t^2}/2$  and are displayed in Fig. 1 as a function of  $t$ . The lowest branch is associated with state  $|-\rangle_t$ , which corresponds to the state  $|\uparrow\rangle$  at  $t_1 \rightarrow -\infty$  and to the state  $|\downarrow\rangle$  at  $t_2 \rightarrow +\infty$ . The opposite holds for the state  $|+\rangle_t$  in the upper branch.

The dynamics of the Landau-Zener model is ruled by the Schrödinger equation, which admits an analytical solution in terms of parabolic cylinder functions [14]. A quantity relevant to our study is the probability  $T(t_1, t_2)$  of a diabatic transfer from state  $|-\rangle_{t_1}$  to state  $|+\rangle_{t_2}$ :

$$T(t_1, t_2) = |{}_{t_1}\langle +|\hat{U}(t_1, t_2)|-\rangle_{t_2}|^2, \quad (2)$$

where  $\hat{U}(t_1, t_2)$  is the evolution operator solving the Schrödinger equation with the time-dependent Hamiltonian (1). The probability  $T$  quantifies the deviation from adiabaticity and thus provides the error, or the infidelity, of the operation. When  $t_1 \rightarrow -\infty$  and  $t_2 \rightarrow +\infty$  it takes the well-known form

$$\lim_{\substack{t_1 \rightarrow -\infty \\ t_2 \rightarrow +\infty}} T(t_1, t_2) = \exp(-\pi g^2/2\epsilon), \quad (3)$$

which shows that the infidelity is controlled by the ratio between the energy gap  $g$  at the avoided crossing point and the driving rate  $\epsilon$ . One typically distinguishes two extremal behaviours: (i) For  $g \gg \sqrt{\epsilon}$ , the gap is sufficiently wide to penalize the transition and enables the system to evolve smoothly from  $|-\rangle_{-\infty} = |\uparrow\rangle$  to  $|-\rangle_{+\infty} = |\downarrow\rangle$ . (ii) On the other hand, if  $g \ll \sqrt{\epsilon}$ , the system does not have time to adjust to the change of parameters and the state gets promoted from the low-energy branch to the high-energy one.

For a finite time window, the transition probability is dominated by the term [2]

$$T(t_1, t_2) \simeq \frac{\epsilon^2}{16g^4} \left( \frac{g^6}{(g^2 + \epsilon^2 t_1^2)^3} + \frac{g^6}{(g^2 + \epsilon^2 t_2^2)^3} \right). \quad (4)$$

This expression is reported for sufficiently long times  $t_2$ , for which the oscillations are damped out, and we have omitted higher-order corrections, including the terms determining the asymptotic behaviour when  $t_1, |t_2| \rightarrow \infty$ . It shows that  $T(t_1, t_2)$  scales algebraically with  $(\epsilon/g^2)$  for finite transfer times.




FIG. 1. Instantaneous eigenenergies of the Landau-Zener Hamiltonian (1) as a function of time (in units of  $g/\epsilon$ ). The blue curves correspond to the energies in units of the gap at anticrossing  $g$ , while the dashed lines correspond to the eigenenergies in the limit  $g = 0$ .

## B. Quantum non-demolition measurement in the adiabatic basis

Projective measurements can realize an effective quantum Zeno dynamics, thus suppressing transitions to states outside the target Hilbert space. They are physically implemented by coupling the system to a second physical system, acting as a meter. When the state of the meter is ignored, the effective dynamics of the system is generally incoherent. Within the framework of quantum reservoir engineering the coupling is tailored in order to stabilize a target state of dynamics [15–18].

During an adiabatic transfer, suppression of diabatic transitions could be ideally realised by performing a measurement in the adiabatic basis. This is equivalent to implementing the Hamiltonian coupling

$$\hat{H}_{QND}(t) = \hat{H}_S(t) \otimes \hat{X}_M, \quad (5)$$

where  $\hat{H}_S(t)$  is given in Eq. (1) and  $\hat{X}_M$  is an operator acting in the Hilbert space of the meter. Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{QND}$  commutes with  $\hat{H}_S$ . For  $\epsilon = 0$  (no time dependence) Hamiltonian (5) realizes a quantum non-demolition measurement: there is no energy exchange between meter and qubit and the measurement of the meter allows one to measure the energy of the qubit with arbitrary precision [8, 9, 19]. QND-type of dynamics have been realised in several setups, in most cases system and meter are qubit and harmonic oscillator with interchangeable roles. In microwave cavity QED the system is a high-finesse mode of the cavity, the meter a Rydberg transition of atoms flying through the cavity [20]. QND is at the basis of spin squeezing protocols using a resonator as a meter [21]. Most recently a QND based protocol has been proposed for determining the spectrum

of a spin chain by coupling a chain of ions with a common vibrational mode, acting as meter [22].

The peculiarity of Eq. (5) is that  $\hat{H}_{QND}(t)$  is now diagonal in the adiabatic eigenbasis. In the rest of this paper we discuss the qubit's effective dynamics generated by the QND coupling of Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{QND}$ , assuming that the meter relaxes quickly to a stationary state that is not affected by the coupling with the system. This dynamics has different characteristics, depending on whether the meter relaxation time scale  $\tau_M$  is effectively instantaneous when compared to the other time scales of the system, or instead whether retardation effects cannot be neglected during the meter's relaxation. In the next section we consider the first regime and derive a quantum adiabatic master equation for the qubit's dynamics. The other, most general situation, is discussed in Sec. IV.

### III. QUANTUM ADIABATIC MASTER EQUATION FOR THE QND MEASUREMENT

The purpose of this section is to derive the equation governing the effective dynamics of the qubit. Here, we assume that the meter's variable can be eliminated from the equation of motion in second order in perturbation

theory and that the meter quickly relaxes to a steady state. In this regime, the incoherent dynamics describes an effective dephasing mechanism in the adiabatic basis, whose net effect is to enforce the adiabatic transfer. We recall that master equations for QND Hamiltonian have been discussed, for instance, in Ref. [23].

