

Unpredictability of wave function's evolution in nonintegrable quantum systems

I. B. Ivanov

Theory Department, Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute,
188300 Gatchina, Russia

Abstract. It is shown that evolution of wave functions in nonintegrable quantum systems is unpredictable for a long time T because of rapid growth of number of elementary computational operations $\mathcal{O}(T) \sim T^\alpha$. On the other hand, the evolution of wave functions in integrable systems can be predicted by the fast algorithms $\mathcal{O}(T) \sim (\log_2 T)^\beta$ for logarithmically short time and thus there is an algorithmic "compressibility" of their dynamics. The difference between integrable and nonintegrable systems in our approach looks identically for classical and quantum systems. Therefore the minimal number of bit operations $\mathcal{O}(T)$ needed to predict a state of system for time interval T can be used as universal sign of chaos.

Chaos as universal phenomenon exists in various systems (for example, in human society) and from this point of view the general approach to chaos should not be based on particular properties of a system. It is well known [1] that motion of nonintegrable classical systems has all attributes of chaos: complexity, unpredictability and randomness. However in nonintegrable quantum systems the apparent signs of chaos seems to be absent [2] and the main direction of studies in the field of "quantum chaos" is semiclassical analysis of various quantum "signatures" of classical chaos [3, 4]. Nevertheless, taking into account the fundamental correspondence principle it is reasonable to suppose that evolution of nonintegrable quantum systems should be also unpredictable. As a basis tool to analyze predictability of dynamics we use a number of elementary computational operations $\mathcal{O}(T)$ needed to determine a state of the system for time interval T .

Let us consider firstly how a number of elementary computational operations needed for prediction of system's evolution depends on time T and accuracy Δ in classical mechanics. It is well known [1] that a distance $\|\delta x(t)\|$ between initially close phase space points grows with time as

$$\|\delta x(t)\| = \|\delta x(0)\|f(t), \tag{1}$$

where $f(t) \sim e^{\lambda t}$ for nonintegrable systems and $f(t) \sim t$ for integrable ones. The exponential growth of inevitable computational errors leads to unpredictability of long time evolution in nonintegrable classical systems. To predict a state (trajectory) of the system by the moment T with accuracy Δ we must make computations with accuracy at least

$$\delta = \frac{\Delta}{f(T)}$$

and length of mantissa

$$n \sim -\log_2 \delta = \log_2 f(T) - \log_2 \Delta.$$

It is reasonable to suppose that an algorithm which generates a trajectory has a power dependence of number of elementary bit operations $\mathcal{O}(n)$ on the length of mantissa (for example, $\mathcal{O}(n) \sim n$ for addition and $\mathcal{O}(n) \sim n^2$ for multiplication):

$$\mathcal{O}(T) \sim n^\alpha \sim (\log_2 f(T) - \log_2 \Delta)^\alpha, \quad (2)$$

where $\alpha > 1$ is some number. Inserting now $f(t)$ in (2) we obtain for nonintegrable systems ($\alpha > 1$)

$$\mathcal{O}(T) \sim T^\alpha, \quad (3)$$

while for integrable ones

$$\mathcal{O}(T) \sim (\log_2 T)^\alpha. \quad (4)$$

In the first case a number of operations and hence a computational time needed for prediction grows as a power of time T . Therefore the prediction for a long time is impossible and evolution is not algorithmically "compressible". In regular systems there is a completely different situation because computational time grows logarithmically with time T and prediction is always possible ("compressibility" of evolution). It is interesting to note that algorithmic "uncompressibility" of some numerical sequence is the main sign of its randomness: such sequence we can only observe.

