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Few interesting lessons of the generic harmonic, translation invariant master equation with Lindblad structure for a one dimensional particle are collected. It is noted that the auxiliary conditions, needed to identify a unique solution, are more involved for mixed state and the extension of the derivation of the master equation to cover some aspect of the auxiliary conditions is needed to fill up the missing information. The relaxed solution with translation invariance displays a well defined structure for infinitesimal system-environment interaction, suggesting the presence of universal laws, reminiscent of thermodynamics. It is argued that recoherence runs parallel with decoherence and the former can be strengthen in the ground state by enlarging the gap in the energy spectrum.

I. INTRODUCTION

While we usually follow only few appropriately chosen degrees of freedom in our experiments, the theoretical background is canonical quantization, developed for closed many-body dynamics with prescribed initial and final states. The effective theories are supposed to fill the gap, where the environment degrees of freedom are eliminated dynamically and their impact on the observed system is represented by the highly involved effective system dynamics.

There are two different ways the effective dynamics can be established, by working in the operator or the path integral formalism. The projector operator method [1–4] leads to an effective equation of motion for the reduced system density matrix, the master equation. The master equation has already been obtained for such a test particle [5] by including decoherence and then taking the dissipation into account followed shortly [6–8]. The more systematic description based on kinetic theory, the Born approximation scheme [9–11], and the inclusion of the higher order perturbative contributions within the gas [12] was added
later, together with the traditional many-body treatment of the environment [13]. The master equation, derived within a simple but generic harmonic model [14–16], offers powerful phenomenological treatment, applicable for weakly interacting environment.

The direct path integral expression for reduced system density matrix [17] can be obtained within the Closed Time Path (CTP) formalism, introduced in quantum field theory [18], condensed matter physics [19–21] and used later in an ever widening area [22]. The exact master equation with memory for the reduced density matrix was derived in this formalism for harmonic effective dynamics in ref. [23] and the master equation employed below represents a Markovian truncation. The time evolution of one and two Gaussian wave packets has been investigated in refs. [24] and [25], respectively.

The two schemes are usually applied in a complementary manner: While the operator approach reproduces directly the density matrix, summarising our information about the system, the path integral formalism is powerful to generate the Green functions of the coordinate operator. The present work grew out from an attempt to apply a simple master equation for the introductory problems to quantum mechanics, namely for the spread of the wave packet and the propagation in the presence of a step function potential. One encounters an unexpected difficulty in these exercises, a missing element of the projection operator method: The effective equation of motion is useful only if it is equipped by the auxiliary conditions which make the solution unique.

The problem of the auxiliary conditions in open dynamics is rather peculiar. The auxiliary conditions for \( N \) classical one-dimensional particles consist of \( N_{\text{closed}}(N) = 2N \) coordinates and velocities. The effective equation of motion for the subset of \( n < N \) particles is an integro-differential equation whose unique solution is identified by \( N_{\text{open}}(n) \geq 2n \) numbers. The \( N_{\text{open}}(n) - 2n \) additional numbers describe the information about the environment which is relevant for the system. For instance the relevant environment information for an approximate description, provided by an effective equation of motion which is truncated to a local differential equation of order \( m \), is expressed in terms of \( 2(m - n) \) numbers. The more accurate effective dynamics need more auxiliary conditions.

The situation is different in the quantum case where the additional information is substantial already by considering the closed dynamics of mixed states, described by Neumann’s equation. In fact, while the auxiliary conditions for Schrödinger’s equation consists of two numbers the auxiliary conditions for Neumann’s equation include functions to handle the
mixing. The missing information is replaced in this work by relying on the translation invariance of the system-environment interaction.

There is another point in the use of the master equation which calls for a closer view. The preservation of the norm and the positivity of the density matrix is guaranteed by the Lindblad structure of the master equation as long as the operators representing the coupling to the environment are bounded. The latter conditions is usually not met in quantum mechanics. It turns out that there are relaxed solutions of the master equation of Lindblad structure where the continuity of the coordinate space, the unboundedness of the momentum operator, leads to physically unacceptable solutions with exponentially increasing total probability. What is remarkable is that an analytic continuation of this solution in a wave number leads us to exponentially decreasing solutions, to decoherence. Such an analytic continuation turns propagating states into virtual (bound) states and decoherence into recoherence. We argue below that the recoherence of bound states is closely related to the decoherence of real, propagating states in open dynamics.

The master equation is introduced in section II, its derivation is based on the most general, translation invariant, harmonic, local $\mathcal{O}(\partial_t^2)$ interaction Lagrangian with an environment. A realistic model with such a Lagrangian contains a test particle interacting with an ideal gas. The polarization of the gas by the test particle, the dressing of the quasi particle of the model, contributes both to transient dissipative effects and to the long lasting modifications of the effective dynamics. The former include Newton’s friction force and a finite life-time of the quasi-particle and an example of the latter is the emergence of relaxed states.

The translation invariance simplifies the dynamics by keeping certain subspaces $\mathcal{A}_q$ of the Liouville space of operators, characterized by the wave vector $q$, closed during the time evolution. The general initial condition is solved within such a subspace in section III. The particular perturbative derivation of the self energy of the test particle limits our results to weakly open systems however points to an interesting effect. Namely, the test particle self energy, characterized by three $\mathcal{O}(g^2)$ constants, $g$ denoting the test particle-environment coupling, realizes a phenomenological scheme which remains valid for any other weakly coupled many-body environments: The effective Lagrangians, induced by different environments differ only in the numerical value of the three effective constants. Special attention is paid to the infinitesimal interaction limit, $g \rightarrow 0$, which is non-continuous. The non-trivial relations, characterizing this limit, apply for any realistic system, whatever strong isolation
it is placed into. The analytic continuation of the solution in $q$ turns propagating states into virtual states and decoherence into recoherence.

We possess the necessary auxiliary conditions to solve the master equation for translation invariant dynamics when the auxiliary conditions, imposed at spatial infinity, are trivial. This is demonstrated in section IV by the separation of the instantaneous and the dynamical decoherence [26] in the case of two plane waves and the spread and the decoherence of a wave packet, followed in section V. The auxiliary conditions are nontrivial in the presence of inhomogeneities owing to the possibility of the reflection and the transmission of waves. The resulting limitation of solving the master equation is demonstrated in section VI in the case of a step function potential. The recoherence of virtual and bound states is discussed in section VII. The main results are summarized in section VIII and an appendix is added for the sake of completeness about the effective equation of motion in the CTP formalism.

II. EFFECTIVE EQUATION OF MOTION

The master equation, used below, is an effective equation of motion for the reduced density matrix, $\rho(x_+, x_-)$, of a one-dimensional test particle in a weakly coupled environment. While the variables $x_{\pm}$ are motivated by the physical origin of the density matrix and the easy identification of the factorizability, $\rho(x_+, x_-) = \psi(x_+)^*\psi(x_-)$, the combinations $x = (x_+ + x_-)/2, x_d = x_+ - x_-$ are more advantageous to separate the physical coordinate $(x)$ from its quantum fluctuations $(x_d)$ or the action of translations $(x)$ from an internal, translation invariant structure of the mixed state $(x_d)$. Such a master equation is not part of the standard tool-box of quantum mechanics hence its origin is briefly summarized here. Readers interested only in the use of the master equation may proceed directly to section II A.

