

Decoherence and the Loschmidt echo

F.M. Cucchietti, D.A.R. Dalvit, J.P. Paz and W.H. Zurek

Theoretical Division, MS B213, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545

(Dated: November 5, 2018)

Environment-induced decoherence causes entropy increase. It can be quantified using, e.g., the purity $\zeta = \text{Tr}\rho^2$. When the Hamiltonian of a quantum system is perturbed, its sensitivity to such perturbation can be measured by the Loschmidt echo $\bar{M}(t)$. It is given by the average squared overlap between the perturbed and unperturbed state. We describe the relation between the temporal behavior of $\zeta(t)$ and $\bar{M}(t)$. In this way we show that the decay of the Loschmidt echo can be analyzed using tools developed in the study of decoherence. In particular, for systems with a classically chaotic Hamiltonian the decay of ζ and \bar{M} has a regime where it is dominated by the classical Lyapunov exponents.

Environment-induced decoherence is an essential ingredient of the quantum-classical transition [1]. Its implications for the quantum versions of classically chaotic systems are especially intriguing, as they go beyond the restoration of the quantum-classical correspondence. Two of us discussed this issue for the first time in [2], presenting a surprising result that has been since amply corroborated [3, 4, 5, 6]: For a quantum system with a classically chaotic Hamiltonian the rate at which information about the initial state is degraded by the environment becomes independent of the system-environment coupling strength. This rate (e.g., the von Neumann entropy production rate computed from the reduced density matrix of the system) is set by the classical Lyapunov exponents, provided that the coupling strength are within a certain (wide) range. This result has important implications and can be a way to define quantum chaos [7]. A related but independent way to do this was considered first by Asher Peres [8] by appealing to a property of quantum systems with a classically chaotic counterpart: Although quantum dynamics is insensitive to small differences in initial conditions, it seems to be highly sensitive to perturbations in the Hamiltonian. The similar idea of “hypersensitivity” was studied in an information theoretic framework by Caves and coworkers [9]. More recently, Levstein, Pastawski and collaborators [10, 11] experimentally studied sensitivity to perturbations by measuring the Loschmidt echo in a many-body spin system. Their work underscored the need for a systematic study of various aspects of the true nature of the sensitivity displayed by quantum systems when their Hamiltonian is perturbed. Further analytical [12] and numerical [13] work triggered an intense activity that helped clarify some aspects of the temporal dependence of the echo [14, 15, 16].

The measure of the echo signal is the overlap between two states that evolve from the same initial wave function Ψ_0 under the influence of two Hamiltonians (the unperturbed one, H_0 , and the perturbed one $H_\Delta = H_0 + \Delta$). More precisely, when U_0 and U_Δ denote the correspond-

ing evolution operators, the echo is defined as

$$M_\Delta(t) = |\langle \Psi_0 | U_\Delta^\dagger(t) U_0(t) | \Psi_0 \rangle|^2. \quad (1)$$

The quantity $\bar{M}(t)$, obtained by averaging M_Δ over an ensemble of perturbations, can be studied analytically and displays a rich temporal dependence. One interesting regime was analyzed by Jalabert and Pastawski [12] who showed, using a semiclassical approximation, that there is a window of values for the perturbation strength for which $\bar{M}(t)$ decays with a rate equal to the classical Lyapunov exponent. In spite of the simple discussion presented above, the physically relevant evolution will typically not be unitary: Decoherence caused by the interaction with the environment will suppress the echo even in the absence of the perturbation Δ . We shall, however, adhere to the usual assumption [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16] that the evolutions are unitary, and show that even in that case of decoherence-free echo suppression it is possible to draw useful conclusions from the analogy we discuss below.

In this letter we establish a direct connection between decoherence and the decay of the Loschmidt echo. In particular, we relate the evolution of $\bar{M}(t)$ and the linear entropy (or purity) of an open quantum system. The existence of a kinship between decoherence and the decay of the Loschmidt echo is not unexpected: such possibility was noted, for example, in Refs. [11, 12], but was never formally established. Demonstrating the relation of these two important areas is interesting not just from a fundamental point of view but may also prove useful since it allows one to use results obtained in the theory of open quantum systems to understand better the behavior of the echo.