#### A. Basic assumptions

The construction of the quantum adiabatic master equation requires some assumptions on the different energy and time-scales. We start with the minimal gap  $g$  between the two energy branches: in order to ascertain the adiabaticity of the coherent part of the dynamics for the LZ system, we shall make sure that  $\epsilon/g^2 \ll 1$ , where  $\epsilon$  is the rate at which the Hamiltonian is varied in time. We also require that the meter relaxes at time scales  $\tau_M$  over which one can consider the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_S(t)$  to be constant, resulting in  $\epsilon\tau_M^2 \ll 1$ . Under these conditions, the incoherent part of the dynamics is dominated by adiabatic mechanisms since non-adiabatic effects scale like  $\epsilon/g^2$ . We follow the procedure outlined in Ref. [24] and obtain the master equation for the qubit density matrix  $\hat{\rho}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \tilde{\rho}(t) = & - \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \left\{ \tilde{H}_S(t) \tilde{H}_S(t-\tau) \tilde{\rho}(t) - \tilde{H}_S(t-\tau) \tilde{\rho}(t) \tilde{H}_S(t) \right\} \mathcal{C}_{XX}(\tau, 0) \\ & - \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \left\{ \tilde{\rho}(t) \tilde{H}_S(t-\tau) \tilde{H}_S(t) - \tilde{H}_S(t) \tilde{\rho}(t) \tilde{H}_S(t-\tau) \right\} \mathcal{C}_{XX}(0, \tau), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where the details of the derivation are provided in Appendix A. Equation (6) is reported in interaction picture, where the operators  $\tilde{A} = \tilde{H}_S$  and  $\tilde{\rho}$  are related to the operators in the laboratory frame by the relation

$$\tilde{A}(t) = \hat{U}^\dagger(t, 0) \hat{A}(t) \hat{U}(t, 0), \quad (7)$$

and  $\hat{U}(t, 0)$  is the evolution operator of the qubit's Schrödinger equation:

$$\hat{U}_S(t, 0) = \mathcal{T} \exp \left[ -i \int_0^t dt' \hat{H}_S(t') \right], \quad (8)$$

with  $\mathcal{T}$  the symbol for time ordering. The scalar function  $\mathcal{C}_{XX}(t, t')$  is the auto-correlation function of the observable  $\tilde{X}_M$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{XX}(t, t') &= \langle \tilde{X}_M(t) \tilde{X}_M(t') \rangle \\ &= \text{Tr} \{ e^{i\hat{H}_M t} \hat{X}_M e^{-i\hat{H}_M(t-t')} \hat{X}_M e^{-i\hat{H}_M t'} \hat{\chi}_M \}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

with  $\hat{\chi}_M$  the density matrix of the meter. Since the meter's state is stationary over the time scale of the qubit evolution, then  $\mathcal{C}_{XX}(t, t') = \mathcal{C}_{XX}(t - t', 0) = \mathcal{C}_{XX}(0, t' - t)$ .

In order to evaluate the integrals of Eq. (6) we implement the adiabatic expansion in first order in the parameter  $\epsilon/g^2$ . In this limit we approximate Eq. (8) by the expression

$$\hat{U}_S(t, t') = \hat{U}_S^{\text{ad}}(t, t') \left[ \mathbf{1} + \hat{V}(t, t') \right] + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2/g^4), \quad (10)$$

where  $\hat{U}_S^{\text{ad}}(t, t')$  is the evolution operator in leading order,

$$\hat{U}_S^{\text{ad}}(t, t') = \sum_{a=\pm} |a\rangle_{t'} \langle a| e^{-i\mu_a(t, t')}. \quad (11)$$

and is thus diagonal in the instantaneous eigenbasis. The global phase factor  $\mu_a(t, t')$  is the sum of the dynamic and of the geometric components:

$$\mu_a(t, t') = \int_{t'}^t d\tau [E_a(\tau) - i_\tau \langle a | \dot{a} \rangle_\tau]. \quad (12)$$

Operator  $\hat{V}(t, t')$  in Eq. (10) is of order  $\epsilon/g^2$  and takes the form

$$\hat{V}(t, t') = -\alpha_{+-}(t, t') |+\rangle_{t'} \langle -| - \text{H.c.}, \quad (13)$$

where the coefficient  $\alpha_{\pm}(t, t')$  take the form [2]

$$\alpha_{+-}(t, t') = \frac{1}{2} \int_{t'}^t d\tau \frac{g\epsilon}{g^2\epsilon^2\tau^2} \exp \left[ i \int_{t'}^{\tau} du \sqrt{g^2 + \epsilon^2 u^2} \right],$$

and  $\alpha_{-+}(t, t') = -\alpha_{+-}^*(t, t')$ . In this procedure we can keep non-adiabatic effects during the relaxation time of the meter by treating them at first order in the perturbative expansion.

### B. Master equation

The resulting master equation for the qubit density matrix and in the laboratory frame and for  $\tau_M \rightarrow 0$  takes the form:

$$\partial_t \hat{\rho} = \mathcal{L}^{\text{ad}}(t) \hat{\rho}, \quad (14)$$

where the superoperator  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{ad}}(t)$  generates the quantum adiabatic master equation, describing dephasing in the instantaneous basis:

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{ad}} \hat{\rho} = -i \left[ \hat{H}_S, \hat{\rho} \right] - \gamma(t) \left( \hat{P}_-(t) \hat{\rho} \hat{P}_+(t) + \hat{P}_+(t) \hat{\rho} \hat{P}_-(t) \right), \quad (15)$$

with operators  $\hat{P}_{\pm}(t) = |\pm\rangle_t \langle \pm|$  projecting into the instantaneous basis with the time-dependent rate

$$\gamma(t) = G(0)(E_+(t) - E_-(t))^2/2.$$

The scaling factor  $G(0)/2$  is the real part of the Fourier transform  $\Gamma_{XX}(\omega)$  of the meter's autocorrelation function at zero-frequency:

$$\Gamma_{XX}(\omega) = \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \exp(i\omega\tau) \mathcal{C}_{XX}(\tau, 0) \quad (16)$$

Note that  $G(0)$  is here assumed to be positive, namely, the bath correlation functions are of positive-type. The quantum adiabatic master equation, Eq. (15), preserves the trace, the hermiticity, and the positivity of the density matrix. It describes an effective dephasing with time-varying rate  $\gamma(t)$ . The dephasing rate, in particular, decreases with the gap and is minimum at the anticrossing point  $t = 0$ , where  $\gamma(0) = G(0)g^2/2$ . Below we use  $\gamma_0 \equiv \gamma(0)$  for quantifying the strength of dephasing.