Let us consider a one-dimensional particle subject of a closed dynamics, defined by the Lagrangian

$$L = \frac{m}{2}\dot{x}^2 - U(x).$$ (1)

We couple this particle to an environment and seek the resulting effective CTP action, some details of this formalism are summarized in appendix A. The Landau-Ginzburg double expansion is employed next and the influence functional is truncated at $O(x^2)$ and $O(\partial_t^2)$.
The result is the Lagrangian

\[ L_{\text{eff}} = (m + \delta m)\dot{x}_d - U\left(x + \frac{x_d}{2}\right) + U\left(x - \frac{x_d}{2}\right) - kx_d\dot{x} - im\xi x_d\dot{x}_d + \frac{i}{2}(d_0x_d^2 + d_2\dot{x}_d^2), \quad (2) \]

other possible quadratic terms are excluded by the positivity, the preservation of the total probability and translation invariance. Note that the term proportional to \( \xi \) is a total time derivative and its role is to generate a time-independent, non-dynamical multiplicative factor \( \exp{\xi mx_d^2/2\hbar} \) to the density matrix, a static decoherence \( (\xi < 0) \) or recoherence \( (\xi > 0) \) in the coordinate representation. The equation of motion for the trajectory \( x(t) \) for \( x_d = 0 \) after the mass renormalization \( m + \delta m \to m \),

\[ 0 = \frac{\delta S_{\text{eff}}}{\delta x_d(t)} = -m\ddot{x} - \nabla U(x) - k\dot{x} \quad (3) \]

indicates that \( k \) is Newton’s friction constant. The time scale of the dynamics is given by the friction, \( \tau_{\text{diss}} = 1/\nu \) where \( \nu = k/m \) for homogeneous potential \cite{27}. The imaginary \( d_0 \)- and \( d_2 \)-dependent part of the Lagrangian controls the decoherence in the coordinate basis, and so the suppression of the off-diagonal elements of the density matrix with increasing \( x_d \) and generates the decoherence length scale, \( \ell_{\text{dec}} \). Simple dimensional consideration suggests \( \ell_{\text{dec}} \sim \sqrt{\hbar \nu/d_0} \) or \( \sqrt{\hbar^2/d_0} \). The first expression is recovered in the calculation, presented in this work with a slight modification, the replacement of the decoherence strength by its renormalized value at the characteristic frequency, \( d_0 \to d_0 + d_2 \nu^2 \).

The effective Lagrangian (2) can be derived in the case of a test particle interacting with a homogeneous gas in the leading order of the test particle and gas interaction. The results, summarized in appendix A 3 show that the parameters \( \delta m, k, d_0, d_2 \) and \( \xi \) of the Lagrangian are \( \mathcal{O}(g^2) \) expressions of the coupling constant \( g \) of the test particle-gas interaction.

### A. Master equation

The effective Lagrangian (2) yields the master equation,

\[ \partial_t \rho = \left[ \frac{i\hbar}{m}\nabla \nabla_d - \frac{i}{\hbar}U(x_+) + \frac{i}{\hbar}U(x_-) - \frac{d_0 + d_2 \nu^2 - 2m\nu \xi}{2\hbar}x_d^2 \right. \\
+ \left. i \left( \frac{d_2 \nu}{m} - \xi \right) x_d \nabla - \nu x_d \nabla_d + \frac{\hbar d_2}{2m^2} \nabla^2 \right] \rho, \quad (4) \]

where the notations \( \nabla = \partial/\partial x \) and \( \nabla_d = \partial/\partial x_d \) have been introduced. The first three terms incorporate Neumann’s equation for a closed system. The fourth term induces Gaussian
decoherence by suppressing the density matrix for large $|x_d|$. The term containing $x_d \nabla$ couples the $x$ and the $x_d$ dependence and $-\nu x_d \nabla_d$ works against the decrease of $\rho$ in $|x_d|$. The last term generates a decoherence induced diffusion in the coordinate space. The parameter $\xi$ multiplies a total time derivative term in the effective Lagrangian (2) hence it represents no dynamical process.

The most general quadratic master equation of the Lindblad form [28] is
\[
\partial_t \rho = -\frac{i}{\hbar} \left[ \frac{p^2}{2m} + \frac{m\omega^2}{2} x^2, \rho \right] - \frac{i}{2\hbar} (\lambda + \mu) [x, \{p, \rho\}] + \frac{i}{2\hbar} (\lambda - \mu) [p, \{x, \rho\}]
\]
\[-D_{pp} \frac{1}{\hbar^2} [x, [x, \rho]] - D_{xx} \frac{1}{\hbar^2} [p, [p, \rho]] - 2D_{px} \frac{1}{\hbar^2} [x, [p, \rho]],
\]
and preserves the positivity of the density matrix for weak friction,
\[
k^2 + 4\xi^2 m^2 \leq 2d_0 d_2.
\]

The classical equation of motion can formally be found by canceling the imaginary part of the Lagrangian [30], i.e. by performing the limit $d_0, d_2 \to 0$. While this limit is excluded by the inequality (7) the true classical limit, induced by strong decoherence, remains within reach.

Special attention must be paid to the mass-shell and the degeneracy singularities of the CTP path integral, regulated by the infinitesimal part (A2) in the CTP action. It contributes to $\mathcal{L}$ by $-\epsilon(x^2 + x_d^2/4)/\hbar$, the first term generates a multiplicative factor, $e^{-\frac{\hbar}{2m} x^2}$ with $\eta = 0^+$, in the density matrix and the second term is neglected in the presence of the finite $O(x_d^2)$ contribution to the right hand side of eq. (4).

B. Liouville space

The Liouville operator $\mathcal{L}$ of the master equation $\partial_t \rho = \mathcal{L} \rho$ is sometime called super-operator because it acts on the linear space $\mathcal{A}$ of operators corresponding to the Hilbert
space $\mathcal{H}$ of pure states. The master equation acts linearly on the Liouville space and the linear superposition of solutions remains a solution as in the case of Schrödinger’s equation. However, this similarity hides a fundamental difference between the wave function and the density matrix as far as the physical interpretation is concerned, namely the expectation values are quadratic, $\langle \psi | A | \psi \rangle$, or linear, $\text{Tr}[\rho A]$, in terms of the wave function or the density matrix, respectively. As a result, there is no interference between the terms of the linear superposition in the solution in the expectation values, $\text{Tr}[A(\rho + \rho')] = \text{Tr}[A\rho] + \text{Tr}[A\rho']$.

