Non-Markovian Casimir-Polder force and populations dynamics on excited and ground state atoms: weak and strong coupling regimes in general environments
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The time-dependent atomic population and force on a two-level atom introduced into an inhomogeneous, generally non-reciprocal environment is evaluated using non-Markovian Weisskopf-Wigner theory in the strong and weak coupling regimes. Ground-state and excited atoms are considered as two separate initial-value problems, and both the early-time and long-time atomic population and force are evaluated. The results are compared with a Markov approximation of the Weisskopf-Wigner theory, and with previous Markov results from the Heisenberg picture. A comparison of the two pictures is made, and the Casimir-Polder force is obtained in the long-time limit.

I. INTRODUCTION

The population and vacuum force on atoms and various multi-level systems (qubits) is of fundamental interest and important for practical applications in atomic control [1–3] and quantum information [4]. Particularly for neutral atoms, vacuum forces [5–7] and population-related spontaneous-emission effects play an important role.

In an inhomogeneous environment, spontaneous emission can exert a force on atomic systems. In previous work [8–10], we determined the quantum force and torque on an excited two-level atom in a non-reciprocal environment using the Heisenberg picture. Specifically, we studied atoms near the interface with a biased plasma, which support unidirectional surface waves. We found that even in a translationally-invariant environment, a lateral force can exist due to the non-reciprocal nature of the surface waves. The previous analysis in [8–10] was based on a Markovian solution of the Heisenberg equations of motion (HEM). The Markov approximation (MA), in conjunction with the Sokhotski-Plemelj (SP) identity, allowed the identification of both resonant and non-resonant force contributions [11–12]. In the limit \( t \to \infty \), the non-resonant force was shown to be equal to the Casimir-Polder (CP) force, which was found to be vertically-directed with respect to the interface. In that work, the MA and use of the SP identity led to a non-zero force at the start of the time origin, \( t = 0 \).

In this work, we determine the correct early-time behavior of the force by removing these approximations. It is found that, although the Markov approximation leads to reasonable results in the event of weak coupling, further approximations that enable use of the SP identity lead to incorrect early-time behavior. Furthermore, we also consider a strong-coupling case that results in strongly non-Markovian behavior. We work within the Schrödinger Picture, which necessitates elucidating the joint atomic-field states, and results in treating the excited-atom and ground-state atom as independent initial-value problems, since the respective states evolve independently. Regarding the Casimir-Polder force on a ground-state atom, we show that it arises from non-energy-conserving states. Some parameters are identified to access the strength of the non-Markovian aspect of the response. The formulation is made for generally non-reciprocal environments, in part to make contact with the work in [8–10], although the main ideas are general and do not necessitate having a nonreciprocal environment.

We now provide a brief comparison of the HEM and Schrödinger Picture methods, in order to clarify the various approximations used. Both start from the same Hamiltonian. In the HEM, the time-evolution of the atomic and field operators is derived as a coupled set of equations from the Heisenberg equation of motion. Solution of the resulting coupled set of equations is extremely difficult, although the field operator equation can be solved by making a one-excitation approximation [13]. However, as this eliminates higher-order correlations, more typically a Markov approximation is made, wherein the dipole operator is assumed to be memoryless. Usually, then, the upper time-limit of the spectral integral is approximated as \( t \to \infty \), and the SP identity leads to resonant and non-resonant terms, the latter being a principal-value integral associated with an energy shift of the atomic transition. In [8], we then
wrote both contributions in terms of the system Green function, which allows complicated environments (e.g., lossy, inhomogeneous, nonreciprocal) acting as reservoirs to be modeled exactly. Alternatively, in this work we use the Weisskopf-Wigner method [14]-[17], which can also incorporate the Green function. In this case, the MA, although also widely-used, is not necessary, and the exact solution can be obtained numerically by solving a Volterra integral equation of the second kind. This leads to the non-Markovian (non-exponential) evolution of the population, which can be used in evaluating the exact dipole force. Various MA-type approximations can also be used in approximating the force.

One complication of the Weisskopf-Wigner method is that atom-field product states need to be defined. Considering a two-state atom defining a two-dimensional field Fock states $H_a = \{e, g\}$, and multimode Hilbert space $H_f$, where $0, 1, 2, ...$ represent the number of quanta in a generic field mode, the product states $H_a \otimes H_f$ separate into two groups, $A = \{\{e, 0\}, \{g, 1\}, \{e, 2\}, \{g, 3\}, \{e, 4\}, ...\}$ and $B = \{\{g, 0\}, \{e, 1\}, \{g, 2\}, \{e, 3\}, \{g, 4\}, ...\}$ that evolve independently. An initially-excited atom evolves within Group A, and, hence, cannot decay into the ground state of the non-interacting system $\{g, 0\}$. That is, in the final state the atom can be in the ground state, but the field will have one or more excitations (even in the lossy case). However, the evolution of the non-interacting system ground state can also be determined, where, even starting from the state $\{g, 0\}$, there is population evolution and force since the direct-product state is not an eigenstate of the Hamiltonian. Thus, the initially-excited atom case and the ground-state atom case need to be treated as two independent initial-value problems, which is not necessary with the HEM method.

The article is organized as follows. In Section II we describe the generally inhomogeneous, nonreciprocal environment (i.e., a structured reservoir) into which an excited or ground-state atom is introduced. In Section III we consider introducing an excited atom into the structured reservoir at $t = 0$, and we solve for the non-Markovian atomic population and force dynamics in terms of a Volterra integral equation of the second kind. We then consider several different Markov-type approximations of the population and force, and their effect on the temporal dynamics. In Section IV we repeat the analysis for a ground-state atom, which leads to the Casimir-Polder force. We then obtain the long-time dynamics in a different manner, using Laplace transforms, and obtain expressions involving a parameter that indicates the degree of non-Markovian behavior. After some concluding remarks, an appendix provides details of the numerical method used to solve the Volterra integral equation.

II. NONRECIPROCAL STRUCTURED RESERVOIR ENVIRONMENT

In a transitionally-invariant and reciprocal environment, spontaneous emission occurs randomly in all directions, so that the net force on a linearly polarized, initially-excited atom is zero. For an atom near an interface, the Casimir-Polder force is present, associated with vacuum fluctuations and the change of the photonic density of states brought about by the presence of the interface. In addition to the force perpendicular to the interface, as shown in [8]-[9], at an interface between a nonreciprocal medium and a simple medium, unidirectional surface plasmon polaritons mediate non-null lateral spontaneous emission forces.