### C. Results

The master equation (15) was analysed in Ref. [25], with the noticeable difference that the dephasing rate was taken to be constant. In that work the asymptotic behaviour of the infidelity  $T$  was analytically determined when  $\sqrt{\epsilon} \ll g, \gamma_0$ . In this limit the infidelity can be cast into the form [25]

$$T = \frac{\epsilon}{2g^2} Q\left(\frac{\gamma_0}{g}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{g^2(\gamma_0^2 + g^2)} \frac{\gamma_0^2}{\gamma_0^2 + g^2}\right), \quad (17)$$




FIG. 2. (color online) Influence of the dephasing Lindbladian, Eq. (15) on the evolution of the infidelity  $T$  for a finite time evolution and different values of the ratio  $\gamma_0/g$ . The curves are obtained by integrating numerically Eq. (15) when the initial state is  $|-\rangle_{t_i}$  over the finite time-window  $[t_i, t_f]$  with  $t_f = -t_i = 5g/\epsilon$  and  $g^2/\epsilon = 1$ .

where  $Q$  is an analytic function, such that  $Q(x) = 0$  for  $x = 0$  and  $Q(x) \rightarrow 0$  for  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . At fixed sweeping speed  $\epsilon$ , the behaviour of the transition probability  $T$  is then controlled by a competition between the gap  $g$  and the dephasing rate  $\gamma_0$ . One can especially notice that the first correction to Eq. (17) exhibits a scaling with  $\epsilon^2$  that echoes the one observed for the transition probability for a Landau-Zener model evolved on a finite time window as in Eq. (4) [2]. In particular, when the dephasing rate  $\gamma_0 \gg g$ , then at leading order  $T \simeq \pi\epsilon/(4\gamma_0g)$ , which indicates an improvement of adiabaticity in a strong dephasing regime. This behaviour is akin to the so-called quantum Zeno effect: indeed, as each measurement projects the system onto an eigenstate of the measured observable, if the measurement is made at a fast frequency, the system does not have the time to evolve away from the state it was projected onto, thus suppressing the probability to tunnel toward another state.

We now analyse the behaviour of the infidelity beyond the asymptotic regime of Ref. [25] and study the competition between Hamiltonian dynamics and dephasing. Figure 2 displays the dynamics of the infidelity  $T$  as a function of time and for several ratios  $\gamma_0/g$  and at fixed  $\epsilon$ . The effects of dephasing are two-fold: we first notice that the oscillations of  $T$  are progressively damped down as  $\gamma_0$  increases, therefore leading to a smoother dynamics. The steady state value is reached for transfer times of the order of  $t_f \sim g/\epsilon$ . Furthermore, the final value of  $T$  decreases as the dephasing rate increases. For sufficiently large ratios  $\gamma_0/g$  the infidelity  $T$  is substantially reduced with respect to the value reached by the means of the coherent Landau-Zener dynamics.

The infidelity  $T$  resulting from integrating Eq. (15) is displayed in Fig. 3 as a function of the dephasing rate,




FIG. 3. (color online) Density plot of the difference between the infidelity  $T$  and the Landau-Zener prediction  $T_{LZ}$ , noted  $\delta T = T - T_{LZ}$ , as a function of  $g^2/\epsilon$  and  $\gamma_0/g$ . The lines in shades of gray represents levels of  $T$ . The infidelity  $T$  is determined numerically Eq. (15) over the time interval  $[t_i, t_f]$  with  $t_f = -t_i = 5g/\epsilon$ . The transition probability  $T_{LZ}$  used to compute  $\delta T$  is the transfer probability for the coherent dynamics at the corresponding parameters. Note that the time interval over which the system is evolved is proportional to  $g/\epsilon$ .

$\gamma/g$  and of the adiabaticity parameter,  $g^2/\epsilon$ . The transfer time is here taken to be the half of the one in Fig. 2. The behaviour at  $\gamma_0 = 0$  is the prediction  $T_{LZ}$  of the coherent Landau-Zener dynamics, where the infidelity decreases as  $\epsilon$  decreases. By adding dephasing, for any value of  $\epsilon$  the fidelity as a function of  $\gamma_0$  first becomes worse then it improves again. The difference  $\delta T = T - T_{LZ}$  highlights the parameter region where the QND coupling improves the protocol's fidelity at finite times: we observe that  $\delta T < 0$  for relatively large values of  $\epsilon$ , thus for relatively fast drives. In this regime dephasing measurement suppresses tunneling to the higher energy state.

#### IV. BEYOND THE QUANTUM ADIABATIC MASTER EQUATION

The results of the previous section suggest that the QND measurement endorses adiabaticity. This statement is reliable for sufficiently small values of the adiabaticity parameter  $\epsilon/g^2$ , but comes still at the price of long transfer dynamics. In order to study the efficiency of the protocol for short times and relatively large values of the adiabatic parameter  $\epsilon/g^2$  we need to consider regimes of large coupling between meter and qubit, where the relaxation time scale of the meter becomes relevant. For this purpose we integrate the full dynamics of qubit and meter, assuming that the meter undergoes a dissipative dynamics. In what follows, the meter is a harmonic oscillator. This choice is made for providing a simple example

that is close to experimental realizations.