The key step in our demonstration is a simple observation: The average echo $\bar{M}(t)$, for an ensemble of perturbations characterized by a probability density $P(\Delta)$, is

$$\bar{M}(t) = \int D\Delta P(\Delta) |\langle \Psi_0 | U_\Delta^\dagger(t) U_0(t) | \Psi_0 \rangle|^2. \quad (2)$$

This equation can be rewritten in a more convenient way by defining the density matrix of the average perturbed

state:

$$\bar{\rho}(t) = \int D\Delta P(\Delta) U_{\Delta}(t)|\Psi_0\rangle\langle\Psi_0|U_{\Delta}^{\dagger}(t). \quad (3)$$

In fact, $\bar{M}(t)$ is simply the overlap between the average state $\bar{\rho}(t)$ and the unperturbed density matrix $\rho_0(t)$ evolved from the initial state, $\rho_0(t) = U_0(t)|\Psi_0\rangle\langle\Psi_0|U_0^{\dagger}(t)$:

$$\bar{M}(t) = \text{Tr}(\bar{\rho}(t)\rho_0(t)). \quad (4)$$

Once we recognize this simple fact we can go one step further and notice that the state $\bar{\rho}$ generally evolves in time according to a master equation which is of the same kind as the ones arising in the study of decoherence. Hence, the evolution of the echo $\bar{M}(t)$ is directly placed in the context of open quantum systems and decoherence.

Equation (4) can be used to establish an inequality between the average echo $\bar{M}(t)$ and the purity $\zeta(t) = \text{Tr}\bar{\rho}^2(t)$ (used to characterize decoherence). Using Schwartz inequality (applied to the inner product between two hermitian operators) and assuming that the initial state is pure we find that

$$\bar{M}^2(t) \leq \zeta(t). \quad (5)$$

Related inequalities were noticed and used in a somewhat different context in [16, 17]. Eq. (5) implies that when the purity $\text{Tr}\bar{\rho}^2$ decays exponentially with a rate γ_D , then the overlap $\bar{M}(t)$ should also decay exponentially (or faster) with a rate that should be no less than $\gamma_D/2$. However, as we will see later (and as has been established in the literature [5, 12, 13]), there is an important regime (the so-called Lyapunov regime) where both quantities decay with the same rate set by the Lyapunov exponent.

Let us now analyze some generic features of the evolution of the average state $\bar{\rho}(t)$. It is useful to notice that $\bar{\rho}$ generally obeys a master equation with non-unitary terms. These terms arise because averaging of the evolution over an ensemble of perturbations yields an effect analogous (although not equivalent) to the tracing out of the unobserved degrees of freedom [1]. We will find it convenient to consider a simple form of perturbation (even though results are not strongly dependent on it). Let us assume that $\Delta(x, t) = V(x)J(t)$, where $V(x)$ is a function of the coordinates of our system and $J(t)$ is an external source. For this case, averaging over the perturbation Δ consists of averaging over functions $J(t)$. We will also assume that the probability density $P(J)$ is a Gaussian functional whose width defines the temporal correlation function for the sources. Thus, we will use

$$P(J) = N \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \int \int dt dt' J(t) \nu^{-1}(t, t') J(t')\right), \quad (6)$$

where N is a normalization factor. The correlation function of the source is then $\int DJ P(J)J(t)J(t') = \nu(t, t')$. Using this, we can show that the evolution operator for $\bar{\rho}(t)$ has a path integral representation with an influence functional [18] given by

$$F[x, x'] = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \int \int dt dt' V_-(t) \nu(t, t') V_-(t')\right), \quad (7)$$

where $V_-(t) = V(x(t)) - V(x'(t))$. In some simple but physically relevant cases it is possible to write a master equation for $\bar{\rho}(t)$. In fact, when the noise is white, i.e. $\nu(t, t') = 2D\delta(t - t')$, we can show that

$$\dot{\bar{\rho}} = \frac{1}{i\hbar} [H_0, \bar{\rho}] - D [V(x), [V(x), \bar{\rho}]]. \quad (8)$$

While the first term on the rhs of this equation generates unitary evolution, the second term is responsible for decoherence: It induces a tendency towards diagonalization in position basis and, in the Wigner representation, it gives rise to a diffusion term. For the simplest case of $V(x) = x$ the equation for the Wigner function reads

$$\dot{W}(x, p) = \{H_0, W\}_{MB} + D \partial_{pp}^2 W(x, p), \quad (9)$$

where the bracket in the rhs is the so-called Moyal bracket, responsible for unitary evolution [1].