In the following, we consider introducing an excited-state or ground-state atom at $t = 0$ into a lossy, inhomogeneous, and non-reciprocal environment, which serves as a structured reservoir for the atom, and examine the time-dynamics of the resulting atomic population, spontaneous emission (SE) rate, and force. The problem is cast as an initial-value problem using Weisskopf-Wigner theory [14]-[17], adopted for the non-reciprocal medium.

Figure 1 depicts the situation, where an atom resides in the vicinity of a material interface.

We suppose the region $z > 0$ is filled by vacuum, and that the region $z < 0$ is filled with a gyrotropic material with permittivity $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0 (\varepsilon_\alpha \mathbf{I}_I + \varepsilon_a \hat{y} \hat{y} + i \varepsilon_g \hat{y} \times \mathbf{1})$, where $\mathbf{I}_I = \hat{I}_y \hat{y} \times \hat{I}_y$, with $\varepsilon_g$ being the magnitude of the gyration pseudovector. For the gyroscopic medium we consider a magnetized plasma (e.g., InSb [18]). For a static bias magnetic field along the $+y$-axis the permittivity components are [19]

$$
\varepsilon_I = 1 - \frac{\omega_p^2}{\omega(z + i\Gamma)} - \frac{\omega^2}{\omega_c^2} + \frac{\omega^2 \omega_p^2}{\omega_c(z + i\Gamma)}, \quad \varepsilon_a = 1 - \frac{\omega_p^2}{\omega(z + i\Gamma)}, \quad \varepsilon_g = \frac{1}{\omega_p^2} \frac{\omega_c^2}{\omega(z + i\Gamma)} - \frac{\omega^2 \omega_p^2}{\omega_c^2}.
$$

(1)
Here, \( \omega_p \) is the plasma frequency, \( \Gamma \) is the collision rate associated with damping, \( \omega_c = -qB_0/m > 0 \) is the cyclotron frequency, \( q = -e \) is the electron charge, \( m \) is the electron effective mass, and \( B_0 \) is the static bias. In the special case that \( B_0 = 0 \), the system is reciprocal. A limitingly-low-loss plasma is assumed for simplicity, since loss does not qualitatively affect the time-dynamics of interest. The analytical form of the Green function for this environment is provided in [5].

In the following, we assume that the dipole is linearly-polarized, \( \gamma = \tilde{2}\gamma_z \), with \( \gamma_z \) real-valued, located a distance \( z_0 \) from the interface, and we take \( \omega_p = 200 \times 10^{12} \) Hz and \( \omega_0 = 0.65\omega_p \).

### III. INITIALLY-EXCITED ATOM INTRODUCED INTO A NON-RECIPROCAL STRUCTURED RESERVOIR

In this section, we consider introducing an excited-state atom at \( t = 0 \) into the structured reservoir described above. The ground-state atom is considered in Section [IV].

#### A. Initially-Excited Atom: Schrödinger Picture Wavefunction Amplitude Evolution in a Non-Reciprocal Environment

In the Schrödinger picture, the system Hamiltonian is [20]

\[
\hat{H} = \int d^3r \int_0^\infty d\omega \omega \hat{\alpha} \hat{\beta} (r, \omega) \hat{f}(r, \omega) + \hbar \omega_0 \hat{\sigma}_+ \hat{\sigma}_- - \mathbf{p} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{E}}(r_0),
\]

where the first term is the Hamiltonian for the field modes, the second term is the Hamiltonian for the atomic operators, and the last term accounts for the field-atom coupling. In [2], \( \hat{f}, \hat{f}^\dagger \) are the canonically conjugate field variables (continuum bosonic operator–valued vectors of the combined matter-field system) that satisfy

\[
\left[ \hat{f}_k (r, \omega), \hat{f}^\dagger_{k'} (r', \omega') \right] = \delta_{kk'} \delta (\omega - \omega') \delta (r - r'),
\]

\[
\left[ \hat{f}_k (r, \omega), \hat{f}^\dagger_{k'} (r', \omega') \right] = \left[ \hat{f}^\dagger_k (r, \omega), \hat{f}^\dagger_{k'} (r', \omega') \right] = 0,
\]

\( \hat{\sigma}_\pm \) are the canonically conjugate two-level atomic operators (\( \hat{\sigma}_+ = |e\rangle \langle g|, \hat{\sigma}_- = |g\rangle \langle e| = \hat{\sigma}_+^\dagger \)), with \( |e\rangle \) and \( |g\rangle \) being the excited and ground atomic states, respectively, and \( \mathbf{p} \) is the dipole operator, where \( \gamma \) is the dipole operator matrix-element.

For the atom-field system, we define product states such as \( |e, 0\rangle = |e\rangle \otimes |\{0\}\rangle \) and \( |g, i_1 (r, \omega_\lambda)\rangle = |g\rangle \otimes |\{i_1 (r, \omega_\lambda)\}\rangle \). The state \( |i_1 (r, \omega_\lambda)\rangle = |i_1 (r, \omega_\lambda)\rangle \) indicates that the \( i \)th field mode of the nonuniform continuum is populated with a single quanta, and that it is vector-valued with field component in the \( i \)th direction.

It can be noted that if one uses, rather than the full interaction Hamiltonian \( \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{E}(r_0) \), the rotating wave approximation (RWA) interaction Hamiltonian which contains \( \left( \hat{\sigma}_+ \hat{\mathbf{f}} + \text{H.c.} \right) \), then the initial state \( |e, 0\rangle \) produces only \( |g, 1\rangle \). However, the full interaction Hamiltonian \( \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{E}(r_0) \sim (\hat{\sigma}_+ + \hat{\sigma}_-) (\mathbf{f} + \mathbf{f}^\dagger) \) acting on the initial state \( |e, 0\rangle \) leads to an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space of the set of states \( A = \{|e, 0\rangle, |g, 1\rangle, |e, 2\rangle, |g, 3\rangle, |e, 4\rangle, \ldots\} \), where the \( n > 1 \) photons could be in the same or different field modes. For the excited atom, we truncate the space to consist of \( \{|e, 0\rangle, |g, 1\rangle\} \), which is equivalent to a rotating wave approximation even when using the full interaction Hamiltonian. Later, we consider non-energy-conserving states, which are necessary for the analysis of the ground-state atom.