The Liouville operator $\mathcal{L}$ is obviously non-Hermitian but its restriction into the space of Hermitian operators $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{L}|_\mathcal{O}$, can be shown to be Hermitian. The argument starts by pointing out that $\mathcal{L}|_\mathcal{O}$ acts on $\mathcal{O}$, a linear space over the real numbers, hence it can be written as the sum of a symmetric and an antisymmetric operator, $\mathcal{L}|_\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{L}_+ + \mathcal{L}_-$, $\mathcal{L}_+$ ($\mathcal{L}_-$) being symmetric (antisymmetric) with real (imaginary) spectrum. The linear space $\mathcal{O}$ consists of operators of real spectrum hence $\mathcal{L}_- = 0$. Note that $\mathcal{L}$ preserves the Hermiticity therefore the formal expressions of $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}|_\mathcal{O}$ are identical. A natural representation of the Hermitian density matrices and $\mathcal{L}$ as real functions and operator, respectively, can be obtained by the analytic extension $x_d \rightarrow ix_d$. The spectrum of $\mathcal{L}|_\mathcal{O}$, denoted by $\mathcal{L}$ below, is real, $\partial_t \rho_\Omega = \Omega \rho_\Omega = \mathcal{L}\rho_\Omega$, and the eigenvectors are stationary solutions of the master equation. The Hermiticity of $\mathcal{L}|_\mathcal{O}$ is not as useful property as the Hermiticity of an observable. The reason is that the subspace of $\mathcal{A}$ containing the positive, unit trace density matrices is defined by equations which are linear in $\rho$ and the natural scalar product of the Liouville space, $\langle\langle A|B\rangle\rangle = \text{Tr}[A^\dagger B]$, plays no privileged role in physics.

The eigenvectors of $\mathcal{L}$ with $\text{Re}\Omega < 0$ appear in the states at finite time while relaxing to a steady state, characterized by $\Omega = 0$. It is shown in appendix A3 within the framework of the simple ideal gas environment model that the steady state components are in a thermal equilibrium with the environment.

C. Probability current

Schrödinger’s equation for closed systems keeps the bare probability current,

$$ (n, j) = \left( \rho(x, 0), \frac{\hbar}{im} \nabla_d \rho(x, 0) \right), \quad (8) $$
conserved. It is easy to check that the renormalized current,

\[ (n, J) = \left( \rho(x, 0), \frac{h}{im} \nabla_d \rho(x, 0) - \frac{\hbar d_2}{2m^2} \nabla \rho(x, 0) \right), \tag{9} \]
given in terms of the density matrix \( \rho(x, x_d) \) is preserved by our master equation. The renormalization, \( j_{\text{env}} = J - j \), a reminiscent of Fick's law, is generated by the decoherence driven diffusion and represents the polarization cloud induced by our particle in its environment.

The polarization cloud makes clear the way the total probability can be conserved with non-unitary time evolution. While the test particle is obviously stable, the norm of its state leaks into the environment. This takes place in such a manner that the renormalized flux \( J = j + j_{\text{env}} \) covers the flow of the probability density.

D. Translations

The translation \( x_\pm \rightarrow x_\pm + a \) induces the transformation \( \rho(x, x_d) \rightarrow \rho(x - a, x_d) \) of the density matrix and the linear subspaces, \( \mathcal{A}_q = \{ e^{iqx} \chi(x_d) \} \subset \mathcal{L} \) with arbitrary \( \chi(x_d) \), remain closed under translation invariant dynamics. While the representation of translations on the pure states of a particle splits into one dimensional irreducible subspaces, the high dimension of \( \mathcal{A}_q \) reflects the richness of the mixed states. Therefore it is sufficient to solve the master equation in the subspaces \( \mathcal{A}_q \).

The phase cancellations between the bra and the ket components of the density matrix lead to an interesting difference in the class of translation invariant pure and mixed states in the potential \( U(x) = U_0 - fx \). The potential \( U_0 \) drops out and the homogeneous force is represented by the term \( ifx_d/\hbar \), leaving Neumann's equation translation invariant. This potential, being a pure gauge potential, generates an \( x \)-dependent phase for translations. The dropping of the constant component \( U_0 \) makes the same Neumann's equation to cover both the propagating \( (U_0 < 0) \) and the tunneling \( (U_0 > 0) \) states. The master equation (4) preserves this property.

E. Auxiliary conditions and Hilbert spaces

Let us consider first the solution of Schrödinger's equation for a square integrable wave function within the interval \( a \leq x \leq b \) for \( 0 \leq t \). One can define a different Hilbert
spaces within this functional space, \( \mathcal{H}_\theta = \{ \psi(x) | \psi(b) = e^{i\theta} \psi(a) \} \), where the momentum is a Hermitian operator. But linear sum of these Hilbert spaces may be needed to describe the pure states of interest, such in the cases of reflection or transmission of a step function potential. The solutions of Schrödinger’s equation can be identified by the initial condition \( \psi(x,0) = \psi_i(x) \) and two boundary conditions, say \( \psi(a,t) = \psi_b(t) \), \( \nabla \psi(a,t) = \psi_b(t) \phi(t) \), specifying the probability density and the flux at \( a \), \( n(a,t) = |\psi_b(t)|^2 \) and \( j(a,t) = \hbar \text{Im}(\phi_b^*(t)) n(a,t)/m \). Hence the boundary conditions prescribe a particle source with given density and flux. One can define an instantaneous Hilbert space, consisting of square integrable wave functions satisfying these boundary conditions with a given value of \( \phi_b \) and arbitrary \( \psi_b \), containing states with fixed rate of change of the probability density in space, \( \nabla n/n = 2 \text{Re}\phi_b \), and velocity, \( j/n = \hbar \text{Im}\phi_b/m \), at the boundary. The solution, corresponding to time dependent particle source, evolves through different Hilbert spaces. Such a particle source preserves the pureness of the state despite being related to the environment.

The possibility to prescribe certain features of the state by the boundary conditions is widened dramatically by extending the description over mixed states. When we have partial information about the state, then we use the density matrix, representing a sum of pure states, weighted by their corresponding probability. Neumann’s equation handles such a mixture, i.e. controls the information encoded by the probability distribution of the pure states as well. This new element increases the complexity of the auxiliary conditions.

The solution of Neumann’s equation, a second order hyperbolic equation, within a generic region of the \((x,x_d)\) coordinate plane, depicted in Fig. 1, is fixed uniquely by prescribing the density matrix and its normal derivative along the boundary of the region in a manner which may depend on the time. Wigner’s function, the Fourier transform of the density
matrix in $x_d$,

$$w(x, k) = \int dx_d e^{-ikx_d} \rho(x, x_d),$$

(10)

yields the (eventually complex) distribution of the wave number at the location $x$. Thus the presence of the mixed state contributions allows us to prescribe freely a time-dependent probability density along the $x$ axis ($x_d = 0$) and the distribution of the momentum at some space point. There are pathological regions on the $(x, x_d)$ plane with boundary, called characteristic lines, where the two functions of the boundary conditions can not be freely chosen. The characteristic curves of Neumann’s equation are the horizontal and vertical lines on the $(x, x_d)$ plane. The horizontal lines remain characteristic curves of the master equation (4).