Let us consider now a time evolution of some state $\psi(q, t)$ in a stationary quantum system $H(q, p)$

$$i\hbar \partial_t \psi(q, t) = H\psi(q, t), \quad (5)$$

$$\psi(q, 0) = \psi_0(q),$$

Any solution of (5) at $t = T$ can be represented as

$$\psi(q, T) = \sum_{\mu} c_{\mu} e^{-iE_{\mu}T/\hbar} \phi_{\mu}(q), \quad (6)$$

where $\{E_{\mu}\}$ and $\{\phi_{\mu}\}$ – are exact eigenenergies and eigenfunctions of Hamiltonian H and $c_{\mu} = \langle \phi_{\mu} | \psi_0 \rangle$. So if quantum chaos exists it hides in eq. (6) which is essence of quantum unitary evolution. In analogy with classical case it would be reasonable to investigate a time dependence of two initially close wave functions ψ_1 and ψ_2 . It is natural to characterize a difference between wave functions by the quantity

$$\|\delta\psi\| = \|\psi_2 - \psi_1\| = \sqrt{2(1 - \text{Re}\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle)}. \quad (7)$$

If at $t = 0$ we have $\|\delta\psi(0)\| < \varepsilon$ then at $t = T$ the difference (7) is also small $\|\delta\psi(T)\| < \varepsilon$ because from unitarity it follows that $\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle$ does not vary with time. Therefore in quantum systems there is no divergence of initially close states which is the main sign of chaos in classical systems.

How then unpredictability of evolution can arise in quantum systems? To predict a state of the system $\psi(q, T)$ at moment $t = T$ it is necessary to know all eigenvalues and eigenfunctions in (6) exactly. Really we use in (6) approximate eigenvalues and eigenfunctions

and therefore by some moment exact wave function and our prediction will be completely different. It is obvious that to increase a maximal time of accurate prediction we must improve accuracy of eigenvalues. The spectrum of integrable systems is easy computable and computational resources grow slowly with increasing of accuracy while for nonintegrable systems considerable efforts are needed to improve the spectrum and thus to increase the time of correct prediction. Therefore we can assume that quantum integrable systems differ significantly from nonintegrable ones in a sense of number of bit operations $\mathcal{O}(T)$ needed to predict a future. In the remaining part of this Letter we consider some details of the suggested mechanism of unpredictability and hence of chaos in quantum unitary evolution.

Let us assume that we have found approximate eigenenergies $\{\tilde{E}_\mu\}$ and eigenfunctions $\{\tilde{\phi}_\mu\}$. Then we can predict by means (6) that at moment T wave function will be

$$\tilde{\psi}(q, T) = \sum_{\mu} \tilde{c}_\mu e^{-i\tilde{E}_\mu T/\hbar} \tilde{\phi}_\mu(q), \quad (8)$$

where $\tilde{c}_\mu = \langle \tilde{\phi}_\mu | \psi_0 \rangle$. Our main goal now is to find a time dependence of the difference between exact $\psi(q, T)$ and approximate $\tilde{\psi}(q, T)$ wave functions

$$\|\delta\psi(T)\| = \|\tilde{\psi}(T) - \psi(T)\| = \sqrt{2(1 - \text{Re}(\langle \psi(T) | \tilde{\psi}(T) \rangle))}. \quad (9)$$

Making use of (6) and (8) we have:

$$\langle \psi(T) | \tilde{\psi}(T) \rangle = \sum_{\mu, \nu} c_\mu^* \tilde{c}_\nu e^{-i(\tilde{E}_\nu - E_\mu)T/\hbar} \langle \phi_\mu | \tilde{\phi}_\nu \rangle. \quad (10)$$

Now we need some assumptions about accuracy of spectrum obtained. If a maximal error of eigenfunctions $\tilde{\phi}_\mu$ does not exceed ε

$$\delta\phi_\mu = \tilde{\phi}_\mu - \phi_\mu,$$

$$\|\delta\phi_\mu\| < \varepsilon.$$

then the error of E_μ is

$$\delta E_\mu = \tilde{E}_\mu - E_\mu = 2E_\mu \text{Re}(\langle \phi_\mu | \delta\phi_\mu \rangle) + \langle \delta\phi_\mu | H | \delta\phi_\mu \rangle, \quad (11)$$

$$|\delta E_\mu| < 2|E_\mu|\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 \|H\|,$$

and error of c_μ is

$$\delta c_\mu = \tilde{c}_\mu - c_\mu = \langle \delta\phi_\mu | \psi_0 \rangle,$$

$$|\delta c_\mu| < \varepsilon.$$

Scalar product $\langle \phi_\mu | \tilde{\phi}_\nu \rangle$ we can write as

$$\langle \phi_\mu | \tilde{\phi}_\nu \rangle = \delta_{\mu\nu} + \langle \phi_\mu | \delta\phi_\nu \rangle = \delta_{\mu\nu} + R_{\mu\nu},$$

$$|R_{\mu\nu}| < \varepsilon.$$




Figure 1: A typical behaviour of (a) $\langle \psi(T) | \tilde{\psi}(T) \rangle$ and (b) $\|\delta\psi(T)\|$.