We assume a general inhomogeneous, lossy, and non-reciprocal environment characterized by the permittivity tensor \( \varepsilon (r, \omega) \). We follow the phenomenological macroscopic Langevin noise approach [21]-[26] (see also [27], where a comparison with a generalized Huttner-Barnett approach is discussed, and also [28], where the phenomenological assumptions are derived from a canonical formulation). The quantized Schrödinger picture electric field operator is

\[
\hat{\mathbf{E}}(r) = \int_0^\infty d\omega \omega \mathbf{I} \mathbf{G}(r, r', \omega) \cdot \mathbf{T}(r', \omega) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{f}}(r', \omega) + \text{H.c.}
\]

where \( \mathbf{T}(r, \omega) \cdot \mathbf{T}^\dagger(r, \omega) = \frac{1}{\pi \varepsilon} (\varepsilon (r, \omega) - \varepsilon^\dagger (r, \omega)) \); for reciprocal media, \( \mathbf{T} = \sqrt{\text{Im} [\varepsilon (r, \omega)]} \mathbf{I} \), and where \( \mathbf{G}(r, r', \omega) \) is the classical Green function for the nonreciprocal environment. The notation for the Green function here differs from that used in [9]-[10] by a factor of \( \omega \varepsilon \mu_0 \). The Green function has vacuum and scattered contributions, where the vacuum term, divergent in the dipole approximation, leads to the Lamb shift. We assume that the Lamb shift is accounted for in the definition of the atomic transition frequency \( \omega_0 \), and in the following we use the scattered Schrödinger Green function, which dominates the material response for close atom-interface separations. We assume that an atom is introduced to the environment at \( t = 0 \). Furthermore, we assume that the medium is initially (i.e., at \( t = 0 \)) in thermal equilibrium, and that the atomic transition frequency \( \omega_0 \) is not too close to a material resonance. Otherwise, both of those effects would give rise to additional transients [29] that are ignored here.

The equation of motion (Schrödinger equation) is

\[
(i/\hbar) \dot{\psi} = \hat{H} \psi.
\]

Using the energy-conserving states (ECS) \( \{|e, 0\rangle, |g, i_1 (r, \omega_\lambda)\rangle\} \), the expansion of the wavefunction is

\[
|\psi(t)\rangle_{\text{ECS}} = b_{eo} (t) |e, 0\rangle + \int d^3r \int_0^\infty d\omega d_{i_1} (r, \omega, t) |g, i_1 (r, \omega_\lambda)\rangle,
\]
where $b_{eo}(t)$ is the atomic excited state population amplitude. Here and in the following we sum over repeated vector-component indices. Conservation of probability requires

$$|b_{eo}(t)|^2 + \int_0^\infty d\omega \int dr |b_{gi}(r,\omega_\lambda,t)|^2 = 1. \quad (7)$$

It is convenient to write $b_{eo}(t) = c_{eo}(t) e^{-i\omega_0 t}$ and $b_{gi}(r,\omega_\lambda,t) = c_{gi}(r,\omega_\lambda,t) e^{-i\omega_\lambda t}$. Plugging the wavefunction into the Schrödinger equation and using orthogonality, for $\gamma = \bar{x}_j\gamma_j$, it is straightforward to obtain the coupled set of equations

$$\frac{d}{dt} c_{eo}(t) = -\gamma_j \sqrt{\frac{1}{\hbar}} \int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{\omega_j^2}{c^2} \frac{\gamma \cdot G_I(r_0,\omega_\lambda) \cdot \gamma}{2i} \int_0^t c_{eo}(t') e^{-i(\omega_\lambda-\omega_0)(t-t')} dt', \quad (8)$$

$$\times \int d^3r' K_{ji}(r_0,\omega_\lambda) c_{gi}(r',\omega_\lambda,t) e^{-i(\omega_\lambda-\omega_0)t},$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} c_{gi}(r,\omega_\lambda,t) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\hbar}} \int_0^\infty \frac{\omega_\lambda^2}{c^2} K_{ji}(r_0,\omega_\lambda) c_{eo}(t),$$

$$\times e^{i(\omega_\lambda-\omega_0)t}, \quad (9)$$

where $K(r,\omega_\lambda) = G(r,\omega_\lambda) \cdot T(r,\omega_\lambda)$. It can be noted that $[8]-[10]$ are the same as $[20] (6.26)-(6.27)$ and $[23] (23)-(24)$, except here generalized to nonreciprocal media.

Integrating $[9]$, assuming that the excitation initially resides in the atom, $c_{gi}(r,\omega_{\lambda},t=0) = 0$, and inserting the result into $[8]$ and using $[26]$,

$$2i\frac{\omega_\lambda^2}{c^2} \int d^3r' K_{ik}(r,\omega_\lambda) K_{jk}(r_0,\omega_\lambda)$$

$$= G_{ij}(r,r_0,\omega_\lambda) - G_{ij}(r_0,r,\omega_\lambda) = G_{L,k}(r,r_0,\omega_\lambda),$$

leads to the non-Markovian population equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} c_{eo}(t) = -\gamma_j \sqrt{\frac{1}{\hbar}} \int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{\omega_j^2}{c^2} \frac{\gamma \cdot G_I(r_0,\omega_\lambda) \cdot \gamma}{2i} \int_0^t c_{eo}(t') e^{-i(\omega_\lambda-\omega_0)(t-t')} dt', \quad (10)$$

having the form of a Volterra integral equation of the second kind,

$$\frac{d}{dt} c_{eo}(t) = \int_0^t H(t,t') c_{eo}(t') dt', \quad (12)$$

with the kernel

$$H(t,t') = -\frac{1}{\hbar} \int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{\omega_j^2}{c^2} \frac{\gamma \cdot G_I(r_0,\omega_\lambda) \cdot \gamma}{2i}$$

$$\times e^{-i(\omega_\lambda-\omega_0)(t-t')} \quad (13)$$

We will assume the initial-value condition $c_{eo}(0) = 1$. It is useful to note that for a linearly-polarized, real-valued dipole moment (assumed here), $\gamma \cdot G_I(r_0,\omega_\lambda) \cdot \gamma$ picks out a diagonal element of the Green function, and $G_{L,ii}(r_0,\omega)$ is the same for the reciprocal and non-reciprocal cases. The procedure for numerically solving the Volterra integral equation is shown in the appendix.

