

Decoherence in quantum open systems revisited

Robert Alicki

Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, University of Gdańsk, Wita Stwosza 57, PL 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland
(October 28, 2018)

The following statements belonging to the folklore of the theory of environmental decoherence are shown to be incorrect: 1) linear coupling to harmonic oscillator bath is a universal model of decoherence, 2) chaotic environments are more efficient decoherers.

03.65.-w , 05.30.-d

Decoherence became one of the most popular topics in the physical literature of the last decade [1-3]. This is mainly due to the progress in experimental techniques allowing to observe the onset of decoherence at the most interesting regime i.e. at the border between quantum and classical worlds [4]. Another motivation is a destructive role of decoherence in the possible future technology based on quantum information processing [5]. Despite the fact that the theoretical models of decoherence exist at least for 40 years [6] a closer look at certain aspects of these theories reveals quite fundamental inconsistencies and misconceptions.

We begin with a rather eclectic definition.

Decoherence is the irreversible, uncontrollable and persistent formation of quantum correlations (entanglement) of the system with environment.

Usually, decoherence is accompanied by *dissipation* i.e. the exchange of energy with environment. For the sake of clarity we shall restrict ourselves to the case of *pure decoherence* called also *dephasing* for which the process of energy dissipation is negligible. Pure decoherence is supposed to be the main ingredient of the theory explaining the apparent absence of superpositions of macroscopically distinguishable states and the transition from quantum to classical world. Indeed, superpositions of quantum states separated by large energy gaps are practically not observable due to rapidly oscillating phases, hence the mechanism of environmental decoherence becomes interesting and relevant for the states with almost equal energies.

We shall concentrate ourselves on a careful analysis of the following issues:

a) No-go theorem for pure decoherence which states that this phenomenon cannot be described by a coupling to harmonic oscillator bath which is linear in the oscillator coordinates and/or momenta or equivalently by a coupling to a free bose system linear in field operators.

b) False decoherence.

c) Dependence of pure decoherence rate on chaotic properties of environment.

The "physical proof" of the formulated above *no-go theorem* is very simple. Pure decoherence in the open system must be accompanied by the irreversible perturbation of the environment's state but the energy of the environment must be asymptotically preserved. However, the linear coupling to the bosonic environment implies that the only change of its state is caused by irreversible processes of emission and absorption of single bosons which must alter the environment's energy. This statement apparently contradicts various models of pure decoherence existing in the literature [7,8].

In order to explain this discrepancy and to illustrate at the same time the phenomenon of false decoherence we discuss the simplest version of the *spin - boson model*. The spin-1/2 represents an open system while bosonic field at the vacuum state a model of a (zero-temperature) bath. Although the example with the Hamiltonian defined below is one of the simplest and most studied exactly solvable models in quantum theory [9], it seems that some of its subtle mathematical and physical features were overlooked in the context of decoherence in quantum open systems.

The bosonic reservoir is defined in terms of fields $a(\omega)$, $a^+(\omega)$ satisfying CCR

$$[a(\omega), a^+(\omega')] = \delta(\omega - \omega') , \quad \omega, \omega' \in [0, \infty) \quad (1)$$

a single-boson Hilbert space $L^2[0, \infty)$, a single-boson Hamiltonian h_1 , $(h_1 f)(\omega) = \omega f(\omega)$ and the second quantization Hamiltonian

$$H_B = \int_0^\infty d\omega \omega a^+(\omega) a(\omega) \quad (2)$$

acting on the bosonic Fock space $\mathcal{F}_B(L^2[0, \infty))$ with the vacuum state Ω . Introducing "smeared fields" $a(f) = \int_0^\infty d\omega \tilde{f}(\omega) a(\omega)$ we can define a spin-boson Hamiltonian depending on the function ("formfactor") $g \in L^2[0, \infty)$

$$\mathbf{H}_g = \sigma_3 \otimes (a(h_1 g) + a^+(h_1 g)) + \sigma_0 \otimes H_B \quad (3)$$

acting on the Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{H}_{SB} = \mathbf{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{F}_B(L^2[0, \infty)) \equiv \mathcal{F}_B(L^2[0, \infty)) \oplus \mathcal{F}_B(L^2[0, \infty)) \quad (4)$$

where $\sigma_\mu, \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ are standard Pauli matrices.