Our initial condition will be a pure stationary state of the closed dynamics where the particle flux is fixed at spatial infinity, $x \to \pm \infty$. The interaction with the environment is turned on at $t = 0$ and we follow the emergence of the mixed components during the time evolution. The integration over the environment coordinates in the path integral formalism provides a unique and full description of the effective dynamics in terms of the Green functions. But if we want to use the effective equation of motion we need its auxiliary conditions. Thus the program of deriving the effective equations of motion has to be appended by the derivation of the remaining auxiliary conditions. This latter is lacking at the time being hence we replace it by the closeness of the subspaces $A_q$ during the time evolution in a translation invariant effective dynamics. This is a safe point but we shall venture beyond the translation invariant dynamics and consider a piecewise constant potential. The solution of the master equation is constructed in this case by matching the solutions introduced in different regions of the $(x, x_d)$ plane with translation invariant dynamics. Our assumption is that the translation invariant physical boundaries assure the closeness of the subspaces $A_q$ in the causal subset of the regions $x \to \pm \infty$. The causal subset of a region consists of points where the initial condition uniquely determines the solution.

III. INITIAL CONDITION PROBLEM

We seek the solution of the master equation (4) with the potential $U(x) = U_0 - fx$, within the space $A_q$, the solutions with more involved $x$-dependence can be obtained by
linear superposition. The solution of the master equation for $\chi$,

$$\partial_t \chi(t, x_d) = - \left( \frac{hq}{m} + x_d \nu \right) \nabla_d \chi$$

$$+ \left[ - \frac{hq^2 d_2}{2m^2} + \left( i \frac{f}{\hbar} - \frac{qd_2}{m \nu} + q \xi \right) x_d - \frac{d_0 + d_2 \nu^2 - 2m \nu \xi}{2\hbar} x_d^2 \right] \chi(t, x_d), \quad (11)$$

is the easiest to find by first constructing the characteristic curve, a trajectory $\bar{x}_d(t)$, satisfying the equation of motion

$$\partial_t \bar{x}_d(t) = \nu \bar{x}_d(t) + \frac{hq}{m}, \quad (12)$$

together with the initial condition $\bar{x}_d(0) = x_{d0}$. The solution,

$$\bar{x}_d(t) = x_{d0} e^{\nu t} + \frac{hq}{m \nu} (e^{\nu t} - 1), \quad (13)$$

is next used to rewrite the master equation as an ordinary differential equation along the characteristic curve,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \chi(t, \bar{x}_d(t)) = \left[ - \frac{hq^2 d_2}{2m^2} + \left( i \frac{f}{\hbar} - \frac{qd_2}{m \nu} + q \xi \right) \bar{x}_d(t) - \frac{d_0 + d_2 \nu^2 - 2m \nu \xi}{2\hbar} \bar{x}_d^2(t) \right] \chi(t, \bar{x}_d(t)). \quad (14)$$

This is easy to solve with the initial condition $\chi(0, x_d) = \chi_i(x_d)$,

$$\chi(t, x_d) = \chi_i \left( x_d e^{-\nu t} - \frac{hq}{m \nu} (1 - e^{-\nu t}) \right) e^{a_q(t) + \Omega_q(t) x_d - \frac{d(t)}{2} x_d^2}, \quad (15)$$

where

$$a_q(t) = \frac{q k_f \hbar}{m \nu} (1 - e^{-\nu t}) + \frac{hq^2}{4m^2 \nu^3} [d_0(e^{-2\nu t} - 4e^{-\nu t} + 3) - d_2 \nu^2(1 - e^{-2\nu t})]$$

$$- \frac{hq^2 \xi}{2m \nu^2} (1 - 2e^{-\nu t} + e^{-2\nu t}),$$

$$\Omega_q = - \frac{q h}{m} \left( ik_f + \frac{d_0 q}{2m \nu^2} \right)$$

$$k_q(t) = (1 - e^{-\nu t}) \left( k_f - i q \frac{\xi}{\nu} e^{-\nu t} \right) - i \frac{q}{2m \nu^2} [d_0(1 - e^{-\nu t})^2 - d_2 \nu^2(1 - e^{-2\nu t})],$$

$$d(t) = \frac{1}{\ell^2_{dec}}. \quad (16)$$

The wave number $k_f = f/\hbar \nu$ corresponds to the classical drift velocity $v_f = h k_f/m = f/m \nu$ and

$$\frac{1}{\ell^2_{dec}} = \frac{d_0 + d_2 \nu^2}{2\hbar \nu} - \frac{m \xi}{\hbar} \quad (17)$$

denotes the asymptotic decoherence length scale. The dissipation time scale, $\tau_{diss} = 1/\nu$, gives the onset of the decoherence, too.
The initial condition used below, $\phi_i(x_d) = e^{ik_i x_d}$, leads to the solution

$$
\rho_q(t, x_d, x) = e^{a_{q,k_i}(t) + \Omega q (1 - e^{-2vt}) x_d^2 - \frac{d}{2} (1 - e^{-2vt}) x_d^2}
$$

with

$$
a_{q,k_i}(t) = a_q(t) - i \frac{hq k_i}{m \nu} (1 - e^{-vt}),
$$

$$
k_{q,k_i}(t) = k_q(t) + k_i e^{-vt}.
$$

(A. Unbounded operators)

The usual argument about the positivity and the conservation of the total probability assumes that the operators of the master equation are bounded which is not the case here. The preservation of the norm can easily be tested owing to the conserved current (9). In fact, any time-independent solution of the master equation with $\rho(\pm \infty, 0) = 0$ the integral $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \rho(x, 0)$ is time-independent. However $\rho(x, 0)$ diverges at one end of the real axes when the wave number $q$ is imaginary.

To see what happens in this case we consider the velocities, defined by $j(x) = v_b \rho(x, 0)$ and $J(x) = v \rho(x, 0)$ because they are space-independent. Their expression for imaginary wave number is

$$
v_{b,iq}(t) = \frac{\hbar}{m} \left[ e^{-vt} \nabla_d \ln \phi_i \left( \frac{hq}{m \nu} (e^{-vt} - 1) \right) + k_{iq}(t) \right],
$$

$$
v_{cl,iq} = \frac{hq d_2}{m 2m}
$$

where $v_{cl} = v - v_b$. The time-independence of the cloud velocity $v_{cl}$ follows from the conservation of the wave vector $q$ and its direction points toward lower particle density direction in agreement with Fick’s law. The bare velocity interpolates between the initial,

$$
v_{b,iq}(0) = \frac{\hbar}{im} \nabla_d \ln \phi_i(0),
$$

and the relaxed value,

$$
v_{b,iq}(\infty) = \frac{\hbar}{m} \left( k_f + q \frac{d_0 - d_2 \nu^2}{2m \nu^2} \right),
$$

the environment induces a non-trivial contribution to the bare current. The homogeneity of the velocity $v$, together with the inhomogeneous probability density $\rho(x, 0)$, leads to a time dependence in the contribution to the total probability, the particle number.
What we see here is the result of the unbounded nature of the operators making up generator $\mathcal{L}$ and is related to non-vanishing flux at the edge, at $|x| \to \infty$ [31]. The role of the particle flux in the time-dependence is showed clearly by the continuity equation, $\Omega_q = qv(\infty)$, too. The steady state with $\Omega_q = 0$ can be found by the help of an appropriately chosen dragging force $k_f = -d_0q/2mv^2$ which prevents the particles to enter or to leave at the edges.