##### A. Continuous QND coupling to an overdamped oscillator

We assume that the meter is a damped harmonic oscillator with free Hamiltonian  $H_M = \omega_c \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a}$ , where  $\hat{a}^\dagger$  creates a quantum of energy  $\omega_c$ . The operator  $\hat{X}_M$  of the QND Hamiltonian, Eq. (5), is taken to be

$$\hat{X}_M = x_0 (\hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger),$$

where  $x_0$  determines the strength of the QND coupling and is dimensionless. The dynamics of the coupled qubit and oscillator is governed by the Lindblad equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \hat{\rho} = & -i[\hat{H}_{SM}(t), \hat{\rho}] + \kappa(n+1) \left( \hat{a} \hat{\rho} \hat{a}^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{ \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a}, \hat{\rho} \} \right) \\ & + \kappa n \left( \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{\rho} \hat{a} - \frac{1}{2} \{ \hat{a} \hat{a}^\dagger, \hat{\rho} \} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where

$$\hat{H}_{SM}(t) = \hat{H}_S(t) + \omega_c \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} + x_0 (\hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger) \otimes \hat{H}_S(t), \quad (19)$$

while  $\kappa$  is the rate at which the oscillator relaxes to a thermal state at inverse temperature  $\beta$  and with mean vibrational occupation

$$n = 1/(\exp(\beta\omega_c) - 1).$$

Now the time scale  $\tau_M \sim 1/\kappa$  determines the memory of the meter.

Figure 4(a) displays the infidelity at time  $t = 5g/\epsilon$  as a function of the decay rate  $\kappa$  and for different values of  $x_0$ : we first observe that in the limit  $\kappa \gg x_0, \epsilon/g$  the infidelity tends to increase: this is actually the regime of the quantum adiabatic master equation, where the coupling with the meter induces an effective dephasing dynamics (see App. C for a detailed comparison). On the other hand, the effective dephasing rate scales as  $1/\kappa$  and is thus a small correction to the Landau-Zener coherent dynamics: thus as  $\kappa$  increases the infidelity tends towards the coherent LZ value. Interestingly, the infidelity decreases as  $x_0/\kappa$  is increased, suggesting that adiabaticity is enforced in the parameter regime where the memory time of the meter is a small but finite time scale.

This behaviour is confirmed in Fig. 4(b), which shows the infidelity as a function of  $x_0$ : for increasing values of  $x_0$ , the infidelity decreases. It reaches a saturation value, as one can verify analytically in the limit  $x_0 \rightarrow \infty$ . We note that by increasing  $x_0$  retardation (memory) effects due to the coupling with the meter become increasingly important. In this regime non-adiabatic effects become important, leading to transitions between the adiabatic eigenstates. These processes cool the qubit for sufficiently low temperatures of the meter.

We finally discuss the effect of the temperature of the meter, which is here tuned by varying the parameter  $n$






FIG. 4. Evolution of the infidelity  $T$  for  $g^2/\epsilon = 1$  and for different values of the parameters that control the behaviour of the joint qubit-meter system. The results are obtained by numerically solving Eq. (18) for an oscillator of maximum occupancy  $n_{\max} = 50$ . (a) accounts for the influence of the damping rate  $\kappa$  on the dynamics of infidelity, computed for the choice of parameters  $\omega_c = g$ , and  $\beta = 10/\omega_c$ . (b) shows the influence of the coupling constant  $x_0$ , for  $\omega_c = g$ ,  $\kappa = \omega_c$  and  $\beta = 10/\omega_c$ . The inset displays the evolution of  $T$  for some values of  $x_0$ . (c) displays how  $T$  varies as a function of the average vibrational occupancy  $n$  (linked to the inverse temperature  $\beta$ ) of the boson bath computed for  $\omega_c = g$  and  $x_0 = 1$ .

in Eq. (18). We first note that, in the regime of the quantum adiabatic master equation, the temperature determines the strength  $G(0)$ . In the presence of diabatic transitions, instead, low temperatures tend to suppress transition from the lower to the upper branch, and diabatic effects due to coupling with the meter induce cooling. At larger temperatures, instead, heating transitions take place. This is visible in Fig. 4(c): decreasing the temperature leads to a reduction of the infidelity, confirming that diabatic effects lead to cooling of the qubit in the adiabatic basis, and thus to an effective error corrections. This tendency is reverted for large values of  $\kappa$  as dephasing effects become predominant, and is consistent with the observation that dephasing induced by the contact with a thermal bath tends to suppress diabatic transitions in the Landau-Zener model [26, 27].

### B. Pulsed QND coupling

The dynamics discussed so far requires the capability to continuously tune the coupling between meter and qubit as a function of time. We now analyse the effect of a pulsed dynamics, such that the coupling with the meter is performed at certain instants of times during the dynamics. We model the coupling using the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}'_{\text{QND}}(t) \simeq \sum_j \delta(t - j\delta t) x_0 (\hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger) \otimes \hat{H}_S(t), \quad (20)$$

where  $\delta t$  is the time interval between two successive measurements. The effects of this discretized QND measurement can then be solved numerically, where the Dirac distribution  $\delta$  is approximated by a short pulse of duration  $T_P = 1/x_0$ . The outcome of these calculations is displayed on Fig. 5. The infidelity as a function of time exhibits cusps at the corresponding QND pulse. Each of




FIG. 5. Evolution of the infidelity  $T$  for  $g^2/\epsilon = 1$  and for different sampling times  $\delta t$ . Results are obtained for the choice of parameters  $\omega_c = g$ ,  $\kappa = 2\omega_c$ ,  $x_0 = 10$  and  $\beta = 10/\omega_c$  and for a truncated oscillator of maximum occupancy  $n_{\max} = 75$ . Results are compared with the Landau-Zener prediction (LZ) and the continuous QND measurement (QND).

these pulses corrects the evolved state of the spin and suppresses the infidelity, with an efficiency that increases as  $1/\delta t$ . We note that few QND measurements in the anticrossing region tend to increase the fidelity of the process and suppress the LZ oscillations. These results highlight the robustness of the adiabaticity enforcement by the QND coupling, since even for sparse measurements we observe values of the infidelity that lie below the value predicted for the bare Landau-Zener model.

## V. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOKS

We have analysed the effect of a quantum-non-demolition type of measurement on enforcing adiabaticity of the Landau-Zener dynamics. The QND coupling we considered is time dependent and commutes with the Landau-Zener Hamiltonian at the given time. In the limit in which the meter instantaneously relaxes to the steady state, the QND coupling realizes an effective dephasing of the qubit in the instantaneous, adiabatic basis, thus suppressing diabatic transitions for given transfer times. A more interesting dynamics is found in the regime where the relaxation time of the meter cannot be neglected over the characteristic time scales of the qubit. By suitably choosing the parameters these dynamics perform an effective error correction mechanism by cooling the qubit in the lower state, thus realising high fidelity adiabatic transfer in relatively short times. We note that previous work on Landau-Zener dynamics in the presence of external baths identified the competition of incoherent processes, which promote or suppress diabatic transitions [28], and cast them in terms of interference processes by the means of an elegant path-integral formulation. Future work will analyse the time-dependent QND coupling in these terms.