This particular choice of the parametrization of the interaction Hamiltonian becomes clear soon. The condition $\|g\|^2 = \int_0^\infty |g(\omega)|^2 d\omega < \infty$ is usually satisfied by introducing an ultraviolet cut-off at ω_c and putting in the infrared region

$$|g(\omega)|^2 \sim \omega^{-1+\kappa}, \text{ with } \kappa > 0. \quad (5)$$

The Hamiltonian (3) can be diagonalized using unitary Weyl operators $W(f) = \exp\{a(f) - a^\dagger(f)\}$ with $f \in L^2[0, \infty)$ acting on the Fock space $\mathcal{F}_B(L^2[0, \infty))$ and satisfying

$$W(f)^* = W(-f), \quad W(f)W(h) = e^{-i\text{Im}\langle f, h \rangle} W(f+h), \quad W(f)a(\omega)W(f)^* = a(\omega) + f(\omega)\mathbf{1}. \quad (6)$$

The vectors $W(f)\Omega$ are called *coherent states* and they form an overcomplete set in the following sense. If for a given vector Ψ from the bosonic Fock space and any $f \in L^2[0, \infty) \langle \Psi, W(f)\Omega \rangle = 0$, then $\Psi = 0$. Taking into account the formula (6) and that $\langle \Omega, W(f)\Omega \rangle = \exp\{-(1/2)\|f\|^2\}$ we obtain

$$|\langle W(f)\Omega, W(g)\Omega \rangle|^2 = e^{-\|f-g\|^2} \leq e^{-\|g\| - \|f\|} \quad (7)$$

As a consequence for $\|g\| = \infty$ $W(g)$ cannot be defined as a unitary operator on $\mathcal{F}_B(L^2[0, \infty))$. Introducing a unitary operator on \mathcal{H}_{SB} (4) ($\|g\| < \infty$)

$$\mathbf{W}(g) = \begin{pmatrix} W(g) & 0 \\ 0 & W(-g) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

we obtain the diagonalized form

$$\mathbf{W}(g)\mathbf{H}_g\mathbf{W}(g)^* = \sigma_0 \otimes \int_0^\infty d\omega \omega a^\dagger(\omega)a(\omega) - E_g \mathbf{1} \quad (9)$$

where

$$E_g = \langle g, h_1 g \rangle = \int_0^\infty \omega |g(\omega)|^2 d\omega. \quad (10)$$

Therefore the degenerated ground states of \mathbf{H}_g are given by

$$\mathbf{H}_g\Phi_\pm(g) = -E_g\Phi_\pm(g), \quad \Phi_\pm(g) = e_\pm \otimes W(\pm g)\Omega, \text{ where } \sigma_3 e_\pm = \pm e_\pm. \quad (11)$$

In the standard dynamical approach to decoherence one starts with an initial product state of the spin-boson system

$$\Psi_{in} = \psi \otimes \Omega, \quad \psi = \psi_- e_- + \psi_+ e_+, \quad \psi_\pm \in \mathbf{C} \quad (12)$$

satisfying

$$|\langle \Psi_{in} | \Phi_\pm(g) \rangle|^2 = e^{-\|g\|^2}, \quad E(\Psi_{in}) = \langle \Psi_{in} | \mathbf{H}_g | \Psi_{in} \rangle = 0, \quad (13)$$

computes its time evolution governed by the Hamiltonian (3)

$$\Psi(t) = e^{-it\mathbf{H}_g}\Psi_{in} = \exp\{i(tE_g - \text{Im}\langle g | g_t \rangle)\}(\psi_- e_- \otimes W(g_t - g)\Omega + \psi_+ e_+ \otimes W(g - g_t)\Omega) \quad (14)$$

where $g_t(\omega) = e^{-i\omega t}g(\omega)$ and calculates the reduced density matrix for the spin

$$\rho_t = \text{Tr}_B |\Psi(t)\rangle \langle \Psi(t)| = \begin{pmatrix} |\psi_+|^2 & \psi_+ \bar{\psi}_- e^{-\gamma t} \\ \bar{\psi}_+ \psi_- e^{-\gamma t} & |\psi_-|^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (15)$$

