

# Dynamical Invariants of Open Quantum Systems

S. L. Wu(武松林)<sup>1,\*</sup> X. Y. Zhang(张兴远)<sup>2</sup> and X. X. Yi(衣学喜)<sup>2,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*School of Physics and Materials Engineering,  
Dalian Nationalities University, Dalian 116600 China*

<sup>2</sup>*Center for Quantum Sciences and School of Physics,  
Northeast Normal University, Changchun 130024, China*

(Dated: June 9, 2018)

For a closed quantum system, a dynamical invariant is defined as an operator whose expectation value is a constant. In this paper, we extend the concept of dynamical invariants from closed systems to open systems. A dynamical equation for invariants (the dynamical invariant condition) is derived for Markovian dynamics. Different from dynamical invariants of closed quantum systems, the time evolution of dynamical invariants of open quantum systems is no longer unitary, and eigenvalues of any invariant are time-dependent in general. Since any hermitian operator which can fulfill the dynamical invariant condition is a dynamical invariant, we construct a type of special dynamical invariants of which a part of the eigenvalues is still constant. The dynamical invariants in the subspace spanned by these eigenstates thus evolve unitarily.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Yz, 03.67.Pp, 02.30.Yy

## I. INTRODUCTION

Dynamical invariants of a closed system, defined as hermitian operators with time-independent expectation values, were proposed by Lewis half a century ago[1]. This theory was designed to investigate the time evolution of dynamical systems with an explicitly time-dependent Hamiltonian[2]. Thereafter, the dynamical invariants are successfully applied to investigate time-dependent problems in quantum mechanics[3] such as the Berry phase[4], and the connection between quantum theory and classical theory[5] was established with the help of these invariants. Recently, this theory has attracted attention again due to its application in *shortcuts to adiabaticity* to speed up adiabatic and quantum control processes [6, 7]. Such scheme is also known as the *inverse engineering technology*, which has been widely used in a number of quantum controls and quantum information processings[8–11].

Although the theory of dynamical invariants is powerful in the study of closed quantum systems, the definition of dynamical invariants for open quantum systems is still rarely studied. In this paper, we generalize the dynamical invariants from closed systems to open systems. Noticing that the dynamical invariants are in fact hermitian operators whose expectation values remain constant in time evolution[1], we then can define a dynamical invariant for open systems and derive the dynamical equation of those invariants (the dynamical invariant condition) based on this spirit. We should emphasize that the dynamics of open quantum systems can be described in many ways, e.g., master equation[12–14], Kraus representation[15] and so on. This fact may make

the definition of dynamical invariants for open systems different with respect to that of closed systems. Dynamical invariants are not unique even for a given description of open systems, as we show later.

As well known, when a quantum state is initially in a decoherence-free subspace (DFS), the quantum state would evolve unitarily [16–18]. For a quantum system governed by a Markovian master equation in the Lindblad form

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\rho}(t) &= -i[H(t), \rho(t)] + \mathcal{L}\rho(t), \\ \mathcal{L}\rho(t) &= \sum_{\alpha} \left[ F_{\alpha}\rho(t)F_{\alpha}^{\dagger} - \frac{1}{2}\{F_{\alpha}^{\dagger}F_{\alpha}, \rho(t)\} \right],\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

with Lindblad operator  $F_{\alpha}(t)$ , a subspace spanned by  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DFS}} := \{|\Phi_1\rangle, |\Phi_2\rangle, \dots, |\Phi_D\rangle\}$  is a D-dimensional decoherence free subspace inside the  $N$ -dimensional Hilbert space, if and only if the following conditions are fulfilled[16–18]: (1) All of the bases of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DFS}}$  are the degenerated eigenstates of all Lindblad operators  $F_{\alpha}(t)$  with common eigenvalues  $c_{\alpha}(t)$ , i.e.,

$$F_{\alpha}(t)|\Phi_j(t)\rangle = c_{\alpha}(t)|\Phi_j(t)\rangle \quad (2)$$

for  $\forall j, \alpha$ , and (2)  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DFS}}$  is invariant under the following operator

$$\begin{aligned}H_{\text{eff}} &= G(t) + H(t) \\ &+ \frac{i}{2} \sum_{\alpha} (c_{\alpha}^*(t)F_{\alpha}(t) - c_{\alpha}(t)F_{\alpha}^{\dagger}(t)),\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

in which

$$G(t) = i \left( \sum_{j=1}^D |\Phi_j(t)\rangle \langle \dot{\Phi}_j(t)| + \sum_{n=1}^{N-D} |\Phi_n^{\perp}(t)\rangle \langle \dot{\Phi}_n^{\perp}(t)| \right).$$

Here we use the notation  $|\Phi_n^{\perp}(t)\rangle (n = 1, \dots, N - D)$  as the basis of complimentary subspace  $\mathcal{H}^{\perp}$  of DFS [19].