1. Markov Approximations of the Population

Before presenting results for the non-Markovian population, it is interesting to consider various Markov approximations in evaluating the time integral in $[11]$. The first approximation is to assume that the population has no memory (Markov approximation, MA), $c_{eo}(t') \approx c_{eo}(t)$, and the second approximation is to extend the upper limit of the integration to infinity, which can typically be justified by noting that the most important contribution to the integral comes from the vicinity of $\omega_0 = \omega_\lambda$. Then, the Sokhotski–Plemelj (SP) identity,

$$\int_0^t e^{\pm i(\omega-\omega_0)(t-t')} dt' \quad (14)$$

$$\rightarrow \int_0^\infty e^{\pm i(\omega-\omega_0)(t-t')} dt' = \pi \delta (\omega - \omega_0) \pm iPV \left( \frac{1}{\omega - \omega_0} \right)$$

leads to the usual resonant and non-resonant contributions. Since these two approximations are often used together, we will refer to this as the full Markov (FM) approximation.

Another option is to assume that the population has no memory (MA), but that the upper limit of the integration is not extended to infinity, leading to

$$\int_0^t e^{-i(\omega-\omega_0)(t-t')} dt' = \frac{1 - e^{-i(\omega-\omega_0)t}}{i(\omega - \omega_0)}. \quad (15)$$

We will refer to this as the partial Markov (PM) approximation. In the following it will be useful to refer to the
function
\[ h_c(r, r, \omega, g) = \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_0^\infty \frac{d\omega_0}{\omega^2} \frac{\omega_0^2}{2i(\omega_0 - \omega)} e^{i\omega_t} g, \]
where \( g = g(\omega, t) \).

The FM approximation of the Volterra integral equation yields
\[ \frac{d}{dt} c_{eo}^{FM}(t) = -\Gamma^{FM} \frac{1}{2} + id^{FM} c_{eo}^{FM}(t), \]
with energy shift is \( d^{FM} = \delta = PV(h_c(r_0, r_0, \omega_0, 0)) \), where PV indicates a principal-value integral, and decay rate \( \Gamma^{FM} \)
\[ \Gamma^{FM} = \frac{2\omega_0^2}{\hbar c^2} \frac{\gamma \cdot G(r_0, r_0, \omega_0) \cdot \gamma}{2i}. \]

Since, \( \gamma \cdot G(r_0, r_0, \omega_0) \cdot \gamma = 2i \Im \gamma \cdot G(r_0, r_0, \omega_0) \cdot \gamma \)
for a linear dipole, \( \Gamma \) and \( \delta \) are seen to be real-valued, as required, and provide the usual exponential decay and energy shift of \(-\hbar \delta\), which agree with the well-known expressions for reciprocal media. Therefore, for a linear dipole the form of \( \Gamma \) and \( \delta \) in terms of the Green function are the same in the reciprocal and non-reciprocal case.

From (17), \( c_{eo}^{FM}(t) = c_{eo}^{FM}(0) e^{-\Gamma^{FM} t} e^{i\omega t} \), such that the FM amplitude of the state \( |e, 0\rangle \) is
\[ b_{eo}^{FM}(t) = c_{eo}^{FM}(0) e^{-\Gamma^{FM} t} e^{-i(\omega_0 - \delta) t}, \]
with \( c_{eo}^{FM}(0) = 1 \) by assumption of the initial-value condition.

In the PM approximation,
\[ \frac{d}{dt} c_{eo}^{PM}(t) = -c_{eo}^{PM}(t) p_e(t), \]
where \( p_e(t) = PV(h_c(r_0, r_0, \omega_0, f_c(t))) \), \( f_c(t) = -i(1 - e^{-i(\omega_0 - \omega)f_c(t)}) \). The solution of (20) is
\[ c_{eo}^{PM}(t) = e^{\Gamma^{FM} t} c_{eo}^{PM}(0), \]
with \( c_{eo}^{PM}(0) = 1 \) by assumption of the initial-value condition.

Since by causality \( G(r_0, r_0, \omega) \) must be analytic in the upper-half \( \omega_0 \)-plane, and \( \lim_{|\omega_0| \to \infty} (\omega_0^2/c^2) G(r_0, r_0, \omega_0) = 0 \), the integral for \( h_c \) can be closed with a semi-circle in the first quadrant of the complex \( \omega_0 \)-plane, resulting in an integral over positive imaginary frequencies.

The coupling parameter
\[ g = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar \omega_{SPP}^2}{32\pi \varepsilon_0 \omega_0^2}} \]
where \( \omega_{SPP} \approx \omega_0 \), delineates weak \((g \ll 1)\) and strong \((g \geq 0.5)\) coupling. Fig. 2 shows the non-Markovian population dynamics obtained from the numerical solution of (11) for a dipole positioned \( z_0 = 0.7c/\omega_p \) above the interface, such that \( g = 0.044 \) indicates weak coupling. Comparison is made to the usual Markov population decay (19) (Eq. (21) yields a similar result as (19)). The non-Markovian result shows the correct zero slope at \( t = 0 \), as shown in the insert of Fig. 2. Other than the initial slope, it can be seen that excellent agreement between the Markov solution and the non-Markov solution is obtained, as expected for weak coupling. Although not shown, the non-Markovian solution is also expected to show slower than exponential decay for long times.

Figure 3 shows the same result as Fig. 2 except for atom height \( z_0 = 0.1c/\omega_p \) above the interface. In this case, \( g = 0.808 \), indicating strong coupling. The exact solution is strongly non-Markovian, as expected, and exhibits Rabi oscillations.

**B. Initially-Excited Atom: Non-Markovian Force in a Non-Reciprocal Environment**

From canonical quantization, the quantum operator for the dipole force on an atom located at \( r_0 \) is
\[ \mathbf{\hat{F}}_j = \mathbf{\hat{p}} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial j} \mathbf{\hat{E}}(r) \bigg|_{r=r_0}, \quad j = x, y, z. \]

The expectation value of force operator in the \( \alpha \)th direction due to a dipole oriented along the \( j \)th coordinate is
\[ \mathbf{\hat{F}}_\alpha^j(t) = \langle \mathbf{\hat{F}}_\alpha^j \rangle \]
\[ = \langle \psi(t) | (\hat{\sigma}_+ + \hat{\sigma}_-) \gamma_j \mathbf{\hat{F}}_\alpha \mathbf{\hat{E}}(r) \bigg|_{r=r_0} \rangle |\psi(t) \rangle \]
into the force expression, then evaluating the resulting
approximations for the population. The Markov approximation of the force is obtained by substituting the PM or FM approximations for the population state. There are several combinations of approximations that can be used to approximate the force. One form of the Markov approximation of the force is given by (19). The atom is located at \( z_0 = 0.1 \text{c}/\omega_p \) above the interface, such that \( g = 0.808 \).