with

$$\gamma_t = 2\|g - g_t\|^2. \quad (16)$$

The interpretation of the obtained results is rather straightforward. Two degenerated ground states of the Hamiltonian \mathbf{H}_g should be interpreted as the states of a *dressed spin* which consists of a *bare spin* and a *cloud* of virtual bosons represented by the coherent states $W(\pm g)\Omega$. As for $t \rightarrow \infty$ the traveling wave g_t becomes orthogonal to g the asymptotic form of $\Psi(t)$ possesses the structure of superposition of two triple product states $e_{\pm} \otimes W(\pm g)\Omega \otimes W(\mp g_t)\Omega$. Therefore, the evolution of the initial product state (12) given by (14) describes the process of formation of the cloud accompanied by emission of the average energy E_g in a form of coherent traveling waves $\pm g_t$. In principle, such process may be observed for example after rapid injection of an electron into a polar medium when the new stable physical system - a *polaron* - is formed. However, this process has nothing to do with the decoherence of polaron states in a solid. Similarly, for fundamental interactions (e.g. electromagnetic one) the processes of dressing could be important in the presence of particle creation or in cosmological context but not for the low energy decoherence phenomena. Therefore, from the physical point of view the discussed model describes a phenomenon which should be called *false decoherence* [13].

The degree of false decoherence is characterised by $\gamma_t \leq 8\|g\|^2$. To obtain an asymptotically exponential decay of the off-diagonal elements of the reduced density matrix (15) we must assume that $\|g\| = \infty$ (see (16)) and moreover

$$0 < \gamma = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\gamma_t}{t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{\omega_c} \omega^2 |g(\omega)|^2 \frac{1 - \cos \omega t}{t \omega^2} d\omega = \pi \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \omega^2 |g(\omega)|^2. \quad (17)$$

This result agrees with a standard wisdom relating the pure decoherence rate to the value at $\omega = 0$ of the *spectral density function*

$$\hat{R}(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\omega t} \langle R(t)R \rangle_B dt \quad (18)$$

where R is a bath's operator appearing in the interaction Hamiltonian $\sigma_3 \otimes R$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle_B$ is an average with respect to the environment's state. It is a special case of the quantum *fluctuation - dissipation theorem* which in fact should be called in this context a "fluctuation-decoherence theorem". For our model $R = a(h_1g) + a^\dagger(h_1g)$ and hence $\hat{R}_0(\omega) = 2\pi\omega^2|g(\omega)|^2$ where the subscript "0" indicates the zero-temperature (vacuum) state of the bath. However, a non zero value of γ means that $|g(\omega)|^2 \sim \omega^{-2}$ what due to (5) corresponds indeed to $\|g\| = \infty$ and the average energy E_g (10) emitted during the false decoherence process is infinite.

The meaning of this result is the following. From the previous discussion we know that only under the condition $\|g\| < \infty$ the formal expression (3) defines a Hamiltonian possessing a (doubly degenerated) ground state and describes a physically admissible stable system. For $\|g\| = \infty$ even its renormalised version $\mathbf{H}'_g = \mathbf{H}_g + E_g \mathbf{1}$ does not possess a ground state in the Hilbert space (4). This is a well known *van Hove phenomenon* related to the existence of *nonequivalent representations of CCR* and being the simplest instance of difficulties with the formulation of a mathematically sound Quantum Field Theory [10].

In principle, the states $\Phi_{\pm}(g)$ treated as limits of "normal" states from the Hilbert space (4) with $\|g\| \rightarrow \infty$ can exist in the sense of state functionals on the algebra of observables. But in this case they are *disjoint*, i.e. they define nonequivalent representations of the algebra of observables. Formally, it follows from the formula $\Phi_+(g) = \sigma_1 \otimes W(2g)\Phi_-(g)$ which for $\|g\| \rightarrow \infty$ indicates that there exists no unitary operator which transforms $\Phi_-(g)$ into $\Phi_+(g)$. Physically, it means that their superpositions are indistinguishable from their mixtures. In other words *superselection rules* appear in the theory and the corresponding *classical observables* emerge. For our model z -component of a dressed spin becomes such an observable. Some authors invoke this mechanism to describe the emergence of classical observables for quantum systems and call this phenomenon *decoherence* [11]. In fact, it should be called *static decoherence* because the disjointness is a permanent feature of these states. Although from the mathematical point of view this is an attractive approach, on the other hand it can lead to profound interpretational difficulties. Strict application of this idea, for example in the case of electromagnetic interactions, produces a physically unacceptable superselection rule which prevents coherent superpositions of different momentum states of an electron [10,11]. As the author of [10] writes: "The seeming paradox may serve as a warning against overrating the significance of idealizations in the mathematical description of a physical situation". One can hope that the recent rigorous investigations of the nonrelativistic electrodynamics [12] will improve our understanding of this fundamental issue.