\*Electronic address: slwu@dlnu.edu.cn

†Electronic address: yixx@nenu.edu.cn

Actually, the condition (2) requires that any quantum state in the DFSs must still be a quantum state of the DFS after the action of  $H_{\text{eff}}$ , i.e.,

$$\langle \Phi_n^\perp(t) | H_{\text{eff}} | \Phi_j(t) \rangle = 0, \forall n, j. \quad (4)$$

This is also known as the DFS condition.

Since any hermitian operator which satisfies the dynamical invariant condition is a dynamical invariant of the system[8, 20], the following questions are interesting: whether there exists a kind of dynamical invariants whose evolution is unitary? What are the conditions for such dynamical invariants? In this paper, we will answer those questions by looking for a sort of dynamical invariants which is block-diagonal. The upper block evolves unitarily, and the lower block decouples to the upper block. Our results show that this type of dynamical invariants exists, if a DFS can be found in the dynamics of quantum systems.

This paper is structured as follows. We begin by defining a dynamical invariant and presenting the dynamical invariant condition for an open system described by the Markovian master equation in Sec.II A. After determining the dynamical invariant condition, in Sec.II B, we construct a type of dynamical invariants in which a part of it that belongs to the decoherence free subspace decouples to the other part. In Sec.III, a pure dephasing model is considered to illustrate how to construct the dynamical invariants proposed in this paper. Finally, Sec.IV summarizes the results and presents the conclusions.

## II. GENERAL FORMALISM

### A. Dynamical Invariants of an Open Quantum System

Let us start with the Lewis-Riesenfeld's dynamical invariant theory for closed quantum systems[1]. A dynamical invariant  $I(t)$  is defined as a time-dependent hermitian operator, which satisfies the von Neumann-like equation,

$$\frac{\partial I(t)}{\partial t} + i[H(t), I(t)] = 0, \quad (5)$$

where  $H(t)$  is a time-dependent Hamiltonian. Obviously, the dynamical invariants comply with the following properties: (a) The expectation values of the dynamical invariants are constant. (b) The eigenvalues of a dynamical invariant are constant, while the eigenstates are time-dependent. (c) Any time dependent hermitian operator which satisfies Eq.(5) is a dynamical invariant for closed quantum systems. Each dynamical invariant corresponds to a symmetry of the closed quantum system.

From the definition of dynamical invariants for closed systems, we find that the dynamical invariants for open quantum systems cannot be obtained by generalizing the Lewis-Riesenfeld's theory directly. Nevertheless, the

essence of the dynamical invariants is the conservation quantity of quantum systems. Therefore, we define a dynamical invariant for open systems as follows,

**Definition 1.** A dynamical invariant  $I(t)$  of a quantum open system is a time-dependent hermitian operator, whose expectation value is a constant, i.e.,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle I(t) \rangle = 0. \quad (6)$$

On the one hand, when the quantum system is closed, the dynamical invariants are back to that for closed systems, i.e., it satisfies the von Neumann-like equation. Therefore, the definition we proposed here covers the Lewis's definition [1]. Actually, Eq.(6) is nothing but the dynamical equation of the invariants. So in the later discussions, we name the dynamical equation of the invariants as *dynamical invariant condition*. On the other hand, once the dynamics of an open quantum system is given, the dynamical invariant condition can be derived.

To give an explicit dynamical invariant condition, we need to specify open quantum systems. **An open system described by a Lindblad Markovian master equation is a good example, see Eq.(1).** By the definition of the dynamical invariants, the expectation value of a dynamical invariant satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle I(t) \rangle = \text{Tr} \{ \dot{I}(t) \rho(t) + I(t) \dot{\rho}(t) \} = 0. \quad (7)$$

After the consideration of the dynamical equation Eq.(1), we rewrite the above equation as,

$$\text{Tr} \left( \left( \dot{I}(t) + i[H(t), I(t)] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha} (2F_{\alpha}^{\dagger} I(t) F_{\alpha} - \{F_{\alpha}^{\dagger} F_{\alpha}, I(t)\}) \right) \rho(t) \right) = 0. \quad (8)$$

Therefore, the dynamical invariants for open quantum systems must obey

$$\frac{\partial I(t)}{\partial t} + i[H(t), I(t)] + \sum_{\alpha} (F_{\alpha}^{\dagger} I(t) F_{\alpha} - \frac{1}{2} \{F_{\alpha}^{\dagger} F_{\alpha}, I(t)\}) = 0. \quad (9)$$

This is the dynamical invariant condition for the open system described by Eq.(1). Different from the dynamical invariants of closed quantum systems, the evolution of the dynamical invariants of open quantum systems is not unitary, but it is still trace-conserving.