![Graph showing non-Markovian population dynamics in the strong-coupling regime.](image)

**FIG. 3.** Non-Markovian population dynamics in the strong-coupling regime, obtained from the numerical solution of (11), and compared with the usual Markov population decay using (10). The atom is located at \( z_0 = 0.1 \text{c}/\omega_p \) above the interface, such that \( g = 0.808 \).

Using (9), and, summing over repeated indices, (10), the general non-Markovian force is\( \mathcal{F}_\alpha(t) = 2 \text{Re} \left\{ \frac{i}{\pi \varepsilon_0} c_{\text{eo}}^* (t) \int_0^\infty d\omega \lambda \frac{\omega^2}{c^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega \lambda} \frac{\partial \gamma \cdot G_1 (r, r_0, \omega \lambda) \cdot \gamma}{2i} \right\}_{t=r_0}^{t' \rightarrow \infty} \) for \( \alpha = x, y, z \). Note that the force is expressed in terms of \( c_{\text{eo}}(t) \) rather than \( b_{\text{eo}}(t) \).

Regarding the derivatives, writing a scalar component of the Green function as
\[
G(r, r_0, \omega) \sim \int dk_x dk_y \left( \overline{G}_r (k_x, k_y) + i \overline{G}_i (k_x, k_y) \right)
\times e^{i k_x(x-x_0)} e^{i k_y(y-y_0)} e^{-\gamma_0 (k_x k_x + k_y k_y)}.
\]

for the layered environment depicted in Fig. 1, where \( \gamma_0 = \sqrt{k_x^2 + k_y^2 - k_0^2} \), it is easily shown that
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \omega \lambda} \frac{\partial \gamma \cdot G_1 (r, r_0, \omega \lambda) \cdot \gamma}{2i} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
- i \text{Re} & \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega \lambda} \frac{\partial \gamma \cdot G (r_0, r_0, \omega) \cdot \gamma}{2i}, & \alpha = x, y \\
\text{Im} & \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega \lambda} \frac{\partial \gamma \cdot G (r_0, r_0, \omega) \cdot \gamma}{2i}, & \alpha = z.
\end{array} \right.
\]

\[
\mathcal{F}_\alpha \alpha = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
- i \text{Re} & \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega \lambda} \frac{\partial \gamma \cdot G (r_0, r_0, \omega) \cdot \gamma}{2i}, & \alpha = x, y \\
\text{Im} & \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega \lambda} \frac{\partial \gamma \cdot G (r_0, r_0, \omega) \cdot \gamma}{2i}, & \alpha = z.
\end{array} \right.
\]

\[
1. \text{ Markov Approximations of the Force}
\]

The exact, generally non-Markovian force is given by (25). There are several combinations of approximations that can be used to approximate the force. One form of the Markov approximation of the force is obtained by substituting the PM or FM approximations for the population into the force expression, then evaluating the resulting time-integral exactly. In this manner, for example, the resulting FM approximation of the force is
\[
\mathcal{F} \text{FM}_{\alpha} (t) = 2 \text{Re} \left\{ \frac{i}{\pi \varepsilon_0} \int_0^\infty d\omega \lambda \frac{\omega^2}{c^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega \lambda} \frac{\partial \gamma \cdot G_1 (r, r_0, \omega \lambda) \cdot \gamma}{2i} \right\}_{t=r_0}^{t' \rightarrow \infty} e^{-i(\omega \lambda - \omega_0)(t-t')} dt'.
\]

Using (9), and, summing over repeated indices, (10), the general non-Markovian force is
\[
\mathcal{F}_\alpha (t) = 2 \text{Re} \left\{ \frac{i}{\pi \varepsilon_0} c_{\text{eo}}^* (t) \int_0^\infty d\omega \lambda \frac{\omega^2}{c^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega \lambda} \frac{\partial \gamma \cdot G_1 (r, r_0, \omega \lambda) \cdot \gamma}{2i} \right\}_{t=r_0}^{t' \rightarrow \infty} e^{-i(\omega \lambda - \omega_0)(t-t')} dt'.
\]

As a further approximation, the upper-limit of the time-integral could be extended to \( t \rightarrow \infty \), allowing the SP identity to be used. However, this leads to non-zero force at \( t = 0 \).
Fig. 4 shows the normalized \( F_z = 3|\gamma|^2 / (16\pi z_0^2 \varepsilon_0) \) exact vertical force \( F_z \) from (25) compared with the FM approximation (28), the PM2 approximation (29), and the HEM result [8], for the weak-coupling case \( \gamma z_0 = 0.7c/\omega_p \).

The FM approximation (28) is in excellent agreement with the exact force (25), and the PM2 force (29) is also in fairly-good agreement with these results, indicating that the early-time dynamics are essentially Markovian. Both of these results have the correct null value at the time origin [35], and then oscillate, eventually settling down to the MA HEM solution, which, from setting the upper limit of the spectral integral to \( t \to \infty \) and subsequent use of the SP identity, does not show the correct early-time dynamics. For the nonreciprocal case, a lateral force also exists, but will be omitted here.

In a Markovian approximation, the Casimir-Polder energy shift, force can be written as the total differential of the energy shift, 
\[
\frac{d}{dt} (\frac{\mathcal{F}}{2}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \int_0^\infty d\omega \left( \frac{\omega^2}{c^2} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \sum_{\gamma} G_{i}(r, r_0, \omega, \lambda) \cdot \gamma \mid_{r=r_0}.
\]

Using the Wick rotation, complex-plane analysis leads to resonant and nonresonant components.