A very similar model of harmonic oscillator heat baths (temperature $T > 0$) with a linear coupling to an open system is used to model quantum Brownian motion. In the Markovian approximation the following Master Equation for the reduced density matrix of the 1-dimensional Brownian particle, the so-called Caldeira-Leggett equation, has been derived [8]

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_t = -i[H, \rho_t] - i\eta[X, \{P, \rho_t\}] - 2M\eta T[X, [X, \rho_t]] \quad (19)$$

where X, P are position and momentum operators, $H = P^2/2M + V(X)$, η is a *friction constant*, M is a mass of the Brownian particle and $V(X)$ is a potential energy. While in a general case the eq.(19) describes both decoherence and dissipation the formal heavy particle limit ($M \rightarrow \infty, M\eta = \text{const.}$) produces a simplified equation describing pure decoherence

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_t = -i[V(X), \rho_t] - \gamma[X, [X, \rho_t]] \quad (20)$$

with the decoherence rate $\gamma > 0$. Again we have an apparent contradiction to our no-go theorem and the solution of this paradox is also similar. The derivation of eq.(19) is based again on the condition $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \hat{R}(\omega) > 0$. It is easy to check that for $\omega \ll T$ (we put $\hbar \equiv k_B \equiv 1$) $\hat{R}_T(\omega) \simeq (T/\omega)\hat{R}_0(\omega)$ and hence the condition of above is satisfied for the *ohmic form* [8,9] of the interaction. In our notation it means that $|g(\omega)|^2 \sim \omega^{-1}$ in the infrared region and according to (5) it corresponds to a singular and unstable model.

Summarizing the above results one should stress that the very idea of the theory of open systems demands a clear operational decomposition into the well-defined open system S and the stable reservoir R . It is possible only if we use an effective theory for "dressed" systems with Hamiltonians of both systems H_S and H_R acting as self-adjoint operators on the Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_S, \mathcal{H}_R$ of physical ("dressed") states and the interaction H_{int} between S and R is a weak perturbation of $H_S + H_R$ with all necessary cut-offs and formfactors such that $H_S + H_R + H_{int}$ is a well-defined Hamiltonian on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_R$ possessing a ground state. This last assumption is a minimal stability condition which must be satisfied even if we consider thermal states of the environment only. In order to fulfil these requirements for the models of open systems linearly coupled to harmonic oscillator (bosonic) baths one has to introduce beside the ultraviolet cut-off ω_c the proper scaling of formfactors (5) in the infrared domain. It follows that such models are very useful to describe dissipation accompanied by decoherence like spontaneous emission of light by atoms and molecules but fail in the case of pure decoherence, because $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \hat{R}(\omega) = 0$. As a consequence the models based on vacuum fluctuations of the background quantum fields (gravitational, electromagnetic,...) [14] are very unlikely to solve the problem of transition from the quantum to classical world.

Fortunately, it is not difficult to construct proper models of pure decoherence. They should involve interactions enabling *elastic scattering* processes which perturb the reservoir's state without changing its energy. Beside the direct elastic collisions with atoms, molecules, photons etc. the other "bilinear" processes are possible within this scheme like, for instance, absorption of a foton followed by an excitation of internal degrees of freedom of a Brownian particle and the time-reversed process [15]. The simplest "spin-boson" version of such model is given by the following Hamiltonian

$$\mathbf{H}^f = \sigma_3 \otimes (a^+(f; +)a(f; -) + a^+(f; -)a(f; +)) + \sigma_0 \otimes \sum_{\epsilon=+,-} H_B(\epsilon) \quad (21)$$

where

$$H_B(\epsilon) = \int_0^\infty d\omega \omega a^+(\omega; \epsilon)a(\omega; \epsilon) . \quad (22)$$