Since the dynamical invariants are hermitian as we assumed earlier, they can be written in spectral decomposition,

$$I(t) = \sum_k \lambda_k |\psi_k(t)\rangle \langle \psi_k(t)|, \quad (10)$$

where  $\lambda_k$  is the  $k$ -th eigenvalue of  $I(t)$  and  $|\psi_k(t)\rangle$  is the corresponding eigenstate. Because the evolution of the

dynamical invariants is not unitary, the eigenvalues might be time-dependent. This can be seen by substituting Eq.(10) into the dynamical invariant condition Eq.(9). After simple algebra, the evolution of the eigenvalue  $\lambda_k$  follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \lambda_k &= \langle \psi_k(t) | \frac{\partial}{\partial t} I(t) | \psi_k(t) \rangle. \\ &= \langle \psi_k(t) | \sum_{\alpha} (\lambda_k F_{\alpha}^{\dagger} F_{\alpha} - F_{\alpha}^{\dagger} I(t) F_{\alpha}) | \psi_k(t) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

A proof of this statement can be found in Appendix A. Note that the eigenvalues are only affected by the decoherence process. One may wonder whether the dynamical invariants can be designed properly, such that some of the eigenvalues are time-independent. For instance, when  $|\psi_k(t)\rangle$  is the degenerate eigenstate of  $F_{\alpha}$  ( $\forall \alpha$ ), the corresponding eigenvalue  $\lambda_k$  remains constant. This is possible as will show later, a type of dynamical invariants for open quantum systems, in which a part of the eigenvalues is constant, can be constructed.

### B. Decoherence Free Subspace and Dynamical Invariants

Generally speaking, any hermitian operator fulfilling Eq.(9) is a dynamical invariant of open quantum systems. In this subsection, we propose a type of dynamical invariants with part of its eigenvalues being constant. As discussed earlier, the eigenvalues would be constant, if the corresponding eigenstates are in DFSs. Thus, we may construct the dynamical invariants in the form,

$$I(t) = \begin{pmatrix} I^D(t) & 0 \\ 0 & I^C(t) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (12)$$

In Eq.(12),  $I^D(t)$  is the part of this dynamical invariant belonging to the DFS, i.e.,

$$I^D(t) = \sum_{i,j} I_{ij}^D(t) |\Phi_i(t)\rangle \langle \Phi_j(t)|; \quad (13)$$

$I^C(t)$  is the other part of the dynamical invariants belonging to the complementary subspace, which can be decomposed by the bases of the complementary subspace,

$$I^C(t) = \sum_{mn} I_{mn}^C(t) |\Phi_m^{\perp}(t)\rangle \langle \Phi_n^{\perp}(t)|. \quad (14)$$

There are three key features for this kind of dynamical invariants: (1) the eigenvalues of  $I^D(t)$  are constant; (2)  $I^D$  decouples to  $I^C$ ; (3)  $I^D$  and  $I^C$  can both be used as the dynamical invariants of open quantum systems independently.

The Lindblad operators can also be rewritten in block form by the same merit as in Ref.[21],

$$F_{\alpha} = \begin{pmatrix} c_{\alpha} \mathcal{I}^D & A_{\alpha} \\ 0 & B_{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \quad (15)$$

where  $\mathcal{I}^D$  is the identity operator in the DFS. The upper (lower) block acts entirely inside  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DFS}}$  ( $\mathcal{H}^{\perp}$ ); the off-diagonal block  $A_{\alpha}$  mixes  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DFS}}$  and  $\mathcal{H}^{\perp}$ . The presence of  $A_{\alpha}$  is permitted since the DFS condition Eq.(2) that gives no information about the invariant of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DFS}}$  acted by  $H_{\text{eff}}$ . Likewise, it is convenient to rewrite the Hamiltonian  $H$  and  $G$  as

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} H^D & H^N \\ H^{N\dagger} & H^C \end{pmatrix} \quad (16)$$

and

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} G^D & G^N \\ G^{N\dagger} & G^C \end{pmatrix} \quad (17)$$

with the blocks on the diagonal corresponding once again to the operators restricted to  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DFS}}$  and  $\mathcal{H}^{\perp}$ . Here we do not restrict the discussion to whether the DFS is time dependent (t-DFS) or not (traditional DFS). When the DFS is time independent, the basis  $|\Phi_j\rangle$  and  $|\Phi_n^{\perp}\rangle$  ( $\forall j, n$ ) are constant vectors, i.e.,  $G = 0$ .