Now (10) becomes

$$\langle \psi(T) | \tilde{\psi}(T) \rangle = \sum_{\mu} c_{\mu}^* \tilde{c}_{\mu} (1 + R_{\mu\mu}) e^{-i\delta E_{\mu} T / \hbar} + \sum_{\mu \neq \nu} c_{\mu}^* \tilde{c}_{\nu} R_{\mu\nu} e^{-i(E_{\nu} - E_{\mu} + \delta E_{\nu}) T / \hbar}. \quad (12)$$

It is clear that first sum carries the main contribution in $\langle \psi(T) | \tilde{\psi}(T) \rangle$ because second sum has a small multiplier $R_{\mu\nu}$. To understand the main features of (10) it is sufficient to investigate time dependence of

$$\langle \psi(T) | \tilde{\psi}(T) \rangle \approx \sum_{\mu} |c_{\mu}|^2 e^{-i\delta E_{\mu} T / \hbar}. \quad (13)$$

At $T = 0$ a value of $\langle \psi(0) | \tilde{\psi}(0) \rangle$ equals 1, then $\langle \psi(T) | \tilde{\psi}(T) \rangle$ decreases and at some moment T_p reaches values nearly zero. After this $\langle \psi(T) | \tilde{\psi}(T) \rangle$ starts to oscillate about zero with some small amplitude. For times $T > T_p$ the value of $\|\delta\psi(T)\|$ oscillates about mean value $\sqrt{2}$ which corresponds to completely independent states. This typical behaviour of $\langle \psi(T) | \tilde{\psi}(T) \rangle$ and $\|\delta\psi(T)\|$ is shown in Fig. 1. This means that for $T > T_p$ wave function $\tilde{\psi}(T)$ completely differs from exact function $\psi(T)$ and our further prediction is impossible.

We want now to find how T_p and average amplitude of small oscillations \bar{A} depend on errors δE_{μ} and coefficients c_{μ} . Our intuition and numerical experience say that T_p depends on dispersion of errors dE while \bar{A} is a function of number dim of the most important addendums in (13). It is obvious that $\langle \psi(T) | \tilde{\psi}(T) \rangle$ becomes nearly zero when arguments of exponents in (13) fill interval $[0, 2\pi]$. From this condition we have T_p :

$$T_p \sim \frac{2\pi}{2dE/\hbar} = \frac{\pi\hbar}{dE}. \quad (14)$$

To estimate \bar{A} let us make further simplification that all c_{μ} in (13) are equal $1/\sqrt{dim}$. In such a case (13) becomes

$$P(T) = Re(\langle \psi(T) | \tilde{\psi}(T) \rangle) = \frac{1}{dim} \sum_{\mu=1}^{dim} \cos(\delta E_{\mu} T / \hbar) \quad (15)$$

and $P^2(T)$ is:

$$P^2(T) = \frac{1}{dim^2} \sum_{\mu, \nu} \cos(\delta E_{\mu} T / \hbar) \cos(\delta E_{\nu} T / \hbar) =$$

$$\frac{1}{dim^2} \sum_{\mu} \cos^2(\delta E_{\mu} T / \hbar) + \frac{1}{dim^2} \sum_{\mu \neq \nu} \cos(\delta E_{\mu} T / \hbar) \cos(\delta E_{\nu} T / \hbar).$$

It is easy to see that if we make time averaging of $P^2(T)$ then the first sum equals $dim/2$ while the second sum is zero because arguments of cosines are almost independent for different E_{μ} and E_{ν} . In the result average amplitude of oscillations of $Re(\langle \psi(T) | \tilde{\psi}(T) \rangle)$ can be estimated as

$$\bar{A} \sim \sqrt{P^2(T)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2dim}}. \quad (16)$$

We tested our theoretical estimates (14) and (16) for wide range of parameters and found good agreement with numerical computations. So we have obtained a quite reasonable result that uncertainty in our knowledge of spectrum $E \pm dE$ leads to limitation in prediction time of $\psi(T)$ evolution $T_p \sim \hbar/dE$.