The bosonic fields satisfy CCR

$$[a(\omega; \epsilon), a^+(\omega'; \epsilon')] = \delta_{\epsilon\epsilon'} \delta(\omega - \omega') . \quad (23)$$

The single-boson Hilbert space $L^2[0, \infty) \otimes \mathbf{C}^2$ contains an additional discrete quantum number $\epsilon = \pm$ and we put a single-boson Hamiltonian h_1 , $(h_1 f)(\omega; \epsilon) = \omega f(\omega; \epsilon)$. The boson can be seen, for instance, as a particle moving in 1-dimensional space with the kinetic energy ω and the momentum direction ϵ . The smeared fields are obviously defined by $a(f; \epsilon) = \int_0^\infty d\omega \bar{f}(\omega)a(\omega; \epsilon)$. For $\int_0^\infty |f(\omega)|^2 d\omega < \infty$ the Hamiltonian (21) is well-defined on the Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{H}^{SB} = \mathbf{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{F}_B(L^2[0, \infty) \otimes \mathbf{C}^2) \equiv \mathbf{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{F}_B(L^2[0, \infty)) \otimes \mathcal{F}_B(L^2[0, \infty)) \quad (24)$$

and possesses a double degenerated product ground state $e_\pm \otimes \Omega_+ \otimes \Omega_-$. Instead of the vacuum state we take as a reference state of the environment a quasi-free state with the average $\langle \cdot \rangle_B$ describing a free bosonic gas in the thermodynamic limit determined uniquely by the density $n(\omega)$ such that

$$\langle a^+(\omega; \epsilon)a(\omega'; \epsilon') \rangle_B = n(\omega)\delta_{\epsilon\epsilon'}\delta(\omega - \omega') . \quad (25)$$

We do not go into the detailed analysis of this simple model but we present only the formula for the pure decoherence rate in the Markovian low density Born approximation [16]

$$\gamma \simeq \pi \int_0^\infty |f(\omega)|^4 n(\omega) d\omega . \quad (26)$$

From the formula (26) it follows that choosing a proper f one can always reproduce a given finite value of the decoherence rate with arbitrarily small $\|f\|$. No problems with infinite clouds of virtual bosons or instabilities of the equilibrium state appear in this model. As shown in [17] scattering mechanisms can perfectly describe quantum Brownian motion of a heavy particle immersed in a medium.

The final topic of this Letter is the influence of chaotic properties of an environment on the decoherence rate in an open system. The intuition supported by some heuristic arguments suggests, as it is formulated in [18], that "...one would expect that environments with unstable dynamics will be much more efficient decoherers,...". The closer look at this problem shows that the opposite statement is true. Namely, for pure decoherence we need an irreversible perturbation of the environment's state which asymptotically conserves its energy. Therefore, the reservoir's energy eigenstates should be degenerated and labeled by other quantum numbers which can be altered without energy modification. However, for a chaotic system its energy levels are typically nondegenerated due to the mechanism of *level repulsion* [19]. As a consequence chaotic reservoirs are worse decoherers.

The physical arguments of above can be illustrated by the following model introduced in the context of "1/f noise" in [20]. Consider again a 1/2-spin system interacting with an ensemble of N identical M -level chaotic quantum systems by means of the following mean-field type Hamiltonian

$$\mathbf{H}_Q = \sigma_3 \otimes N^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^N Q^{(k)} + \sigma_0 \otimes \sum_{k=1}^N h^{(k)} \quad (27)$$

where $h^{(k)}$ is a copy of the Hamiltonian with the spectral resolution $h = \sum_{m=1}^M \epsilon_m |m\rangle\langle m|$, $\epsilon_{m+1} \geq \epsilon_m$ and $Q^{(k)}$ is a copy of an operator $Q = Q^*$, $\text{Tr}Q = 0$. The reference state of the environment is assumed to be a product state $\otimes_{k=1}^N \rho^{(k)}$ where $\rho^{(k)}$ is a copy of a microcanonical state giving an uniform probability distribution over all states $|m\rangle$. Under the above assumption for $N \rightarrow \infty$ the mean-field reservoir's observable $N^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^N Q^{(k)}$ behaves like a Gaussian noise and in the Markovian approximation the pure decoherence rate γ for the spin is given by the following version of the fluctuation-dissipation formula