After putting Eq.(12) into the general dynamical invariant condition Eq.(9), the dynamical invariants  $I^D$  and  $I^C$  are governed by the following equations,

$$\dot{I}^D + i[G^D + H^D, I^D] = 0, \quad (18)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{I}^C + i[G^C + H^C + \frac{i}{2} \sum_{\alpha} A_{\alpha}^{\dagger} A_{\alpha}, I^C] + \sum_{\alpha} A_{\alpha}^{\dagger} I^D A_{\alpha} \\ - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha} (\{B_{\alpha}^{\dagger} B_{\alpha}, I^C\} - 2B_{\alpha}^{\dagger} I^C B_{\alpha}) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

$$\begin{aligned} I^D (i(G^N + H^N) - \sum_{\alpha} \frac{c_{\alpha}^*}{2} A_{\alpha}) \\ - (i(G^N + H^N) - \sum_{\alpha} \frac{c_{\alpha}^*}{2} A_{\alpha}) I^C = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Here we suppose that the bases of DFSs and complementary subspaces are time-dependent. The operator  $G$  results from the time dependent bases of the DFS and its complementary subspace.

On the one hand, Eq.(20) is nothing but the decoupling condition of  $I^D$  and  $I^C$ . If the decoupling condition fulfills, the dynamical invariants we proposed would exist and the off-diagonal element of Eq.(12) would vanish permanently. It is easy to check that the decoupling condition is satisfied when the decoherence free subspace emerges: As mentioned in the DFS condition,  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DFS}}$  is invariant under the operator  $H_{\text{eff}}$ . In other words, the vanishing off-diagonal element of  $H_{\text{eff}}$  guarantees the invariant of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DFS}}$ , which is presented as Eq.(4). Considering block form of the invariants, the vanishing off-diagonal element can be written as

$$i(G^N + H^N) - \sum_{\alpha} \frac{c_{\alpha}^*}{2} A_{\alpha} = 0. \quad (21)$$

After taking the DFS condition into Eq.(20), the decoupling condition is always held. Therefore, the decoupling condition is nothing but the DFS condition.

On the other hand, the evolution of  $I^D$  ( $I^C$ ) is governed by Eq.(18) (Eq.(19)). Firstly, we may observe from Eq.(18) that the evolution of  $I^D$  is unitary and not related to  $I^C$ , which is the very dynamical invariant condition for the closed quantum system (Eq.(5)). In other words, the evolution of  $I^D$  is decoherence free, hence we would like to name it *decoherence free dynamical invariants*. As a result, as soon as Eq.(2) is placed into Eq.(11), we can immediately find that  $\lambda_j^D$  is constant due to  $\partial\lambda_j^D/\partial t = 0$ , where  $\lambda_j^D$  is the  $j$ -th eigenvalue of  $I^D$ . As mentioned above, the eigenstates associated with the constant eigenvalues construct a basis set of the DFS. Therefore, it is easy to design  $I^D$  in accordance with the common eigenstates of the Lindblad operators. Secondly, the evolution of the dynamical invariants  $I^C$  is governed by Eq.(19). The dynamics of  $I^C$  is similar to the Markovian-Lindblad master equation with the Lindblad operators  $B_\alpha$  and the Hamiltonian  $G^C + H^C - i\sum_\alpha A_\alpha^\dagger A_\alpha/2$  except for an extra term  $\sum_\alpha A_\alpha^\dagger I^D A_\alpha$ . The extra term determines that the evolution of  $I^C$  is not closed, but is impacted by  $I^D$ . In consideration of Eq.(15), the eigenvalues of  $I^C$  satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\lambda_n^C &= \sum_j (\lambda_n^C - \lambda_j^D) |\langle \psi_j | A_\alpha | \psi_n^\perp \rangle|^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_m (\lambda_n^C - \lambda_m^C) |\langle \psi_m^\perp | B_\alpha | \psi_n^\perp \rangle|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Note that all of the eigenvalues  $\lambda_n^C$  are time-dependent. Furthermore, the evolutions of  $\lambda_n^C$  are not self-determined, but affected by the eigenvalues of  $I^D$ .

### III. DYNAMICAL INVARIANTS FOR A DEPHASING SYSTEM

As an example, we consider a quantum system consisting of  $n$  physical qubits, which interacts collectively with a dephasing environment [22]. The Hamiltonian of the quantum system can be written as,

$$H_0 = \sum_{i<j} (g_{ij}^x(t)O_{ij}^x + B_i^z(t)O_i^z), \quad (23)$$

in which  $g_{ij}^x(t)$  and  $B_i^z(t)$  denote controllable coupling strengths, and

$$\begin{aligned} O_{ij}^x &= \frac{\sigma_i^x \sigma_j^x + \sigma_i^y \sigma_j^y}{2}, \\ O_i^z &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\sigma_i^z}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The operator  $O_{ij}^x$  is the  $XY$  interaction between the  $i$ -th qubit and the  $j$ -th qubit, where  $\sigma_i^x$  and  $\sigma_i^y$  are Pauli operators for the  $i$ -th qubit. This Hamiltonian can be used to describe a number of quantum systems, such as trapped ions and quantum dots [24–27]. The source of