The dynamics here predicted can be verified in several setups, some prominent examples are a single trapped ion [29], a single trapped atom in a resonator [9, 30], and a superconducting qubit in circuit QED [6]. The QND type of Hamiltonian here discussed can be realised by means of the protocol of Ref. [22], which shall be extended in order to tune the coupling between meter and qubit as a function of time. Errors in performing the stationary QND Hamiltonian have been discussed in Ref. [22]. In the case here discussed they can be corrected by cooling via the meter. We have further shown that the requirement of continuous, time-dependent QND coupling can be relaxed: diabatic transitions can be suppressed by performing a stroboscopic series of instantaneous QND measurements during the dynamics.

Faster adiabatic transfer dynamics can be achieved by tailoring the temporal variation of the Landau-Zener Hamiltonian [31, 32], and combining measurements with optimal control techniques [19, 33, 34]. Suppression of errors at faster tuning rates can be studied beyond adiabatic perturbation theory in the framework of the quantum non-adiabatic master equations [35–37].

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Jacek Dziarmaga, Christiane Koch, Ronnie Kosloff, and Marek Rems for their helpful insights. This work was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation), Project-ID 429529648 TRR 306 QuCoLiMa ("Quantum Cooperativity of Light and Matter") and by the German Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) via the Quan-

tera project "NAQUAS". Project NAQUAS has received funding from the QuantERA ERA-NET Cofund in Quantum Technologies implemented within the European Union's Horizon 2020 Programme.

## Appendix A: The Born-Markov approximation

In the following, we will derive the Lindblad equation in the case of the a system coupled to a measurement apparatus which performs non-demolition measurement.

The construction of the non-adiabatic master equation requires some assumptions on the different energy and time-scales involved in the description of dynamics, starting with the minimal gap  $g$  between the two energy branches. The gap shall be compared with the rate at which the Hamiltonian  $H_S$  evolves, namely  $\epsilon$ . In order to ascertain the adiabaticity of the coherent part of the dynamics for the LZ system, we shall make sure that  $\epsilon/g^2 \ll 1$ . Under this condition, the incoherent part of the dynamics is dominated by adiabatic mechanisms since non-adiabatic effects scale like  $\epsilon/g^2$ . The derivation of the adiabatic master equation will also requires that the meter relaxes at time scales  $\tau_M$  over which one can consider the Hamiltonian  $H_S(t)$  to be constant, resulting in  $\epsilon\tau_M^2 \ll 1$ .

Let us consider  $\hat{\chi}$ , the density matrix representing the two-level system and the measurement apparatus, such that the density matrix of the system is obtained via the partial trace of the states of the meter  $\hat{\rho}(t) = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{M}}[\hat{\chi}(t)]$ . The time-evolution of the density matrix  $\hat{\chi}$  is piloted by the Liouville-von Neumann equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\hat{\chi} = -i\left[\hat{H}_{S\mathcal{M}}, \hat{\chi}\right], \quad (\text{A1})$$

where  $H_{S\mathcal{M}}$  is a Hamiltonian of the generic form

$$\hat{H}_{S\mathcal{M}} = \hat{H}_S(t) \otimes \hat{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{M}} + \hat{\mathbf{1}}_S \otimes \hat{H}_{\mathcal{M}} + \hat{H}_S(t) \otimes \hat{X}_{\mathcal{M}}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Let us notice that we are actually treating an unusual case where the Hamiltonian of the system is time-dependent, and so is the interaction term that couples the system to the meter, via non-demolition measurement.

To treat the effects of this coupling on the dynamical properties of the system, we will place ourselves in the interaction picture, thus isolating the interaction dynamics from the free dynamics. In the interaction picture, we may define the family of freely evolved operators  $\tilde{A}(t)$  such that

$$\tilde{A}(t) = \hat{U}^\dagger(t, t_0)\hat{A}(t_0)\hat{U}(t, t_0), \quad (\text{A3})$$

where the free evolution operator  $U(t, t_0)$  is defined as the solution of the Schrödinger equation in the non-interacting case

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{U}(t, t_0) &= \mathcal{T} \exp \left[ -i \int_{t_0}^t dt' \left( \hat{H}_S(t') + \hat{H}_{\mathcal{M}} \right) \right] \\ &= \hat{U}_S(t, t_0) \otimes \hat{U}_{\mathcal{M}}(t, t_0), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

where  $\mathcal{T}$  is the time-ordering operator.

The Liouville-von Neumann equation in the interaction pictures is then modified, as terms describing the coherent part of dynamics are eliminated by the application of the free evolution operator, only leaving terms accounting for the incoherent dynamics. The equation of motion of the density matrix can then be self-consistently expanded up to an arbitrary order

$$\frac{d}{dt}\tilde{\chi}(t) = -i \left[ \tilde{V}_{S\mathcal{M}}, \tilde{\chi}(0) \right] - \int_0^t dt' \left[ \tilde{V}_{S\mathcal{M}}(t), \left[ \tilde{V}_{S\mathcal{M}}(t'), \tilde{\chi}(t') \right] \right] \quad (\text{A5})$$

with  $\tilde{V}_{S\mathcal{M}} = \tilde{H}_S \otimes \tilde{X}_{\mathcal{M}}$  being the interaction between the system and the measurement device. Under the assumption that the system is initially decoupled to the meter, tracing out the meter will result on the vanishing of the first term in the previous equation. The equation of motion for the reduced density matrix then reads

$$\dot{\tilde{\rho}}(t) = - \int_0^t dt' \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{M}} \left\{ \left[ \tilde{V}_{S\mathcal{M}}(t), \left[ \tilde{V}_{S\mathcal{M}}(t'), \tilde{\chi}(t') \right] \right] \right\}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

In order to proceed forward, we will need to make a first assumption on the form taken by the full density matrix  $\tilde{\chi}$ .