**IV. CASIMIR-POLDER FORCE ON A GROUND-STATE ATOM INTRODUCED INTO A NON-RECIROCAL STRUCTURED RESERVOIR**

In the Heisenberg picture, atom-field states do not need to be defined, and the force \( \mathcal{F}_z \) found via the HEM naturally becomes the Casimir-Polder force for large times. However, using the Weisskopf-Wigner method, the states for the excited atom-field are \{\( |e, 0\rangle, |g, 1, (r, \omega_0)\rangle \}\), and the ground state is never reached (even using the full set of states \( A = \{ |e, 0\rangle, |g, 1\rangle, |e, 2\rangle, |g, 3\rangle, |e, 4\rangle, \ldots \} \)). In this section, we investigate the CP force on a ground-state atom introduced into a non-reciprocal structured reservoir at \( t = 0 \).

**A. Ground-State Atom: Non-Markovian Population and Force in a Non-Reciprocal Environment**

When considering the Casimir-Polder force on a ground-state atom, the assumption is usually that both the atom and field are in the ground state. If we assume an initial state as a direct product of atomic and field ground states, i.e., the non-interacting system ground state \( |g, 0\rangle \), the full interaction Hamiltonian acts on the initial state to produce the set of states \( \{ |g, 0\rangle, |e, 1\rangle, |g, 2\rangle, |e, 3\rangle, |g, 4\rangle, \ldots \} \), where, again, the numbers represent the number of quanta in the generic field mode. The two sets
of states, \( A = \{ |e, 0 \rangle, |g, 1 \rangle, |e, 2 \rangle, |g, 3 \rangle, |e, 4 \rangle, \ldots \} \)
used for an initially-excited atom, and \( B = \{ |g, 0 \rangle, |e, 1 \rangle, |g, 2 \rangle, |e, 3 \rangle, |g, 4 \rangle, \ldots \} \)
used for an initial ground-state atom, are independent (uncoupled). The set \( B \) is useful for the following situation: If we introduce a quasi-ground-state atom \( |g, 0 \rangle \) at \( t = 0 \) into a
structured nonreciprocal reservoir, then the SE and force evolve using set \( B \), in contradistinction to the situation involving an initially-excited atom considered in the previous sections. Here, we truncate the Hilbert space to consist of the two non-energy-conserving (NEC) virtual states \( \{ |g, 0 \rangle, |e, 1 \rangle \} \), such that the wavefunction is

\[
|\psi(t)\rangle_{\text{NECS}} = b_{g_0}(t) |g, 0\rangle + \int d^3r \int_0^\infty d\omega \lambda b_{e_1} (r, \omega, t) |e, 1 (r, \omega)\rangle .
\]

Since the two pairs of states \( A \) and \( B \) are independent (uncoupled), \( |\psi(t)\rangle_{\text{NECS}} \) and \( |\psi(t)\rangle_{\text{NECS}} \) can be evolved separately.

For the NECS states \( \{ |g, 0 \rangle, |e, 1 \rangle \} \) we find that

\[
\mathcal{F}_\alpha = 2 \Re \left\{ \frac{i}{\pi \varepsilon_0} b_{g_0}^*(t) \int_0^\infty d\omega \lambda \frac{\omega^2 \lambda^2}{c^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \gamma \cdot G_1 \left( r, r_0, \omega \lambda \right) \cdot \gamma \right|_{r = r_0} \int_0^t b_{g_0}(t') e^{-i \left( \omega \lambda + \omega_0 \right) (t-t')} dt' \}
\]

which agrees with the result from the full Markov approximation, \( \frac{d}{dt} \gamma_{g_0}^F (t) = \gamma_{g_0}^F (t) i \delta_t \), so that

\[
\gamma_{g_0}^F (t) = e^{i \delta_t t} .
\]

Therefore, in the Markov approximation, the state \( |g, 0\rangle \) has no decay, unlike the state \( |e, 0\rangle \). The relative energy difference between the states \( |e, 1\rangle \) and \( |g, 0\rangle \) is \( \hbar \omega_0 \).

For the weak-coupling case, the frequency shift is found to be \( \delta_t = 7.78 \times 10^{-3} \omega_0 \), such that the real and imaginary parts of the population oscillate with a period of \( \Gamma t \approx 151.55 \) (in this section, \( \Gamma \) is the decay rate of the excited atom, \( |18\rangle \)). Alternatively, in the strong-coupling case, Fig. 6 shows \( |b_{g_0}(t)|^2 \), where it can be seen that the population is strongly non-Markovian. In this case, \( \delta_t = 0.32 \omega_0 \), which leads to a period of \( \Gamma t \approx 0.4 \) (not evident in Fig. 6 due to the absolute value).

The exact, generally non-Markovian force is obtained by using the numerically-determined amplitude \( b_{g_0}(t) \) from (32) in (34). As discussed in Section III B 1, several different approximations are possible for the force. If one first evaluates the PM or FM population, \( b_{g_0}^F (t) = e^{i \delta_t t} \approx b_{g_0}^F (t) \), and inserts this into the force equation
but for longer times, F\text{vian.} The FM,2 approximation results in weak coupling case, since the system is essentially Markovian. The approximations agree very well with the exact force (34), only the exact force is shown, and compared with the FM,2 approximation. We see that at t = 0 the force has the correct null value (whereas the FM,2 approximation does not due to extending upper limit of the time-integral to t → ∞), and then oscillates and rapidly settles down to the value of the FM,2 Casimir-Polder force (which is the same as obtained in \text{[S]}) . Therefore, we see that the long-time (Tt ≫ 1) behavior of the vertical force on the ground-state atom is the usual Markovian Casimir-Polder force.