B. Irreversibility

The memory loss, characteristic of diffusive dynamics, is clearly visible in the solution (15) as the losses of importance of the initial condition $\chi_i(x_d)$ during the time evolution. In fact, a solution with an initial condition satisfying

$$\chi_i\left(\epsilon - \frac{mv}{hq}\right) = c\epsilon^{-\frac{\Delta\Omega}{\nu}}\left[1 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)\right]$$

(23)

develops into

$$\rho_q(t, x, x_d) = c\left(x_d + \frac{hq}{mv}\right)^{-\frac{\Delta\Omega}{\nu}}\epsilon^{\frac{\Delta\Omega}{\nu}}e^{\frac{\Delta\Omega}{\nu}a_q + \Gamma_q + i\bar{k}_q x_d - \frac{x^2}{2\nu\tau_{dec}}}$$

(24)

with

$$a_q = \frac{h}{mv}\left(iqk_f + \frac{3d_0 - d_2v^2}{4mv^2}q^2 - \frac{\xi}{2v^2}\right),$$

$$\bar{k}_q = k_f - i\frac{d_0 - d_2v^2}{2mv^2}q,$$

(25)

as $t \to \infty$. Hence the manifold of functions (23) form the domain of attraction. The time scale of the memory loss is $\tau_{diss}$. It is easy to check that the asymptotic solution (24) is realized from the very beginning in the case of the initial condition

$$\bar{\chi}_q(x_d) = \left(1 + \frac{mv}{hq}x_d\right)^{-\frac{\Delta\Omega}{\nu}}$$

(26)

Another hallmark of dissipation is the high degree of degeneracy of the time evolution. It is easy to see that the transformation

$$\rho(x, x_d) \to \left(1 + \frac{mv}{hq}x_d\right)^{-\frac{\Delta\Omega}{\nu}}\rho(x, x_d)$$

(27)

leads to the shift, $\Omega_q \to \Omega_q + \Delta\Omega$, without modifying the other parameters of the solution. Thus the asymptotic frequency spectrum is infinitely degenerate.
C. Infinitesimal environment interaction

It is instructive to inspect the infinitesimal system-environment coupling limit, \( g \rightarrow 0 \), of the equilibrium solution with \( \Omega = 0, f = 0 \). The lack of a gap in the environment spectrum can be established only after an infinitely long time observation \([32]\), leading to the non-commutativity of the limits \( t \rightarrow \infty \) and \( g \rightarrow 0 \): While the solution of the time-dependent master equation is a continuous function of \( g \) at any finite time, the stationary solutions remain influenced by an infinitesimal interaction and develop a non-continuous limit at \( g = 0 \). The structure, developed in this limit, is universal as are the laws of Statistical Mechanics, i.e. remains qualitatively the same for weakly open systems, independently of the details of the infinitesimal system-environment interactions.

The dependence of the effective dynamics on the coupling constant \( g \) can be made explicit by performing the change \( V \rightarrow g^2 V \) in eqs. (A16), leading to \( d_0 = g^2 \tilde{d}_0 + \mathcal{O}(g^4) \), \( d_2 = g^2 \tilde{d}_2 + \mathcal{O}(g^4) \), \( \nu = g^2 \tilde{\nu} + \mathcal{O}(g^4) \) and \( \xi = g^2 \tilde{\xi} + \mathcal{O}(g^4) \) where the ignored \( \mathcal{O}(g^4) \) terms come from higher loop contributions in eliminating the environment. We restrict our attention to the equilibrium solutions with \( \Omega = 0 \) since the time-dependent stationary solutions do not converge when \( g \rightarrow 0 \). The remarkable feature of the limit is the emergence of a non-trivial \( \mathcal{O}(g^2/g^2) = \mathcal{O}(g^0) \) decoherence length, \( \ell^*_{\text{dec}} = \sqrt{2\hbar \tilde{\nu}/\tilde{d}_0} \). The discontinuity of the limit \( g \rightarrow 0 \) indicates that no isolation can prevent a particle from developing a universal \( \mathcal{O}(g^0) \) Gaussian decoherence,

\[
\rho_0 = e^{-\frac{d_0}{4\hbar}x^2}[1 + \mathcal{O}(g^2)], \tag{28}
\]

rendering the application of closed dynamics an unrealistic approximation for the long time dynamics of real, propagating particles. Such a singularity of the equilibrium state does not imply singular dynamics, the decoherence is a dynamical process, the excitation of the environment \([26]\), and the time needed to establish the finite decoherence length diverges as \( g \rightarrow 0 \).

If the steady state is inhomogeneous then there is a finite length scale available, in our case \( 1/q \), to localize the particle and thereby to prevent the excitations of long range, low lying quasi-particles in the environment. The result is the loss of the decoherence as \( g \rightarrow 0 \),

\[
\rho_q = e^{iqx}[1 + \mathcal{O}(g^2)]. \tag{29}
\]
It is worthwhile noting that the relaxed translation invariant density matrix,

$$\rho_0(x, x_d) = e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\ell_{dec}^2} + i k f x_d}, \quad (30)$$

is the Gibbs operator with a quantum fluctuations induced temperature, $T_q = \hbar^2 / m \ell_{dec}^2 k_B$ [27].

**IV. INSTANTANEOUS AND DYNAMICAL DECOHERENCE**

The decoherence is a dynamical process, it builds up during the time evolution, and one can characterize it by using different points of view [26]. The suppression of the off-diagonal density matrix elements is basis dependent and we shall consider it in the coordinate and the momentum basis. The simplest way to measure the decoherence strength is to take the quantum state at a fixed time, to consider the decrease of its matrix elements with increasing off-diagonality, given by $x_d$ in the coordinate basis, and to identify the characteristic length, $\ell_{dec}$, of this decrease. The time evolution of an initial pure plane wave state $\langle x | \psi_i \rangle = e^{ik_i x}$,

$$\rho(t, x, x_d) = e^{ik_i e^{-\nu t} + \sum_0^L (1 - e^{-\nu t}) x_d^2 \cdot \frac{1 - e^{-2\nu t}}{2\ell_{dec}^2} x_d^2}, \quad (31)$$

yields the instantaneous coordinate decoherence length

$$\ell_{dec}(t) = \frac{\ell_{dec}}{\sqrt{1 - e^{-2\nu t}}}. \quad (32)$$

This scale acquires a specially important role in homogeneous states where it remains finite for infinitesimal system-environment interactions. The distribution of the momentum in the translation invariant steady state is given by Wigner’s function,

$$w_0(k) = e^{-\frac{\ell_{dec}^2}{2} (k - k_f)^2}. \quad (33)$$

This equation reveals that a particle, dragged by a homogeneous force, relaxes to a completely decohered wave packet with Gaussian momentum distribution, centered at the drift momentum and spread to the inverse asymptotic decoherence length.