decoherence in the quantum system considered here is a dephasing environment. The interaction between the quantum system and the environment can be described by,

$$H_I = \sum_j \sigma_j^z \otimes \hat{B}, \quad (25)$$

where  $\hat{B}$  is the environment operator. The reduced dynamics of the quantum system is described by the following master equation [23],

$$\dot{\rho}(t) = -i[H_0, \rho(t)] + \mathcal{L}(\rho). \quad (26)$$

Here the dephasing is characterized by

$$\mathcal{L}(\bullet) = \gamma(F \bullet F - \bullet),$$

with

$$F = \sum_j \sigma_j^z. \quad (27)$$

It is well known that this master equation is a Lindblad master equation and  $F$  is the corresponding Lindblad operator. The symmetry of the master equation implies that there exists a DFS. Our aim is to find the dynamical invariants of this open quantum system which are block-diagonal as in Eq.(12).

To simplify the problem, we assume that the quantum system consists of two qubits, i.e.,  $N = 2$ . The case with qubits more than two can be studied by the same process as that presented below. For a two-qubit system, the corresponding DFS is spanned by  $\{|01\rangle, |10\rangle\}$  which are the degenerate eigenstates of  $F$  with zero eigenvalue. The bases of the complementary subspace are chosen as  $\{|00\rangle, |11\rangle\}$ . According to Eq.(27), the Lindblad operator  $F$  can be written in block form as in Eq.(15) with  $c = 0$ , and

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, B = \begin{pmatrix} -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (28)$$

The Hamiltonian  $H_0$  also has a matrix representation as Eq.(16) with

$$H^D = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & g_{12}^x(t) \\ g_{12}^x(t) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (29)$$

$$H^C = \begin{pmatrix} -B^z(t) & 0 \\ 0 & B^z(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (30)$$

$$H^N = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (31)$$

In order to verify the dynamical invariants  $I(t)$  which can be expressed as Eq.(12), it is necessary to check if the decoupling condition (Eq.(20)) is satisfied. Since the DFS is time-independent,  $G$  always vanishes in Eq.(20). Moreover, we have already shown that the off-diagonal elements of both the Lindblad operator and the Hamiltonian are trivial. Namely,  $A = H^N = \mathbf{0}$ , where  $\mathbf{0}$  denotes

the zero matrix (all elements of the matrix are zero). Therefore, the dynamical invariants  $I(t)$  can be written in the form of Eq.(12).

Next, let us derive the upper and lower nonzero block elements of  $I(t)$ , i.e.,  $I^D$  and  $I^C$ . The evolution of  $I^D$  is unitary, which is governed by Eq.(18),

$$\dot{I}^D + i[H^D(t), I^D] = 0. \quad (32)$$

The Hamiltonian  $H^D(t)$  can be rewritten in the form of the pauli matrixes,

$$H^D(t) = g_{12}^x(t)\sigma_x. \quad (33)$$

By SU(2) algebra of the pauli matrixes, a dynamical invariant that is hermitian can also be expended by the pauli matrixes,

$$I^D = x^D\sigma_x + y^D\sigma_y + z^D\sigma_z. \quad (34)$$

with coefficients  $x^D, y^D, z^D$  to be derived. Substituting  $H^D$  and  $I^D$  into Eq.(18), the equations of motion for those expansion coefficients are given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}^D &= 0, \\ \dot{y}^D &= 2g_{12}^x(t)z^D, \\ \dot{z}^D &= -2g_{12}^x(t)y^D. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

The solutions of these equations subject to the given initial conditions  $x_0^D, y_0^D, z_0^D$  can be easily obtained,

$$x^D(t) = x_0^D, \quad (36)$$

$$y^D(t) = y_0^D \cos(2\Lambda(t)) + z_0^D \sin(2\Lambda(t)), \quad (37)$$

$$z^D(t) = z_0^D \cos(2\Lambda(t)) - y_0^D \sin(2\Lambda(t)), \quad (38)$$

where  $\Lambda(t) = \int_0^t g_{12}^x(t')dt'$ . The process of obtaining these solution is shown in Appendix B. Consequently we confirm all of the parameters in  $I^D$ . When the initial conditions for those parameters are given, the dynamical invariants  $I^D$  can be constructed.