*Hypothesis 1:* Assuming that the coupling between the system and the meter is sufficiently weak in order to leave the state of the meter globally constant over time, we may write the density matrix as the product state of the system and the meter

$$\partial_t \tilde{\chi}(t) = \tilde{\rho}(t) \otimes \hat{M}_0 + \mathcal{O}(\tilde{V}_{S\mathcal{M}}). \quad (\text{A7})$$

Under this assumption, tracing out the meter leads to a description of the incoherent dynamics in terms of the time-correlation properties of the meter. Developing the two commutators, one obtains the following master equation for the evolution of the reduced density matrix

$$\partial_t \tilde{\rho}(t) = - \int_0^t dt' \left\{ \tilde{H}_S(t) \tilde{H}_S(t') \tilde{\rho}(t') - \tilde{H}_S(t') \tilde{\rho}(t') \tilde{H}_S(t) \right\} \mathcal{C}_{XX}(t, t') \quad (\text{A8})$$

$$- \int_0^t dt' \left\{ \tilde{\rho}(t') \tilde{H}_S(t') \tilde{H}_S(t) - \tilde{H}_S(t) \tilde{\rho}(t') \tilde{H}_S(t') \right\} \mathcal{C}_{XX}(t', t), \quad (\text{A9})$$

$$(\text{A10})$$

where  $\mathcal{C}_{XX}(t, t') = \langle \tilde{X}_{\mathcal{M}}(t) \tilde{X}_{\mathcal{M}}(t') \rangle$  is the auto-correlation function of the observable  $X_{\mathcal{M}}$  that couple the meter to the system.

In order to accurately approximate the dynamics of the open system  $\mathcal{S}$  by a Markovian process, one has to

assume the time-scale separation of the system and the meter, or in other words that the dynamics of the meter is much faster than the one of the system. Therefore, the information transferred from the system to the meter is quickly erased and has no backward effect on the dynamics of the system, then resulting in the loss of memory that characterizes a Markovian time-evolution.

*Hypothesis 2:* Assuming that the dynamics of the meter is much faster than the one of the system, the correlations of the meter are expected to decay sufficiently fast in time so that we may approximately treat the density matrix as a constant over the integration time:

$$\tilde{\rho}(t') \simeq \tilde{\rho}(t) \quad (\text{A11})$$

in the integral term of Eq. (A10) whose upper bound can be taken to infinity. After a change of variable ( $t' = t - \tau$ ) and the application of the time-scales separation approximation, the quantum master equation now takes the form given in Eq. (6). Usually, assuming the weak-coupling of the system and its environment and time-scale separation is sufficient in order to transform this integro-differential equation into a Lindblad equation. However, in order to perform the integrals we have to make further assumptions.

## Appendix B: Adiabatic evolution approximation

In order to give the quantum master equation the form of a Lindblad equation, we will take advantage of the slow nature of the dynamics of the system. Indeed, assuming that the evolution of the system is adiabatic, we may provide an approximate expression for the evolution operator  $U_S(t, t')$ , thus simplifying the calculations.

*Hypothesis 3:* At first order in the adiabatic expansion, the evolution operator reads

$$\hat{U}_S(t, t') = \hat{U}_S^{\text{ad}}(t, t') \left[ \hat{1} + \hat{V}(t, t') \right], \quad (\text{B1})$$

where the contribution at leading order reads

$$\hat{U}_S^{\text{ad}} = \sum_a |a\rangle_t \langle a| e^{i\mu_a(t, t')}, \quad (\text{B2})$$

and the correcting term  $\hat{V}(t, t')$  takes the form

$$\hat{V}(t, t') = - \sum_{a \neq b} \alpha_{ab}(t, t') |a\rangle_t \langle b|. \quad (\text{B3})$$

Both operators are here expressed in the basis of the instantaneous eigenstates of the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_S(t)$ , such that  $\hat{H}_S(t)|E_a(t)\rangle = E_a(t)|E_a(t)\rangle$ . The scalar  $\mu_a(t, t')$  is here the phase accumulated in the time interval  $[t', t]$ :

$$\mu_a(t, t') = \int_{t'}^t d\tau [E_a(\tau) - i_\tau \langle a|\dot{a}\rangle_\tau]. \quad (\text{B4})$$



and the coefficients  $\alpha_{ab}(t, t')$  in Eq. (B3) are expressed as

$$\alpha_{ab}(t, t') = \int_{t'}^t d\tau e^{-i(\mu_b(\tau, t') - \mu_a(\tau, t'))} \tau \langle a | \dot{b} \rangle_{\tau}. \quad (\text{B5})$$

Before applying this approximate expression in the study of the quantum master equation, we will use the properties of the evolution operator to formulate one last approximation. Indeed, the following reasoning, we will be brought to encounter  $\hat{U}_S(t-\tau, 0) = \hat{U}_S(t-\tau, t)\hat{U}_S(t, 0)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \hat{U}_S^{\text{ad}\dagger}(t, 0) e^{-i\tau \hat{H}_S(t)} \hat{H}_S(t) e^{i\tau \hat{H}_S(t)} \hat{U}_S^{\text{ad}}(t, 0) \tilde{\rho}(t) \tilde{H}_S(t) \mathcal{C}_{XX}(\tau, 0) \\ & \simeq \sum_{a,b} e^{i\mu_{ab}(t,0)} |a\rangle_t \langle b| \tilde{\rho}(t) \tilde{H}_S(t) \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau e^{i\tau [E_b(t) - E_a(t)]} \mathcal{C}_{XX}(\tau, 0) \\ & \simeq \sum_a E_a(t) |a\rangle_t \langle a| \tilde{\rho}(t) \tilde{H}_S(t) \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \mathcal{C}_{XX}(\tau) \\ & \simeq \sum_{a,b} \Gamma_{XX}(0) E_a(t) E_b(t) |a\rangle_{t=0} \langle a| \tilde{\rho}(t) |b\rangle_{t=0} \langle b|, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mu_{ab}(t, 0) = \mu_a(t, 0) - \mu_b(t, 0)$  and the matrix element  $(H_S(t))_{ab} = \langle a(t) | H_S | b(t) \rangle = E_a(t) \delta_{ab}$ . Furthermore, we note the spectral function of the auto-correlation  $\Gamma_{XX}(\omega) = \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \exp(i\omega\tau) \mathcal{C}_{XX}(\tau, 0)$ . Following the same path for the other integral terms, the quantum master equation then takes the compact form

$$\partial_t \tilde{\rho} = \sum_{a,b} \Gamma_{XX}(0) E_a(t) E_b(t) \hat{P}_a(t) \left[ \tilde{\rho}(t), \hat{P}_b(t) \right] + \text{h.c.}, \quad (\text{B7})$$

where  $\hat{P}_a(t) = |a(t)\rangle \langle a(t)|$  is the projector at time  $t$  onto the eigenstate labeled  $a$ .