The decoherence is important to understand the suppression of the interference between macroscopically different states. In such an inquiry one chooses a pure initial state as a linear superposition of two different system states and an observable and looks for dynamical decoherence, which manifests through the suppression of the interference contribution to the
observable. Let us choose the initial state which is the linear superposition of two plane waves with wave vectors \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \), \( \langle x|\psi_i\rangle = c_1 e^{ik_1 x} + c_2 e^{ik_2 x} \). The density matrix evolves in time as

\[
\rho(t, x, x_d) = e^{-\frac{i}{2}(1-e^{-\nu t})}\rho_0 e^{\frac{i}{2}(1-e^{-\nu t})} \approx e^{-\frac{i}{2}(1-e^{-\nu t})}\rho_0 e^{\frac{i}{2}(1-e^{-\nu t})} \]

The first, common multiplicative factor describes instantaneous decoherence in the coordinate space and the two terms in the first line belong to diagonal contribution in the momentum basis. The next two lines contain the off-diagonal contribution of the momentum basis and the form,

\[
\rho(t, x, x_d) \approx e^{-\frac{i}{2}(1-e^{-\nu t})}\rho_0 e^{\frac{i}{2}(1-e^{-\nu t})} \approx e^{\text{Re}\Omega_0}(t) [c_1^2 e^{\text{Im}\Omega_0(t)} + c_2^2 e^{\text{Im}\Omega_0(t)}] \approx e^{\text{Re}\Omega_0}(t) [c_1^2 + c_2^2] \]

is valid after relaxation. The expression \( \text{Re}\Omega_q = -d_0 \hbar q^2 / 2m^2 \nu^2 \) reveals the dynamical decoherence scale

\[
P_{\text{dyn,dec}}(t) = \sqrt{\frac{m^2 \nu^2 \hbar}{d_0}}\]

in the momentum basis. The dynamical decoherence length in coordinate space [26],

\[
\ell_{\text{dyn,dec}}(t) = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{d_0}}
\]

suggests the existence of a basis independent dynamical decoherence mechanism, \( P_{\text{dyn,dec}}(t) = m\nu\ell_{\text{dyn,dec}}(t) \).

V. WAVE PACKETS

The propagation of a wave packet is the simplest generalization of the case of two plane waves. This problem has been addressed by using the master equation \( \nu = d_2 = \xi = f = 0 \) [24] and by the help of a harmonic oscillator model of the environment [25]. We consider this problem by allowing all parameters of the master equation (4) to be present.

Let us start with a pure Gaussian wave packet,

\[
\psi(x) = \int \frac{dk}{2\pi} e^{-\frac{k^2}{2}(k-k_0)^2 + ikx}, \quad (38)
\]
at $t = 0$. The closed dynamics generates the density matrix

$$
\rho(x, x_d) = Ne^{ik_0x_d - \frac{x_d^2}{2\sigma_{eff}^2} - \frac{(x-X_0)^2}{\Delta x_0^2} + i\kappa_0^2(x-X_0)x_d}
$$

(39)

with time-dependent parameters. The center of the wave packet follows a free motion,

$$
X_0 = (\hbar k_0/m)t,
$$

and the second moment increases quadratically with the time,

$$
\Delta_0x^2 = \sigma^2 + \hbar^2t^2/m^2\sigma^2.
$$

The role of the $O(xx_d)$ term of the exponent with

$$
\kappa_0^2 = \frac{\hbar m t}{\sigma_4 + \hbar^2 t^2/m^2 \sigma_4}.
$$

can be seen in the probability flux,

$$
\dot{j} = \frac{\hbar}{im} \nabla_d \rho(x, 0) = \frac{\hbar}{m}[k_0 + \kappa_0^2(x-X_0)]Ne^{\frac{(x-X_0)^2}{\Delta x_0^2}}.
$$

(40)

The first term describes the homogeneous motion of the center and the spread of the wave packet is reflected in the second term, describing a flux leaving the center of the moving wave packet.

The initial density matrix,

$$
\rho_i(x, x_d) = \int \frac{dk_+dk_-}{(2\pi)^2} e^{-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}[(k_+ - k_0)^2 + (k_- - k_0)^2] + i(k_+ - k_-)x + i\frac{k_+ + k_-}{2}x_d}
$$

(41)

evolves as

$$
\rho(t, x, x_d) = \int \frac{dk_+dk_-}{(2\pi)^2} e^{\frac{-\sigma^2}{2}[(k_+ - k_0)^2 + (k_- - k_0)^2] + i(k_+ - k_-)x + \frac{i(k_+ + k_-)}{2}x_d + \frac{d(t)}{2}x_d^2}
$$

(42)

in the open dynamics and the uniform convergence of the integrals assures positivity. The integration is straightforward and results

$$
\rho(x, x_d) = e^{ik_{eff}x_d - \frac{x_d^2}{2\sigma_{eff}^2} - \frac{(x-X)^2}{\Delta x^2} + i\kappa^2(x-X)x_d},
$$

(43)

up to a normalization constant.

The coefficient of $x$ in the exponent, a time-independent quantity for a single plane wave, now depends on time owing to the interference between the pure plane waves. The gradual suppression of the $x$-dependence, the spread of the wave packet, takes place already in closed dynamics, governed by the time reversal Schrödinger’s equation and is not a genuine irreversible process, it is due to the smooth phase relations between the plane waves in the initial state. Were we able to prepare a state with highly irregular phases between the plane...
waves, we might observe its shrinking during the time evolution. However the decoherence of the open dynamics is a genuine irreversible process. In fact, the master equation (4) breaks time reversal invariance because this transformation does not act on the invisible environment [32]. Hence one expects that the spread of the wave packet will be different in open dynamics.

The probability distribution
\[ \rho(x, 0) = e^{-\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{\Delta x^2}} \]  
(44)
displays a Gaussian wave packet following the trajectory
\[ X = v_f \left( t - \frac{1 - e^{-\nu t}}{\nu} \right). \]  
(45)

Though the relaxed motion is a trivial result of Newton’s equation, its microscopical, short time details offer a more detailed picture: The motion starts with a constant acceleration,
\[ X = a_f t^2/2 + O(t^3) \]  
with \( a_f = f/m \) since it takes approximately \( \tau_{\text{diss}} \) delay to establish the stationary energy loss to the environment. By the time the dissipation is stabilized, the motion is delayed by \( \tau_{\text{diss}} \), in a manner reminiscent of the phase shift in the scattering processes, that is to say the rearrangement of the particle state by the external forces.