For the lower diagonal-block of the dynamical invariants Eq.(15), the evolution is governed by Eq.(19). Because of the vanishing off-diagonal block of  $F$ , i.e.,  $A = \mathbf{0}$ , the dynamical invariants  $I^C$  can be simplified into,

$$\dot{I}^C + i[H^C, I^C] - \frac{\gamma}{2}(\{B^\dagger B, I^C\} - 2B^\dagger I^C B) = 0, \quad (39)$$

where

$$H^C = -B^z(t)\sigma_z, B = -2\sigma_z.$$

As an hermitian operator,  $I^C$  can be written in the following form,

$$I^C = x^C\sigma_x + y^C\sigma_y + z^C\sigma_z. \quad (40)$$

where  $x^C, y^C$  and  $z^C$  are real time-dependent parameters. Substituting  $I^C$  in Eq.(39), the time development of those parameters is governed by,

$$\dot{x}^C = -2B^z(t)y^C + 8\gamma x^C, \quad (41)$$

$$\dot{y}^C = 2B^z(t)x^C + 8\gamma y^C, \quad (42)$$

$$\dot{z}^C = 0. \quad (43)$$

On the one side, as we expected,  $z^C$  is not affected by the dephasing environment. On the other side,  $x^C$  and  $y^C$  satisfy a set of coupled differential equations. Here, we may introduce new parameters as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} x'(t) &= x^C(t) \exp(-8\gamma t), \\ y'(t) &= y^C(t) \exp(-8\gamma t), \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

which fulfill

$$\dot{x}' = -2B^z(t)y', \quad (45)$$

$$\dot{y}' = 2B^z(t)x'. \quad (46)$$

The new parameters  $x'$  and  $y'$  satisfy the following second order differential equations,

$$\ddot{x}' - \frac{\dot{B}^z(t)}{B^z(t)}\dot{x}' + 4B^{z2}(t)x' = 0, \quad (47)$$

$$\ddot{y}' - \frac{\dot{B}^z(t)}{B^z(t)}\dot{y}' + 4B^{z2}(t)y' = 0. \quad (48)$$

And the solutions can be expressed as,

$$\begin{aligned} x'(t) &= x_0^C \cos(2\Theta(t)) - y_0^C \sin(2\Theta(t)), \\ y'(t) &= y_0^C \cos(2\Theta(t)) + x_0^C \sin(2\Theta(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where  $\Theta(t) = \int_0^t B^z(t')dt'$ . Taking the solutions of  $x'$  and  $y'$  into Eq.(46) and considering the initial condition of  $I^C$ , the solution of  $I^C$  can be written as a function of

$$\begin{aligned} x^C(t) &= (x_0^C \cos(2\Theta(t)) - y_0^C \sin(2\Theta(t))) \exp(8\gamma t), \\ y^C(t) &= (y_0^C \cos(2\Theta(t)) + x_0^C \sin(2\Theta(t))) \exp(8\gamma t), \\ z^C(t) &= z_0^C, \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where  $x_0^C, y_0^C, z_0^C$  are the initial values of  $x^C, y^C, z^C$ .

With the assistance of the analytic solution of  $I(t)$ , we can further discuss the eigenvalues and the eigenstates. The eigenvalues of  $I^D$  and  $I^C$  have the same structure,

$$\lambda_{\pm}^o = \pm \sqrt{x^{o2} + y^{o2} + z^{o2}}, \quad (51)$$

which is associated with the eigenstate as follows,

$$|\psi_{\pm}^o\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} (\lambda_{\pm}^o + z^o)/p_{\pm}^o \\ (x^o - iy^o)/p_{\pm}^o \end{pmatrix}, \quad (52)$$

where  $p_{\pm}^o = \sqrt{2\lambda_{\pm}^o(\lambda_{\pm}^o + z^o)}$  is the normalized coefficient, and  $o \in (D, C)$ . Examining Eq.(36), Eq.(37) and Eq.(38), we find that the eigenvalues of  $I^D$  are constant,

even though  $y^D$  and  $z^D$  are time-dependent, whereas the corresponding eigenstates are time-dependent. This result is very similar with the that for a dynamical invariant of closed quantum systems, which reduces to the unitary dynamics of  $I^D$ . Besides,  $I^C$  is affected by the dephasing noise. The eigenvalues of it are not time-independent anymore, but depend on the decoherence process. After putting the solution of  $I^C$  into Eq.(51), we obtain the following eigenvalues

$$\lambda_{\pm}^C(t) = \pm \sqrt{(x_0^{C2} + y_0^{C2}) \exp(16\gamma t) + z_0^{C2}}. \quad (53)$$

Note  $\exp(16\gamma t)$  in the solution.