From this point, we can return to the Schrödinger picture and recast this quantum master equation into the form of a Lindblad equation describing dephasing mechanisms. Using the relationship  $\tilde{\rho}(t) = \hat{U}_S^\dagger(t, 0) \hat{\rho}(t) \hat{U}_S(t, 0)$ , the left-hand side of Eq. (B7) transforms back into the Liouville-von Neumann part of the Lindblad equation

$$\hat{U}_S(t, 0) \partial_t \tilde{\rho} \hat{U}_S^\dagger(t, 0) = \partial_t \hat{\rho} + i \left[ \hat{H}_S(t), \hat{\rho}(t) \right]. \quad (\text{B8})$$

The application of the evolution operator to the right-hand side of Eq. (B7) on the other hand results in bring-

ing the projectors  $P_a$  to time  $t$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \hat{\rho} &= -i \left[ \hat{H}_S(t), \hat{\rho}(t) \right] \\ &+ \sum_{a,b} \Gamma_{XX}(0) E_a(t) E_b(t) \hat{P}_a(t) \left[ \hat{\rho}(t), \hat{P}_b(t) \right] + \text{h.c.}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B9})$$

where the spectral function  $\Gamma_{XX}(0)$  can be split into two different contributions  $\Gamma_{XX}(0) = \frac{1}{2}G(0) + iS(0)$ , both defined from the full Fourier transform of the auto-correlation function

$$G(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\tau e^{i\omega\tau} \mathcal{C}_{XX}(\tau, 0) \quad (\text{B10a})$$

$$S(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} G(\omega') \mathcal{P} \left( \frac{1}{\omega - \omega'} \right), \quad (\text{B10b})$$

where  $\mathcal{P}$  is Cauchy principal value.

In the case of the Landau-Zener model, the spectrum is reduced to only two levels  $E_{\pm}(t)$ , such that  $E_+(t) = -E_-(t)$ . The quantum master equation then takes the form of Eq. (15).

### Appendix C: Lindblad equation in the adiabatic limit

We will discuss in the following the Lindblad equation in its adiabatic regime, namely in the limit when the




FIG. 6. Asymptotic infidelity  $T$  as a function of the dephasing rate  $\gamma_0$ . Fixing the values of  $g^2/\epsilon = 1$ ,  $x_0 = 1$ ,  $\omega_c = g$  and  $\kappa$ , the dephasing rate at anticrossing  $\gamma_0$  is tuned by changing the temperature, which results in a shift of the vibrational occupancy  $n$ .

damping rate  $\kappa$  is large, our purpose being to ascertain the fact that dephasing effects become then predominant and that the behaviour of the Lindblad equation is consistent with the predictions of the adiabatic master equation for the qubit. The correlation function associated with the observable  $\hat{X} = x_0(\hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger)$  can be computed in the case of the damped harmonic oscillator described by the Lindblad equation

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \hat{\rho} = & -i [\omega_c \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a}, \hat{\rho}] + \kappa(n+1) \left( \hat{a} \hat{\rho} \hat{a}^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{ \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a}, \hat{\rho} \} \right) \\ & + \kappa n \left( \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{\rho} \hat{a} - \frac{1}{2} \{ \hat{a} \hat{a}^\dagger, \hat{\rho} \} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C1})$$

The derivation of the correlation function relies on the decomposition of the density matrix in the right and left eigenvectors of the Liouvillian superoperator  $\rho_\lambda$  and  $\check{\rho}_\lambda$ ,

respectively, such that  $\mathcal{L}\rho_\lambda = \lambda\rho_\lambda$  and  $\check{\rho}_\lambda\mathcal{L} = \lambda\check{\rho}_\lambda$ , with  $\text{Tr}\{\check{\rho}_\lambda\rho_\lambda\} = \delta_{\lambda,\lambda'}$ . This decomposition is known for Eq. (C1) [38, 39].

The correlation function that we defined as  $\mathcal{C}_{XX}(t, t') = \langle X(t)X(t') \rangle$  is expressed in terms of averages over the equilibrium state of Eq. (C1), namely the thermal state  $R_0 = \exp(-\beta\omega_c a^\dagger a)/Z$ . The non-vanishing contributions of the correlation function then lead to the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{XX}(t, t') = & \langle x_0^2 (\hat{a}(t) + \hat{a}^\dagger(t)) (\hat{a}(t') + \hat{a}^\dagger(t')) \rangle \\ = & x_0^2 \left( \text{Tr}\{\hat{a}^\dagger(t)\hat{a}(t')\hat{R}_0\} + \text{Tr}\{\hat{a}(t)\hat{a}^\dagger(t')\hat{R}_0\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using the completeness relation of the eigenbasis  $\sum_\lambda \rho_\lambda \check{\rho}_\lambda = \mathbf{1}$ , we decompose the two contributions of the correlation function as

$$\text{Tr}\{\hat{a}^\dagger(t)\hat{a}(t')\hat{R}_0\} = \sum_\lambda \text{Tr}\{\hat{a}^\dagger e^{(t-t')\mathcal{L}}\rho_\lambda\} \text{Tr}\{\check{\rho}_\lambda \hat{a}\hat{R}_0\},$$

where trace is performed over the basis of the coherent states. Due to orthogonal properties of the Laguerre polynomial involved in the eigenoperators of the Liouvillian, all the contributions in the sum vanish except for the one corresponding to  $(k = \pm 1, n = 0)$ , leading to the simple expression for the correlation function

$$\mathcal{C}_{XX}(t, t') = x_0^2 e^{-\kappa(t-t')/2} \left( (n+1)e^{-i\omega_c(t-t')} + ne^{i\omega_c(t-t')} \right).$$