The vertical force is shown in Fig. 7 for the weak coupling case; since the approximations (39) and (40) agree very well with the exact force (34), only the exact force is shown. An other option is to first impose the Markov approximation b_{go} (t′) \approx b_{go} (t) in the time integral in (34), and then evaluate the time-integral exactly, without extending the upper limit to t → ∞ (PM,2), or extending the upper limit to t → ∞ and using the SP identity (FM,2), leading to

\[ F_{\alpha}^{FM} (t) = 2 \text{Re} \left\{ \frac{i}{\pi \varepsilon_0} \int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{\omega^2}{c^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \frac{G_1 (r, r_0, \omega \lambda)}{2} \frac{\gamma}{\omega \lambda + \omega_0 + \delta g} \right\} . \] (39)

An other option is to first impose the Markov approximation b_{go} (t′) \approx b_{go} (t) in the time integral in (34), and then evaluate the time-integral exactly, without extending the upper limit to t → ∞ (PM,2), or extending the upper limit to t → ∞ and using the SP identity (FM,2), leading to

\[ F_{\alpha}^{PM,2} (t) \approx |b_{go} (t)|^2 \frac{2}{\pi \varepsilon_0} \times \left\{ \text{Re} \int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{\omega^2}{c^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \frac{G_1 (r, r_0, \omega \lambda)}{2} \frac{\gamma}{\omega \lambda + \omega_0 + \delta g} \right\} \] (40)

\[ \times \left\{ \text{Re} \int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{\omega^2}{c^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \frac{G_1 (r, r_0, \omega \lambda)}{2} \frac{\gamma}{\omega \lambda + \omega_0 + \delta g} \right\} \] (41)

Because \[ |b_{go} (t)|^2 \approx 1 \] and \[ \delta g \ll \omega_0, F_{\alpha}^{PM} (t) \approx F_{\alpha}^{PM,2} (t) \] and \[ F_{\alpha}^{FM} (t) \approx F_{\alpha}^{FM,2} (t) \]. The FM and PM,2 approximations agree very well with the exact force (34) for the weak coupling case, since the system is essentially Markovian. The FM,2 approximation results in \[ F_{\alpha}^{FM} (t) \neq 0 \], but for longer times, \[ F_{\alpha}^{FM} (t) \approx F_{\alpha}^{FM} (t) \approx F_{\alpha}^{FM,2} (t) \approx \mathcal{F}_\alpha (t) \]. Since this is the force on the ground-state atom, this can be considered as the CP force, \[ \mathcal{F}_\alpha \].

The reasons for the oscillations in Fig. 7 are as follows. Since we take a bare-state, rather than dressed-state, approach, the initial state \[ |g, 0 \rangle \] is not the true ground state of the atom (and, certainly, neither is \[ |e, 1 \rangle \]). As such, the (light-matter) interaction can push the atom to other states, but with time the system finally settles down to a final state that approximates the true ground state.

The vertical force in the strong-coupling regime is shown in Fig. 8. The strong oscillations in the force are due to the Rabi oscillations of the population.

For the Casimir-Polder force, from the FM approximation of the population, \[ \hbar \delta g = \hbar \delta g (r, r, -\omega_0, 1), \] which is the same as \text{[17] (4.50)} (there they assume a ground-state atom, which is essentially the same as starting with the state \[ |g, 0 \rangle \] ). Then, we can write the Casimir-Polder force as the total differential of the energy shift, \[ \mathcal{F}_\beta = -d (-\hbar \delta g (r)) \], which is the same as \text{[11]}.
Therefore, the strong-coupling regime (where the reservoir was determined. In the FM approximation of the non-reciprocal structured behavior, it has been shown that the non-Markovian behavior of the population and force on a ground-state atom in a non-reciprocal structured ground-state (direct-product ground state) atom, without making a Markov approximation. This leads to a method to quantify the level of the non-Markovian behavior.

Starting with the energy-non-conserving states associated with $|g,0\rangle$, the non-Markovian population obeys \[ b_{go} (s) - b_{go} (t = 0^+) = \frac{1}{\hbar \pi \varepsilon_0} \int_0^\infty d\omega_\lambda \frac{\omega_\lambda^2}{c^2} \frac{\gamma \cdot G_1 (r_0, r_0, \omega_\lambda) \cdot \gamma}{2i} b_{go} (s) \mathcal{L}, \] where \[ \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L} \left\{ e^{-i (\omega_\lambda + \omega_0) t} \right\} = \int_0^\infty e^{-i (\omega_\lambda + \omega_0) t} e^{-st} dt \]

Therefore,

\[ b_{go} (s) = b_{go} (t = 0^+) = \frac{1}{s + \Gamma (s)}. \]

where

\[ \Gamma (s) = \frac{1}{\hbar \pi \varepsilon_0} \int_0^\infty d\omega_\lambda \frac{\omega_\lambda^2}{c^2} \frac{\gamma \cdot G_1 (r_0, r_0, \omega_\lambda) \cdot \gamma}{2i}. \]

Replacing \( s \rightarrow s' - i\omega_0 \),

\[ b_{go} (t) = e^{-i\omega_0 t} \int_0^{\delta + i\infty} \frac{1}{s' - i\omega_0 + G(s')} e^{s' t} ds', \]

where \( G(s') = \Gamma (s' - i\omega_0) \). It can be seen that \( G(s') \) has logarithmic-type branch points at \( s' = 0 \) and \( s' = -i\infty \). To see that a branch cut (BC) exists from \( s' = 0 \) to \( s' = -i\infty \), we can consider \[ G_d (s') = G (x + iy) - G (-x + iy), \]

\[ \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} G_d (s') = \frac{2}{\hbar \varepsilon_0} \int_0^\infty d\omega_\lambda \frac{\omega_\lambda^2}{c^2} \frac{\gamma \cdot G_1 (r_0, r_0, \omega_\lambda) \cdot \gamma}{2i} \delta (y + \omega_\lambda). \]

using

\[ \delta (y) = \frac{1}{\pi} \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{x}{y^2 + x^2}. \]

For \( y > 0 \), the delta function is never encountered, and so \( G_d (y) = 0 \), and there is no discontinuity. But, for \( y < 0 \), the delta function is encountered, and so the branch cut goes from \( s' = 0 \) to \( s' = -i\infty \). Since \( s = s' - i\omega_0 \), the BC goes from \( s = -i\omega_0 \) to \( s = -i\infty \).

Poles will occur at \( s = \Gamma (s) = 0 \). For the numerical parameters assumed in Section II, it is found that there is one pole, located on the imaginary axis at \( s_p = i\alpha_p \), and \( \alpha_p / \omega_0 \ll 1 \).