The eigenstates of  $I^C$  can also be written as a function of time,

$$|\psi_{\pm}^C(t)\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{(\lambda_{\pm}^C(t) + z_0^C)}{p_{\pm}^C(t)} \\ \frac{(x_0^C - iy_0^C)}{p_{\pm}^C(t)} \exp(-2i\Theta(t) + 8\gamma t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (54)$$

in which the normalized constant is also time-dependent  $p_{\pm}^C = \sqrt{2\lambda_{\pm}^C(t)(\lambda_{\pm}^C(t) + z_0^C)}$ . If we set  $z_0^C = 0$ , the eigenvalues and eigenstates can be further simplified to,

$$\lambda_{\pm}^C(t) = \pm \sqrt{(x^{C2} + y^{C2}) \exp(8\gamma t)}, \quad (55)$$

and

$$|\psi_{\pm}^C(t)\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} \pm \sqrt{2}/2 \\ \sqrt{2}/2 \exp(-2i\Theta(t)) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (56)$$

In this special case, the time-dependence of the eigenvalues is dominated by the decoherence process, but the eigenstates can be only determined by the external parameters of the open quantum system.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

This work answers the question regarding the condition required for a dynamical invariant of an open quantum system. According to the definition, the expectation values of dynamical invariants are constant, thus we derive the condition for these invariants. We further construct a type of dynamical invariants in an explicit form when the open system obeys the Lindblad master equation (as shown in Eq.(12)). Furthermore, a relation between the dynamical invariants and the decoherence free subspaces is established.

Practically speaking, the dynamical invariants of an open quantum system provide us with both an intuitive physical framework and a set of tools to understand and manipulate quantum states, especially for quantum systems with time-dependent Hamiltonian[28] and described by Markovian master equation[29]. These tools are proven useful in theoretical formulations of the decoherence-free subspaces and further experimental developments of quantum control[7, 30].

*Note added: When we finished this Manuscript, we had noticed that in a recent paper, arXiv:1510.00518, the authors developed a method to find the dynamical invariants for open systems based on the non-Markovian quantum state diffusion equation.*

#### Appendix A: The Evolution of the Eigenvalues of Dynamical Invariants

In Appendix A, we derive the evolution equation for the eigenvalues of the dynamical invariants. Obviously, the eigenvalue can be obtained by

$$\lambda_k(t) = \langle \psi_k(t) | I(t) | \psi_k(t) \rangle. \quad (A1)$$

By differentiating the eigenvalue with respect to time, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\lambda}_k(t) &= \langle \dot{\psi}_k(t) | I(t) | \psi_k(t) \rangle + \langle \psi_k(t) | \dot{I}(t) | \psi_k(t) \rangle \\ &+ \langle \psi_k(t) | \dot{I}(t) | \psi_k(t) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (A2)$$

By considering that  $I(t) | \psi_k(t) \rangle = \lambda_k | \psi_k(t) \rangle$  and  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\langle \psi_k(t) | \psi_k(t) \rangle) = 0$ , we find

$$\dot{\lambda}_k(t) = \langle \psi_k(t) | \dot{I}(t) | \psi_k(t) \rangle. \quad (A3)$$

Substituting Eq.(9) into the above equation, the evolution of the eigenvalue can be rewritten as

$$\dot{\lambda}_k(t) = - \sum_{\alpha} \langle \psi_k(t) | (F_{\alpha}^{\dagger} I(t) F_{\alpha} - \frac{1}{2} \{ F_{\alpha}^{\dagger} F_{\alpha}, I(t) \}) | \psi_k(t) \rangle.$$

We immediately obtain the equation in the maintext of Sec.II A, i.e.,

$$\dot{\lambda}_k(t) = \sum_{\alpha} \langle \psi_k(t) | (\lambda_k F_{\alpha}^{\dagger} F_{\alpha} - F_{\alpha}^{\dagger} I(t) F_{\alpha}) | \psi_k(t) \rangle. \quad (A4)$$

Here that  $|\psi_k(t)\rangle$  is the eigenstate of  $I(t)$  with the eigenvalue  $\lambda_k$  being used.

#### Appendix B: The solution of time-dependent second order differential equation

In Appendix B, we present the details to solve the time-dependent second order differential equation used in Sec.III. As shown in Eq.(35), the parameters  $y^D$  and  $z^D$  satisfy the following second order differential equation,

$$y^{\ddot{D}} - \frac{\dot{g}_{12}^x(t)}{g_{12}^x(t)} \dot{y}^D + 4g_{12}^x(t) y^D = 0, \quad (B1)$$

$$z^{\ddot{D}} - \frac{\dot{g}_{12}^x(t)}{g_{12}^x(t)} \dot{z}^D + 4g_{12}^x(t) z^D = 0. \quad (B2)$$

We can find that  $y^D$  and  $z^D$  satisfy similar differential equations, so do the parameters  $x'$  and  $y'$  in Eq.(48).