The width of the wave packet,
\[ \Delta x^2 = \frac{\hbar^2(1 - e^{-\nu t})^2 + m^2 \sigma^4 \nu^2}{m^2 \sigma^2 \nu^2} + \frac{\hbar d_0(2\nu t - 3 + 4e^{-\nu t} - e^{-2\nu t}) + \hbar d_2 \nu^2(1 - e^{-2\nu t})}{m^2 \nu^3} \]
\[ + \frac{2\hbar \xi}{m \nu^2}(1 - e^{-\nu t})^2 \]
\[ = \begin{cases} \sigma^2 + \frac{\hbar^2 t^2}{m^2 \sigma^2} + O(g^2) & g \sim 0, \\ \sigma^2 + \frac{2\hbar d_0}{m^2 \nu t} + O(t^2) & \nu t \ll 1, \\ \frac{2\hbar d_0}{m^2 \nu t} + O(e^{-\nu t}) & \nu t \gg 1, \end{cases} \]  
(46)
reproduces the result of the closed dynamics when \( g \to 0 \) according to the first case. The second and the third cases show that the spread speeds up at the beginning and is slowed down after the dissipation and the decoherence mechanism are fully developed, respectively. The speed up comes from the \( O(d_2) \) velocity-dependent decoherence term of the influence Lagrangian which directly suppresses the interference between the pure components of the wave packet with different momentum. This effect is present from the very beginning. The slowing down can be understood by recalling that the spread of the wave packet is due to the irregular phases arising from the interference between different plane wave components in the
probability distribution. Both the decoherence and the friction suppress these contributions thereby they delay the spread. Note that the non-commutativity of the limits $g \to 0$ and $t \to \infty$ appears as the incompatibility of the first and the last cases. There is no manifest singularity on the right hand side of the first equation simply the dominant term depends on the order of the limits [27]. This is the way the non-commutativity of the limits shows up in eqs. (49), (52) and (53) below, too.

The Gaussian decoherence strength,

$$\frac{1}{\ell^2_{\text{eff}}} = \frac{1}{2N\hbar\nu} \left\{ \hbar m^2 \sigma^2 \nu^4 + d_2 (1 - e^{-2\nu t}) \nu^3 (\hbar^2 + m^2 \sigma^4 \nu^2) + d_0[(1 - e^{-2\nu t})m^2 \sigma^4 \nu^3 + \hbar^2 \nu(1 - 4e^{-\nu t} + e^{-2\nu t}(2\nu t - 3))] + 2d_0d_2(1 - e^{-2\nu t})\hbar^2t^3 + 2d_0^2\hbar\sigma^2(1 - e^{-\nu t})(t\nu - 2 + e^{-\nu t}(t\nu + 2)) - 2m\nu\xi(1 - e^{-\nu t})^2 + m^2 \sigma^4 \nu^3 (1 - e^{-2\nu t}) + 2d_0\hbar\sigma^2(1 - e^{-\nu t})(t\nu - 2 + e^{-\nu t}(t\nu + 2)) - 4\xi^2 \hbar m^2 \sigma^2 \nu^3 (1 - e^{-\mu t})^2 \right\}, \tag{47}$$

with

$$N = m^2 \sigma^4 \nu^3 + \hbar^2 \nu(1 - e^{-\nu t})^2 + \hbar\sigma^2 d_0[2\nu t - 3 + 4e^{-\nu t} - e^{-2\nu t}) + \hbar\sigma^2 d_2\nu^2(1 - e^{-2\nu t})] + 2(1 - e^{-\nu t})^2\hbar\sigma^2 m\xi\nu, \tag{48}$$

in the denominator displays the asymptotics

$$\frac{1}{\ell^2_{\text{eff}}} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{2\xi^2} + O(g^2) & g \sim 0, \\
\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} + \left(\frac{2}{\ell_{\text{dec}}} - \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right) \nu t + O(t^2) & \nu t \ll 1, \\
\frac{1}{\ell_{\text{dec}}} + O(e^{-\nu t}) & \nu t \gg 1.
\end{cases} \tag{49}$$

The initial value, $1/2\sigma^2$, is a relic of the spread of the pure state and is unrelated to decoherence. It is interesting that the friction tends to recohere the narrow wave packets in the initial phase of the motion. The decoherence saturates in agreement with earlier calculations in the framework of kinetic theory [5].

Let us now turn to the probability flux. The wave number,

$$k_{\text{eff}} = k_f(1 - e^{-\nu t}), \tag{50}$$

reflects the classical build up of the drift velocity. The conserved current displays a particle flux, leaving the center of the wave packet,

$$J = \frac{\hbar}{m}[k_{\text{eff}} + Q^2(x - X)]e^{-\frac{(x - X)^2}{2\sigma^2}}, \tag{51}$$
with the amplitude

$$Q^2 = \frac{m\nu}{N} \left[ d_0 \sigma^2 (1 - e^{-\nu t})^2 + d_2 \nu^2 \sigma^2 + \hbar \nu e^{-\nu t} (1 - e^{-\nu t}) \right]$$

$$= \begin{cases} 
\frac{m \nu}{m^2 \sigma^4 + \hbar^2 \nu t} + \mathcal{O}(g^2) & g \to 0, \\
\frac{d_2}{m \sigma^2} + \mathcal{O}(t) & \nu t \ll 1, \\
\frac{m}{2 \hbar} + \mathcal{O}(\nu t) & \nu t \gg 1.
\end{cases} \quad (52)$$

The result of the closed dynamics is recovered for infinitesimal environment interaction according to the first case. The environment makes the initial value of the amplitude non-vanishing by generating decoherence in a constant rate. It is rather surprising that the only change the environment makes at long time is to reduce the asymptotic value of $Q^2$ to its half compared to the closed dynamics.

Finally, the term $i \kappa^2 x x_d$ in the exponent of the right hand side of eq. (43) performs a gauge transformation on the state, $\psi(x) \to e^{i \kappa^2 x^2} \psi(x)$ with

$$\kappa^2 = \frac{m \nu}{N} (1 - e^{-\nu t}) \left[ d_0 \sigma^2 (1 - e^{-\nu t}) - d_2 \nu^2 \sigma^2 (1 + e^{-\nu t}) + 2m \nu \sigma^2 e^{-\nu t} + \hbar \nu e^{-\nu t} \right]$$

$$= \begin{cases} 
\frac{m \nu}{m^2 \sigma^4 + \hbar^2 \nu t} + \mathcal{O}(g^2) & g \sim 0 \\
\frac{\hbar}{m \sigma^4} + \frac{2(m \xi - d_2 \nu)}{m \sigma^2} & \nu t \ll 1, \\
\frac{1}{t} \left[ \frac{m (d_0 - d_2 \nu^2)}{2 \hbar \nu} \right] + \mathcal{O}(\nu t) & \nu t \gg 1.
\end{cases} \quad (53)$$

This is not a symmetry because the transformation acts on the state only, leaving the operators unchanged.