Equations like (8) and (9) arise if we consider a quantum system interacting with a quantum environment formed by a collection of harmonic oscillators [19]. In such a case the absolute value of the influence functional generated by the environment is identical to (7) provided one chooses the spectral density and the initial state of the environment in such a way that the noise-kernel it produces is equal to the kernel $\nu(t, t')$ appearing in (7). However, in general the influence functional is a complex number whose phase is responsible for dissipation (noise and dissipation kernels are connected as mandated by the fluctuation-dissipation theorem). There is a physically relevant limit (usually associated with high temperatures) where relaxation effects can be ignored. This is the most interesting limit in decoherence studies aimed at understanding the quantum-classical correspondence [1]. Thus, in such a limit, the evolution of the average state $\bar{\rho}$ is identical to that of a quantum system that interacts with an environment.

A convenient way to visualize the transition from quantum to classical is provided by the Wigner function, whose oscillations are the signature of quantum interference. They should be suppressed by the decoherence term to make the quantum-classical correspondence possible. This is indeed what happens: When the Wigner function oscillates with a well defined wave-vector k_p along the momentum direction ($W(x, p, t) \simeq A(x, t) \cos(k_p p)$), the decoherence term in (9) washes out oscillations exponentially fast with a rate $\Gamma_D = Dk_p^2$. We can see the behavior of a typical




FIG. 1: Wigner function of an initially Gaussian state evolved with a chaotic Hamiltonian without (top) and with (bottom) decoherence. The system is a particle moving in a driven double well potential (see [5]). A region of area \hbar is shown in the top panel where sub-Planckian structure is evident [20]. The color scale is positive from yellow to red, shades of blue are negative and white is zero. In the top panel we can appreciate the distinct regions A_O (A_C) where the Wigner function W_0 oscillates rapidly (is positive), used in Eq. (12).

Wigner function for a chaotic system (a driven double well analyzed in [5]) with and without decoherence in Figure 1. Taking into account our previous discussion, the echo $\bar{M}(t)$ is obtained by computing the overlap between the two Wigner functions displayed in the figures. The purity ζ should be computed by taking the overlap of the decohered Wigner function with itself. Below, we will discuss the relation between these two quantities.

The master equation (9) can be used to obtain the time derivatives of the purity ζ and the echo \bar{M} :

$$\dot{\zeta} = 2D \int dx dp \bar{W}(x, p) \partial_{pp}^2 \bar{W}(x, p), \quad (10)$$

$$\dot{\bar{M}} = D \int dx dp W_0(x, p) \partial_{pp}^2 \bar{W}(x, p). \quad (11)$$

Equation (10) has been used before to show the existence of a domain of exponential decay for the purity $\text{Tr} \bar{\rho}^2$ [2, 4, 5, 7] with a rate that, for classically chaotic systems,

is independent of the diffusion D . The central piece of the argument is the following: After integrating by parts, equation (10) can be rewritten as $\dot{\zeta}/\zeta = -2D/\bar{\sigma}^2$, where $\bar{\sigma}$ characterizes the dominant wavelength in the spectrum of the Wigner function (i.e. $\bar{\sigma}^{-2} = \int (\partial_p \bar{W})^2 / \int \bar{W}^2$). Thus, the rate of change of the purity becomes independent of the diffusion constant when $\bar{\sigma}^2$ is proportional to D . This happens indeed as a consequence of the competition between two effects. The first one is the tendency of chaotic evolution to generate (exponentially fast, at a rate set by the Lyapunov exponent λ) small scale structure in the Wigner function. The second effect is due to diffusion, which tends to wash out small scales exponentially fast at a rate determined by the product Dk_p^2 . As demonstrated in [2], these two effects reach a balance when the scale is such that $\bar{\sigma}^2 = 2D/\lambda$. When this equilibrium is reached, the purity ζ decreases exponentially at a rate fixed by λ .

For this behavior to take place the diffusion constant should be above a threshold [7]. Otherwise the critical width is not established (indeed, in the previous argument the implicit assumption is that the time scale for diffusion to wash out a k_p -oscillation is shorter than the time scale for the oscillations to be regenerated by the dynamics). This simple scenario enables us to understand why there is a regime where purity decreases exponentially with a Lyapunov rate. The same argument can also be used to analyze the exponential decay of the Loschmidt echo. In fact, equations (10) and (11) just differ by a factor of 2 and by the presence of W_0 instead of \bar{W} inside the integral. As before, we can transform the evolution equation of the echo into $\dot{\bar{M}}/\bar{M} = -D/\sigma^2$, $\sigma^{-2} = \int W_0 \partial_{pp}^2 \bar{W} / \int W_0 \bar{W}$. When decoherence is effective and the dominant structure in \bar{W} approaches the critical value, the smallest scales of the pure Wigner function W_0 continue contracting and developing smaller and smaller scales (sub-Planck scales are reached quickly in chaotic quantum systems [20]). In such a case, one can easily conclude that $\bar{\sigma}^2 = 2\sigma^2$. This is readily seen even in the crude approximation of $\bar{W} \sim \exp(-p^2/2\bar{\sigma}^2)$ and $W_0 \sim \exp(-p^2/2\sigma_0^2)$, with $\sigma_0 \sim \exp(-\lambda t)$ and $t \gg 1/\lambda$. Therefore, when the purity starts decaying at the Lyapunov rate the echo does precisely the same.