Without loss of generality, we take Eq.(B2) as an example. In order to obtain the solution of Eq.(B2), we introduce a new parameter  $u$ , which can be written as

$$u = -\frac{\dot{z}^D}{g_{12}^x(t)z^D}. \quad (\text{B3})$$

Taking the first and second order time derivative of  $z^D$  into Eq.(B2), we immediately obtain a first order differential equation about the new parameter  $u(t)$ ,

$$\dot{u}(t) = g_{12}^x(t)(u(t)^2 + 4). \quad (\text{B4})$$

By separating the variables, we rewrite the above equation as,

$$\frac{du(t)}{u(t)^2 + 4} = g_{12}^x(t)dt. \quad (\text{B5})$$

Thus the solution of  $u$  can be obtained,

$$u(t) = 2 \tan(2\Lambda(t) + A). \quad (\text{B6})$$

Here  $A = \arctan(\dot{z}^D(0)/2g_{12}^x(0)z^D(0))$ . After we apply the solution of  $u(t)$  into Eq.(B3), the solution of  $z^D$  can finally be determined,

$$z^D(t) = z^D(0) \cos(2\Lambda(t) + A). \quad (\text{B7})$$

By considering  $\dot{z}^D(0) = -2g_{12}^x(0)y^D(0)$ , we rewrite the solution of Eq.(B2) as

$$z^D(t) = z^D(0) \cos(2\Lambda(t)) - y^D(0) \sin(2\Lambda(t)), \quad (\text{B8})$$

which is Eq.(38).

- 
- [1] H. R. Lewis, Jr., *J. Math. Phys.* **9**, 1976 (1968).  
[2] H. R. Lewis, Jr., and W. B. Riesenfeld, *J. Math. Phys.* **10**, 1458 (1969).  
[3] I. A. Pedrosa, and Alexandre Rosas, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 010402 (2009).  
[4] M. S. Sarandy, E. I. Duzzioni, and M. H. Y. Moussa, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 052112 (2007).  
[5] Dieter Schuch, and Marcos Moshinsky, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 062111 (2006).  
[6] X. Chen, A. Ruschhaupt, S. Schmidt, A. del Campo, D. Guéry-Odelin, and J. G. Muga, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 063002 (2010).  
[7] Yue Ban, Xi Chen, J. G. Muga, and E. Y. Sherman, *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 023604 (2015).  
[8] E. Torrontegui, S. Martínez-Garaot, and J. G. Muga, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 043408 (2014).  
[9] Marcela Herrera, Marcelo S. Sarandy, Eduardo I. Duzzioni, and Roberto M. Serra, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 022323 (2014).  
[10] Utkan Güngördü, Yidun Wan, Mohammad Ali Fasihi, and Mikio Nakahara, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 062312 (2012).  
[11] M. Palmero, S. Martínez-Garaot, J. Alonso, J. P. Home, and J. G. Muga, *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 053411 (2015).  
[12] Enrico Arrigoni, Michael Knap, and Wolfgang von der Linden, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 086403 (2013).  
[13] L. Diösi and L. Ferialdi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 200403 (2014).  
[14] Seogjoo Jang, Stephan Hoyer, Graham Fleming, and K. B. Whaley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 188102 (2014).  
[15] A. K. Rajagopal, A. R. Usha Devi, and R. W. Rendell, *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 042107 (2010).  
[16] N. Aharon, M. Drewsen, and A. Retzker, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 230507 (2013).  
[17] Wei Qin, Chuan Wang, and Xiangdong Zhang, *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 042303 (2015).  
[18] S. L. Wu, *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 032104 (2015).  
[19] S. L. Wu, L. C. Wang, and X. X. Yi, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **45** 405305 (2012).  
[20] Jun Jing, Lian-Ao Wu, Marcelo S. Sarandy, and J. G. Muga, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 053422 (2013).  
[21] Alireza Shabani and Daniel A. Lidar, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 042303 (2005).  
[22] G. F. Xu, J. Zhang, D. M. Tong, Erik Sjöqvist, and L. C. Kwek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 170501 (2012).  
[23] Krzysztof Szczygalski, David Gelbwaser-Klimovsky, and Robert Alicki, *Phys. Rev. E* **87**, 012120 (2013).  
[24] D. Mozyrsky, V. Privman, and M. L. Glasser, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5112 (2001).  
[25] A. Imamoglu, D. D. Awschalom, G. Burkard, D. P. DiVincenzo, D. Loss, M. Sherwin, and A. Small, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 4204 (1999).  
[26] S. B. Zheng and G. C. Guo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 2392 (2000).  
[27] A. Sørensen and K. Mølmer, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 022311 (2000).  
[28] Farhang Haddadfarshi, Jian Cui, and Florian Mintert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 130402 (2015).  
[29] D. Nagy and P. Domokos, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 043601 (2015).  
[30] Ye-Hong Chen, Yan Xia, Qing-Qin Chen, and Jie Song, *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 012325 (2015).