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \hat{R}(\omega), \quad \hat{R}(\omega) = \frac{\pi}{M} \sum_{m,m'=1}^M |\langle m|Q|m'\rangle|^2 \delta((\epsilon_m - \epsilon_{m'}) - \omega). \quad (28)$$

The formula makes sense also when instead of identical subsystems the reservoir consists of a large random ensemble of chaotic systems with Hamiltonians $h^{(k)}$ characterized by a certain average nearest-neighbour level spacing Δ . Then the Wigner level fluctuation law [19] is applicable and gives the following nearest-neighbour level spacing distribution

$$p(s) = (\pi s/2\Delta) \exp(-\pi s^2/4\Delta^2). \quad (29)$$

For $\omega \ll \Delta$ only the nearest-neighbour level spacings $\epsilon_{m+1} - \epsilon_m$ contribute to the spectral function $\hat{R}(\omega)$ (28). Assuming that the matrix elements $\langle m+1|Q|m\rangle$ are not strongly correlated with $\epsilon_{m+1} - \epsilon_m$ we obtain

$$\hat{R}(\omega) \simeq \pi \bar{Q}^2 p(\omega) \sim \omega \quad (30)$$

where \bar{Q}^2 is an averaged value of $|\langle m+1|Q|m\rangle|^2$. As a consequence of (28)(30) pure decoherence rate is equal to zero for chaotic systems while for regular ones Poisson distribution of the level spacing gives a finite value of γ .

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks Michał Horodecki for discussions.

-
- [1] D. Giulini et.al. (Eds) *Decoherence and Appearance of Classical World*, Springer, Berlin (1996)
 - [2] Ph. Blanchard et.al. (Eds.), *Decoherence: Theoretical, Experimental and Conceptual Problems*, Springer, Berlin (2000)
 - [3] H-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione (Eds.), *Relativistic Quantum Measurement and Decoherence*, Springer, Berlin (2000)
 - [4] M.Arndt et.al., *Nature* **401**, 680 (1999); M. Brune et.al. *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **77**, 4887 (1996)

- [5] G. Alber et.al. *Quantum Information*, Springer, Berlin (2001)
- [6] R.P. Feynman and F.L. Vernon, Ann.Phys. (N.Y.) **24**, 118 (1965); E.B. Davies, Ann.Inst.H. Poincare **A 28**, 91 (1978); E. Joos and H.D. Zeh, Z. Phys. **B 59**, 223 (1985); W.H. Zurek, Physics Today, 34 (October 1991)
- [7] W.G. Unruh, Phys.Rev.**A 51**, 992 (1995)
- [8] A.D. Caldeira and A.J. Leggett, Phys.Rev. **A31**, 1057 (1985)
- [9] A.J. Leggett et.al. Rev.Mod.Phys. **59**, 1 (1987)
- [10] R. Haag, *Local Quantum Physics*, Springer, Berlin (1992)
- [11] D. Giulini in ref.[3] and references therein
- [12] V. Bach et.al., Commun.Math.Phys. **207**, 249 (1999)
- [13] A different example of false decoherence due to a mass gap for bosons is given by W.G. Unruh in [3]
- [14] H-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione in [2]; R. Penrose in A. Fokas et.al. (Eds.), *Mathematical Physics 2000* Imperial College Press, London (2000); L. Diósi, Phys.Rev. **A42**, 5086 (1990)
- [15] R. Alicki, *Phys. Rev.* **A65**, 034104 (2002)
- [16] R. Alicki and K. Lendi, *Quantum Dynamical Semigroups and Applications*, Springer, Berlin (1987)
- [17] B. Vacchini, J.Math.Phys.**42**, 4291 (2001)
- [18] W. Zurek, quant-ph/0201118 v1, 25 Jan 2002
- [19] G. Casati and B. Chirikov, *Quantum Chaos*, Cambridge University Press (1995)
- [20] R. Alicki, J.Phys. **A 24**, 4731 (1991)