The next step consists of estimating of number of operations needed to obtain the spectrum with some accuracy dE . If the spectrum of a system can be computed by some formulae or by effective algorithms (as in the case of integrable systems), the number of operations grows slowly with decreasing of error dE . To explain this let us assume for simplicity that to compute the spectrum we must perform some series of successive actions which do not depend on accuracy required (for example $E_N = \hbar\omega(N + 1/2)$). Obviously the necessary number of bit operations $\mathcal{O}(dE)$ depends on mantissa length $n \sim -\log_2 dE$ only

$$\mathcal{O}(dE) \sim n^{\gamma} \sim (-\log_2 dE)^{\gamma}, \quad (17)$$

where $\gamma > 1$ – some coefficient characterizing the algorithm of computations. So we have obtained that in integrable systems a number of bit operations depends logarithmically on accuracy dE .

Fortunately the variety of systems in nature is not exhausted by easy computable and predictable systems. Description of any nonseparable system with strong coupling and especially of its excited states is nontrivial problem even for two degrees of freedom. The only reliable way to calculate such systems is to use various variation methods, i.e. to minimize the energy functional over some space of trial functions. Let us consider how the number of operations depends on spectrum accuracy for variational method of Ritz. It is well known [5] that Ritz's method has a power convergence, i.e. approximate eigenfunctions $\tilde{\phi}_{\mu}$ tend to exact ones ϕ_{μ} as

$$\|\tilde{\phi}_{\mu} - \phi_{\mu}\| \sim D^{-\alpha}, \quad (18)$$

where D is dimension of space of trial functions and $\alpha \sim 1$ – some coefficient. Obviously (see (11)) the rate of convergence of eigenvalues does not exceed the power law:

$$|\tilde{E}_{\mu} - E_{\mu}| \sim D^{-\alpha}. \quad (19)$$

To make use of Ritz's method it is necessary to calculate firstly a Hamiltonian matrix with number of elements D^2 , and then to find its eigenvalues. The total number of operations to do this can be estimated as $\mathcal{O}(D) \sim D^{\beta}$, $\beta > 2$. To achieve an accuracy ε the basis dimension $D \sim \varepsilon^{-1/\alpha}$ is required (see (19)) and hence the total number of operations is $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \sim \varepsilon^{-\beta/\alpha}$. Keeping in mind the relation between time of prediction and accuracy of eigenvalues (14)

we obtain the number of bit operations which are needed to predict the wave function's evolution over time interval T :

$$\mathcal{O}(T) \sim T^{\beta/\alpha}. \quad (20)$$

For regular systems (17) the number of operations is equal to

$$\mathcal{O}(T) \sim (\log_2 T)^\gamma. \quad (21)$$

It should be noted that our estimate (20) is valid for any algorithm with power convergence.

So we see that difference between integrable and nonintegrable systems in our approach looks identically in classical and quantum systems. The evolution of integrable systems can be predicted by fast algorithms for logarithmically short time ("compressibility" of evolution) while in nonintegrable systems such "compressibility" is absent. The reason of unpredictability is universal in classical and quantum systems — rapid growth of number of elementary computational operations needed for prediction, but the mechanism of chaos is completely different.

References

- [1] A. Lichtenberg, M. Lieberman. (1983), Regular and Stochastic Motion, New York: Springer
- [2] Proc. of the 5th Yukawa International Seminar. (1994), Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **116**
- [3] M. Berry. (1991), in "Quantum Chaos. Adriatico Research Conf., Trieste, 1990", H.A.Cerdeira, R.Ramaswamy, M.Gutzwiller, G.Casati (editors), World Scientific, p. VII
- [4] B. Eckhardt. (1988) Phys. Rep. **163**, p. 207
- [5] S. G. Mihlin. (1970), Variational methods in mathematical physics, Moscow: Nauka