The complex \( s \)-plane is depicted in Fig. 9 showing that the inverse Laplace transform will involve a residue and a branch-cut integral.

\[ b_{go} (t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{s = -i\infty}^{s = i\infty} b_{go} (s) e^{st} ds \]

\[ = b_{go}^{\text{Res}} (t) + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{BC} b_{go} (s) e^{st} ds, \]

where

\[ b_{go}^{\text{Res}} (t) = \frac{2}{2\pi i} \Gamma (s_p) e^{s_p t} = ce^{i\alpha_p t}. \]

By the Riemann-Lebesgue lemma, the branch-cut contribution goes to zero as \( t \rightarrow \infty \), so that \( b_{go} (t \rightarrow \infty) = b_{go}^{\text{Res}} (t) \). Considering that the Laplace transform of the FM approximation of the population leads to \( (s - i\delta_g) b_{go} (s) = 0 \), then \( s = i\delta_g \), consistent with \( b_{go}^{\text{FM}} (t) = e^{i\delta_g t} \). The difference between \( b_{go}^{\text{FM}} (t) \) and \( \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} b_{go} (t) = b_{go}^{\text{Res}} (t) \) is the value of the oscillation frequency, \( \delta_g \) in the former and \( \alpha_p \) in the latter.

Having considered the population, we want to evaluate the \( t \rightarrow \infty \) value of the force \( F_z \). The method of directly evaluating this using Laplace transforms is cumbersome, and so we will, instead, insert the population

\[ F_z = \frac{1}{\hbar \pi \varepsilon_0} \int_0^\infty d\omega_\lambda \frac{\omega_\lambda^2}{c^2} \frac{\gamma \cdot G_1 (r_0, r_0, \omega_\lambda) \cdot \gamma}{2i}. \]
obtained above, \( \lim_{t \to \infty} b_{go}(t) = b_{go}^{\text{Res}}(t) = ce^{i\alpha_p t} \), into (34), leading to

\[
\mathcal{F}_\alpha = |c|^2 \text{Re} \left\{ \frac{i}{\pi \varepsilon_0} \int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{\omega^2}{c^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} G_1(r, r_0, \omega) \cdot \gamma \right\} |_{r=r_0}.
\]  

Therefore, there is only a non-resonant component of the exact non-Markovian Casimir-Polder force on the ground-state atom.

Comparing with the FM approximation obtained by the same method, (59), in the \( t \to \infty \) limit,

\[
\mathcal{F}^{\text{FM}}_\alpha = 2 \text{Re} \left\{ \frac{i}{\pi \varepsilon_0} \int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{\omega^2}{c^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} G_1(r, r_0, \omega) \cdot \gamma \right\} \frac{1}{\omega + \omega_0 + \delta_g},
\]

we see that if \( |c| = 1 \) and \( \alpha_p = \delta_g \), then these are the same. The occurrence of \( \alpha_p \neq \delta_g \) and \( |c| \neq 1 \) differentiates the Markov and non-Markov solutions.

Numerically, for weak coupling \( (z_0 = 0.7c/\omega_p) \) at \( \omega_0 = \omega_p = 0.65, \alpha_p = 7.80 \times 10^{-4}, \omega_0 \), which agrees with the frequency shift FM approximation, \( \delta_g = 7.78 \times 10^{-4} \omega_0 \). Furthermore,

\[
|c| = |b_{go}^{\text{Res}}(t)| = \frac{1}{|D'(s_p)|} = 0.9995,
\]

so we have, for the pole, \( \alpha_p \approx \delta_g \ll \omega_0 \) and \( |c| \approx 1 \), in which case the non-Markovian \( t \to \infty \) result (53) is approximately the same as the FM result for \( t \to \infty \), (54), as expected for weak coupling. For the strong-coupling case \( (z_0 = 0.1c/\omega_p) \) at \( \omega_0 = \omega_p = 0.65, \alpha_p = 0.282\omega_0 \), whereas the frequency shift FM approximation gives \( \delta_g = 0.3198 \omega_0 \), and

\[
|c| = |b_{go}^{\text{Res}}(t)| = 1 = 0.893.
\]

As expected, \( \alpha_p \neq \delta_g \) and \( |c| \neq 1 \) for the strongly non-Markovian case.

Fig. 10 shows the non-Markovian Casimir-Polder force \( (t \to \infty) \) obtained from the residue leading to (53), and the FM approximation, in the weak-coupling case. It can be seen that the agreement, and the trend, agree fairly well.

**V. CONCLUSIONS**

The non-Markovian time-dynamics of two-level atoms immersed in inhomogeneous, non-reciprocal environments has been studied using Weisskopf-Wigner theory in the strong and weak coupling regimes. Ground-state and excited atoms were considered as two separate initial-value problems. For atoms close to a material interface, strong coupling results in strongly non-Markovian behavior. Various approximations were also discussed, and the Casimir-Polder force was obtained.
[35] The force $\mathcal{F}_0(0) = 0$ is expected based on the following argument: In the Heisenberg picture all the operators at $t = 0$ are taken as the free-field operators, and the initial state is by assumption the product of the ground states of the non-interacting Hamiltonians. Therefore, $\langle \hat{p}(0) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{F}(r,0) \rangle = \langle \hat{p}(0) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{E}(r,0) \rangle = 0 \cdot 0 = 0$ for all components of the force.
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Appendix A: Numerical Solution of Volterra Integral Equation

In order to numerically solve the Volterra integral equation having the form

\[
\frac{d}{dt} c(t) = \int_0^t H(t, t') c(t') dt', \quad (A1)
\]

a grid can be defined \( t_i = 0 + ih, \quad i = 0, 1, ..., N \), where \( h = \frac{t_{\text{final}}}{N} \) with \( N \) the number of grid points \((t_{\text{initial}} = 0 \) is implicit), and using a trapezoidal rule

\[
\int_0^{t_i} H(t, t') c(t') dt' = h \left( \frac{1}{2} H_{i0} c_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} H_{ij} c_j + \frac{1}{2} H_{ii} c_i \right), \quad (A2)
\]

where \( H_{ij} = H(t_i, t_j), \ c_j = c(t_j) \). Writing the derivative as

\[
\frac{d}{dt} c(t) = \frac{c(t+h) - c(t)}{h}, \quad (A3)
\]

then,

\[
\frac{c(i+1) - c_i}{h} = -h \frac{1}{2} H_{ii} c_i = h \left( \frac{1}{2} H_{i0} c_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} H_{ij} c_j \right),
\]

\( i = 0, 1, 2, ..., N \), where for \( i = 0 \), \( c_0 = 1 \). In general,

\[
c_m = \left( 1 + h^2 \frac{1}{2} H_{(m-1)(m-1)} \right) c_{(m-1)}
\]

\[
+ h^2 \left( \frac{1}{2} H_{(m-1)0} + \sum_{j=1}^{m-2} H_{(m-1)j} c_j \right), \quad m = 1, 2, ..., N.
\]