Using the above ideas we are now in a position to present a more complete and illustrative picture of the time dependence of the echo $\bar{M}(t)$ and the purity $\zeta(t)$. For the sake of simplicity we focus on the echo but the same reasoning applies to the purity. To compute the overlap $\bar{M} = \int dx dp W_0 \bar{W}$ we can split the phase space integral into two regions: the region A_C close to the classical unstable manifold of the initial state, where W_0 is positive, and the region A_O over which W_0 oscillates (see Figure 1):

$$\bar{M}(t) = \int_{A_O} dx dp W_0 \bar{W} + \int_{A_C} dx dp W_0 \bar{W}. \quad (12)$$

In the oscillatory region we can estimate the value of the integral assuming that there is a dominant wave vector k_p . In such a case, from Eq. (9) we can assume that $\bar{W} \simeq W_0 e^{-Dk_p^2 t}$. If more than one scale is present the result would be a sum of terms like this one. For the second integral, we can also use a crude estimate assuming that W_0 and \bar{W} are constant over their respective effective support. In particular, $W_0 \sim 1/A_C$ since its integral over A_O cancels out. As \bar{W} approaches the critical width $\bar{\sigma}$ along the stable manifold, the area of its effective support grows exponentially. Therefore, one gets that the second integral is $\int_{A_C} W_0 \bar{W} \sim W_0 A_C \bar{W} \sim \bar{W} \sim e^{-\lambda t}$. Thus, combining the two results we find that the expected behavior of the Loschmidt echo is

$$\bar{M}(t) = a \exp(-\lambda t) + b \exp(-Dk_p^2 t) \quad (13)$$

for appropriate prefactors a and b .

This result was previously derived for the Loschmidt echo using semiclassical techniques [12]. The first term gives the Lyapunov decay, while the second one describes the so-called Fermi golden rule regime (FGR) [14]. In this case the rate is proportional to the diffusion coefficient (which is itself proportional to the square of the strength of the perturbation). As mentioned above, a similar result is expected for the purity.

Our treatment is valid in a semiclassical regime where the evolution of the Wigner function is dominated by the classical Hamiltonian flow and the corresponding interference fringes generated when its phase space support folds. The virtue of this analysis, entirely based on properties of the evolution of \bar{W} derived in the context of decoherence studies, is not only its simplicity but also the fact that it enables us to identify the regions of phase space that can be associated with each of the terms appearing in (13): the FGR contribution arises from the decay of the interference fringes while the Lyapunov contribution is associated with the behavior of \bar{W} near the classical unstable manifold. Recent studies using semiclassical techniques point in the same direction [21].

It is interesting to perform a better estimate of the integral over the region A_C . Assuming that the local Lyapunov exponent is constant along the unstable manifold, one can approximate the value of the integral by using the corresponding result for the simplest system with an unstable fixed point: the inverted oscillator (IO) with Hamiltonian $H_0 = p^2/2m - m\lambda^2 x^2/2$. In such a case, the echo can be computed exactly and turns out to be

$$\bar{M}_{IO}(t) = (1 + r \operatorname{sh}(2\lambda t) + r^2 (\operatorname{sh}^2(\lambda t) - \lambda^2 t^2))^{-1/2}. \quad (14)$$

Here $r = \bar{\sigma}^2/4\sigma_i^2$, where σ_i is the momentum dispersion of the initial state. This exact result shows that for long times ($\lambda t \gg \log(r)/2$) the echo M_{IO} always decays as $\exp(-\lambda t)$. For initial times a decay with a rate determined by diffusion is observed but this transitory regime

always leads to a decay dominated by the Lyapunov exponent. The initial transient is sensitive to the details of the noise statistics. For example, we can also exactly evaluate the echo when the noise kernel is flat (i.e., $\nu(t, t')$ independent of t and t'). For such extreme case the long time behavior of the echo is not changed but the initial transient displays a quadratic decay.