As a result, we obtain that the real part of the correlation function at frequency  $\omega = 0$  reads

$$\frac{G(0)}{2} = x_0^2 (2n+1) \frac{\kappa/2}{(\kappa/2)^2 + \omega_c^2}, \quad (\text{C2})$$

from which can be deduced the value of  $\gamma_0$ , the dephasing rate at the anticrossing point. The asymptotic value of the infidelity  $T$  computed via the adiabatic master equation and the Lindblad equation is displayed on Fig. 6 and shows a consistent behaviour of infidelity in both cases:  $T$  increases for weak values of the dephasing rate before reaching a maximum and decreasing.

- 
- [1] T. Albash and D. A. Lidar, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90**, 015002 (2018).
- [2] C. De Grandi and A. Polkovnikov, in *Quantum Quenching, Annealing and Computation*, Lecture Notes in Physics, edited by A. K. Chandra, A. Das, and B. K. Chakrabarti (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010) pp. 75–114.
- [3] M. Keck, S. Montangero, G. E. Santoro, R. Fazio, and D. Rossini, *New Journal of Physics* **19**, 113029 (2017).
- [4] D. Sels and A. Polkovnikov, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **114**, E3909 (2017), <https://www.pnas.org/content/114/20/E3909.full.pdf>.
- [5] D. Guéry-Odelin, A. Ruschhaupt, A. Kiely, E. Torrontegui, S. Martínez-Garaot, and J. G. Muga, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **91**, 045001 (2019).
- [6] Y. Atia, Y. Oren, and N. Katz, *Entropy* **21** (2019), 10.3390/e21100937.
- [7] G. A. Paz-Silva, A. T. Rezakhani, J. M. Dominy, and D. A. Lidar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 080501 (2012).
- [8] V. B. Braginsky, Y. I. Vorontsov, and K. S. Thorne, *Science* **209**, 547 (1980).
- [9] S. Haroche and J. Raimond, *Exploring the Quantum: Atoms, Cavities, and Photons*, Oxford Graduate Texts (Oxford University Press, 2013).
- [10] L. D. Landau, *Z. Sowjetunion* **2**, 46 (1932).
- [11] C. Zener and R. H. Fowler, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical and Physical Character* **137**, 696 (1932).

- [12] J. Dziarmaga, *Advances in Physics* **59**, 1063 (2010), <https://doi.org/10.1080/00018732.2010.514702>.
- [13] B. Damski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 035701 (2005), publisher: American Physical Society.
- [14] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables* (Dover, 1964).
- [15] J. F. Poyatos, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 4728 (1996).
- [16] S. Pielawa, G. Morigi, D. Vitali, and L. Davidovich, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 240401 (2007).
- [17] B. Kraus, H. P. Büchler, S. Diehl, A. Kantian, A. Micheli, and P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 042307 (2008).
- [18] S. Roy, J. T. Chalker, I. V. Gornyi, and Y. Gefen, *Phys. Rev. Research* **2**, 033347 (2020).
- [19] S. Patsch, S. Maniscalco, and C. P. Koch, *Phys. Rev. Research* **2**, 023133 (2020).
- [20] S. Haroche, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **85**, 1083 (2013).
- [21] J. Hu, W. Chen, Z. Vendeiro, A. Urvoy, B. Braverman, and V. Vuletić, *Phys. Rev. A* **96**, 050301 (2017).
- [22] D. Yang, A. Grankin, L. M. Sieberer, D. V. Vasilyev, and P. Zoller, *Nature Communications* **11**, 775 (2020), number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [23] G. Gordon, D. D. B. Rao, and G. Kurizki, *New Journal of Physics* **12**, 053033 (2010).
- [24] T. Albash, S. Boixo, D. A. Lidar, and P. Zanardi, *New Journal of Physics* **17**, 129501 (2015).
- [25] J. E. Avron, M. Fraas, G. M. Graf, and P. Grech, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **305**, 633 (2011).
- [26] L. Arceci, S. Barbarino, R. Fazio, and G. E. Santoro, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 054301 (2017).
- [27] M. Wubs, K. Saito, S. Kohler, P. Hänggi, and Y. Kayanuma, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 200404 (2006).
- [28] E. Shimshoni and A. Stern, *Phys. Rev. B* **47**, 9523 (1993), publisher: American Physical Society.
- [29] D. Leibfried, R. Blatt, C. Monroe, and D. Wineland, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 281 (2003).
- [30] A. Reiserer and G. Rempe, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **87**, 1379 (2015).
- [31] J. Roland and N. J. Cerf, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 042308 (2002).
- [32] L. Tian, [arXiv:1802.02285](https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.02285) [cond-mat, physics:quant-ph] (2018), arXiv: 1802.02285.
- [33] K. Rojan, D. M. Reich, I. Dotsenko, J.-M. Raimond, C. P. Koch, and G. Morigi, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 023824 (2014).
- [34] D. Basilewitsch, F. Cosco, N. L. Gullo, M. Möttönen, T. Ala-Nissilä, C. P. Koch, and S. Maniscalco, *New Journal of Physics* **21**, 093054 (2019).
- [35] R. Dann, A. Levy, and R. Kosloff, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 052129 (2018).
- [36] R. Dann and R. Kosloff, *Phys. Rev. Research* **3**, 013064 (2021).
- [37] L. Dupays, I. L. Egusquiza, A. del Campo, and A. Chenu, *Phys. Rev. Research* **2**, 033178 (2020).
- [38] H.-J. Briegel and B.-G. Englert, *Phys. Rev. A* **47**, 3311 (1993).
- [39] B.-G. Englert and G. Morigi, in *Coherent evolution in noisy environments*, Lecture Notes in Physics, edited by A. Buchleitner and K. Horneberger (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003) pp. 55–106.