We expect the analogy between Loschmidt echo and decoherence not only to enable intuitive derivations like the one leading us to equation (13) but also to provide new insights into theoretically unexplained experimental features such as the quadratic decay observed in [11]. Our results are also relevant for quantum computation as the Loschmidt echo is a measure of the fidelity with which a given algorithm is implemented. The Lyapunov decay of the fidelity could hinder the practical implementation of such computers, which would then have to deal with an exponential increase of error probability at a rate which is independent of the coupling to the environment and is solely fixed by the (possibly chaotic) nature of the underlying physical system. The high sensitivity of chaotic systems to perturbations seems to be connected to the efficiency of these systems to produce decoherence on other systems, which has been under recent investigation [22].

We thank Diana Monteoliva for help in producing the Figure. We also acknowledge support of ARDA/NSA grant. JPP received also partial support from a grant by Fundaci3n Antorchas.

-
- [1] W.H. Zurek, Phys. Today **44**, 36 (1991); D. Giulini *et al*, *Decoherence and the Appearance of the Classical World in Quantum Theory* (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1996); J. P. Paz and W. H. Zurek, in *Coherent matter waves, Les Houches Session LXXII*, R Kaiser, C Westbrook and F David eds., EDP Sciences (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2001) 533-614; W.H. Zurek, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 715 (2003).
- [2] W.H. Zurek and J.P. Paz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 2508 (1994).
- [3] P.A. Miller and S. Sarkar, Phys. Rev. **E 58**, 4217 (1998); **60**, 1542 (1999).
- [4] A.K. Pattanayak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4526 (1999).
- [5] D. Monteoliva and J.P. Paz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3373 (2000); Phys. Rev. E **64**, 056238 (2001).
- [6] P. Bianucci, J.P. Paz and M. Saraceno, Phys. Rev. **E 65**, 046226 (2002).
- [7] W.H. Zurek and J.P. Paz, Physica (Amsterdam) **83D**, 300 (1995); W.H. Zurek, Phys. Scr. **T 76**, 186 (1998).
- [8] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. **A30**, 1610 (1984); A. Peres, *Quantum theory: concepts and methods*, Kluwer ed (1994).
- [9] R. Schack and C.M. Caves, Phys. Rev. **E 53**, 3387 (1996).
- [10] P.R. Levstein *et al*, J. Chem. Phys. **108**, 2718 (1998).
- [11] G. Usaj *et al*, Mol. Phys. **95**, 1229 (1998); H.M. Pastawski *et al* in *Contemporary Problems of Condensed Matter Physics*, eds. S.J. Vlaev, L.M. Gagger Sager and C. Dvoeglazov (NOVA Scientific Publishers, New York, 2001); H.M. Pastawski *et al* Physica **A 283**, 166 (2000).

- [12] R.A. Jalabert and H.M. Pastawski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2490 (2001).
- [13] F.M. Cucchietti, H.M. Pastawski, D.A. Wisniacki, Phys. Rev. **E 65**, 045206(R) (2002).
- [14] P. Jacquod, P.G. Silvestrov and C.W.J. Beenakker, Phys. Rev. **E 64**, 055203 (2001).
- [15] F.M. Cucchietti *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **E 65**, 046209 (2002); D.A. Wisniacki and D. Cohen, Phys. Rev. **E 66**, 046209 (2002); G. Benenti and G. Casati, Phys. Rev. **E 65** 066205 (2002); N.R. Cerruti and S. Tomsovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 054103 (2002); J. Vanicek and E. Heller, arXiv:quant-ph/0302192.
- [16] T. Prosen, Phys. Rev. **E 65**, 036208 (2002).
- [17] I. García Mata, M. Saraceno and M.E. Spina, arXiv: nlin.CD/0301025.
- [18] R.P. Feynman and F.L. Vernon, Ann. Phys. **24**, 118 (1963).
- [19] A. Caldeira and A. Leggett, Physica (Amsterdam) **121A**, 587 (1983); B.L. Hu, J.P. Paz and Y. Zhang, Phys. Rev. **D 45**, 2843 (1992).
- [20] W.H. Zurek, Nature **412**, 712 (2001).
- [21] F.M. Cucchietti, H.M. Pastawski and R.A. Jalabert, in preparation (2003).
- [22] Z.P. Karkuszewski, C. Jarzynski and W.H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 170405 (2002); R. Blume-Kohout and W.H. Zurek, quant-ph/0212153.