**VI. PROPAGATION OVER STEP FUNCTION INHOMOGENEITIES**

The possibility of using the family of solutions of section III in the presence of step function potential is explored in this section. The simplest attempt, the use of a patchwork of the relaxed solutions (24) to make up a steady state, is seriously limited by the matching conditions which are much more complicated than for pure states. Furthermore the positivity of the solution is very difficult to guarantee. Another strategy which brings us closer to the desired solution is to follow the time evolution by the help of the solution (15).
A. Matching conditions

The matching conditions of Schrödinger’s equation connects the logarithmic derivative of the wave function at the singularity of the potential. The matching conditions for the density matrix and its derivatives refers to the boundaries of the regions of the \((x, x_d)\) plane, shown in Fig. 1, at the location of the singularity. The continuity of the wave function at \(x = 0\) is usually taken for granted in closed systems. Apart of a number of incomplete arguments, the most convincing way to derive this condition for the step function potential is to replace the Heaviside function by a linearly rising function within the interval \(0 \leq x \leq \eta\) and showing by the help of the analytic structure of Airy’s function that the stationary wave function and its first derivative remain continuous in the limit \(\eta \to 0\) \[33\]. In the case of the master equation (4) we have first order derivatives and a quadratic potential, as well. Either of first derivatives can be eliminated by the transformation \(\rho \to e^{\phi}\rho\) where \(\phi\) is a suitable chosen, \(\eta\)-independent quadratic expression of the coordinates \(\hat{x}\) at the expense of generating new linear and quadratic terms to the potential. Since these terms are \(\eta\)-independent, the density matrix remains continuous at the singularity.

The discontinuity of the derivatives of the density matrix can easily be obtained for a potential which is the sum of a bounded term and a Dirac delta, \(\lambda\delta(x)\), by integrating around the singularity at \(x_\pm = 0\) in the \(x_d\) and \(x\) direction over an infinitesimal interval,

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{2i}{\hbar}\lambda \rho^{(\pm)} &= \mp 
\text{Disc}_{x_d} J^{(\pm)}, \\
\frac{i}{\hbar}\lambda \rho^{(\pm)} &= \pm \text{Disc}_x J^{(\pm)},
\end{align*}
\]

where the regularity of the time-dependence has been assumed and the currents are given by extending the definitions (8)-(9) to \(x_d \neq 0\). The matching conditions, imposed on a factorizable density matrix, \(\rho(x_+, x_-) = \psi(x_+)^* \psi(x_-)\), contain the same information at any points along the lines \(x_+ = 0\) and \(x_- = 0\) since the trivial multiplicative factor, depending on the other variable, \(x_-\) or \(x_+\), respectively, drops out. The rich structure of the matching conditions for the master equation, spreading over lines rather than concentrated at a single point, is due to the mixed nature of the state rather than the openness of the dynamics.

The difficulty of using of the family of solutions (24) is obvious: While one could find the solution of the matching conditions in simple cases for an exponential function, \(\Delta \Omega = 0\), the result may diverge in time. The suppression of the time dependence with \(\Delta \Omega \neq 0\) brings in
the power function prefactor which usually violates the matching conditions. Furthermore, it is not clear how to make sure that the full solution represent a positive density matrix. A more promising use of the solution (15), to explore below, is to start with a pure physical initial state and letting the Lindblad structure of the master equation take care of the positivity of the density matrix.

B. Step function potential

As the first example we start the time evolution with a stationary pure state of the scattering on the potential $U(x) = \Theta(x)U_0$ by a source at $x = -\infty$,

$$\psi(x) = \Theta(-x)[e^{ikx} + ae^{-ikx}] + \Theta(x)be^{iqx},$$

where $\hbar k = \sqrt{2mE}$, $\hbar q = \sqrt{2m(E - U_0)}$ with $E > U_0$ and $a = (k-q)/(k+q)$, $b = 2k/(k+q)$.

The initial density matrix in the regions $A$, $B$ and $C$ of Fig. 2 is

$$\rho(0, x, x_d) = \begin{cases} |b|^2 e^{iqx^d} & A, \\ b^* e^{i(k-q)x + \frac{2i k}{2} x^d} + ab^* e^{-i(q+k)x + \frac{2i k}{2} x^d} & B, \\ e^{ikx^d} + |a|^2 e^{-ikx^d} + a^* e^{2ikx} + ae^{-2ikx} & C, \end{cases}$$

and $\rho_D = \rho_D^B$.

As explained in section II E we assume that the different components of the density matrix preserve their form for $x \to \pm \infty$. In order to see the restrictions, imposed by assuming the closeness of the subspaces $A_q$ during the time evolution, we first keep this condition for finite $x$, as well. The equation of motion (11) holds for the regions $A$ and $C$ and can be obtained in regions $B$ and $D$ by introducing a new term, $\pm iU_0/\hbar \rho(t, x_d)$ and the replacements $ifx_d/\hbar \to \pm 2ifx/\hbar$ on the right hand side. The characteristic curve is not influenced by these changes and the solution remains (15) except that the parameters $a_q(t)$, $\Omega_q$ and $k_q(t)$ of (16) show different $f$-dependence and $\Omega_q$ contains the term $\pm iU_0/\hbar$. However the regions $B$ and $D$ are usually less important, for instance they do not contribute to expectation value of observables which are analytical in the momentum.

The strategy to find the solution is shown in Fig. 2 where the arrows indicate the approach of the initial point of the characteristic curve (13) with increasing time. The numbers beside the arrows identify the term on the right hand side of (56). The time evolution is easy to
FIG. 2: Four quadrants of the plane \((x, x_d)\) in the case of the step function. The coordinates are given in units of \(\hbar/m\nu\).

find in the shaded part of the \((x, x_d)\) plan where the characteristic curves do not stretch beyond the border of the region, allowing to use the solution (15)-(16),

\[
\rho(t, x, x_d) = e^{-\frac{d(t)^2}{2} - x_d^2} \begin{cases} 
|b|^2 e^{ik_0 x_d} & A, \\
\left|e^{ik_{0,-k}(t)x_d} + |a|^2 e^{ik_{0+k}(t)x_d} + (a^* e^{i\Omega_2 t} + c.c) \right| C, 
\end{cases}
\]

confirming that the subspaces \(A_q\) can be kept from being mixed in this region.

However the solution in the rest of the \((x, x_d)\) plan is different from (15). The matching conditions are imposed on the density matrix, the sum of the components (15), hence they couple the subspaces \(A_q\). To find the density matrix in the unshaded region we need \(\rho(t, x, x_d)\) for \(t > 0\) on the border and along a line \(L\) connecting the left and the right end of the region, say at \(L = \{(x, x_d) | x_d = 0, -\hbar k/m\nu < x < 0\}\). The former is provided by (57) but the latter is missing. We do not pursue the solution in this region.

The solution in the shaded region assumes the simpler form,

\[
\rho(x, x_d) = e^{ik_f x_d - \frac{d(t)^2}{2} x_d^2} \begin{cases} 
|b|^2 & A, \\
1 + |a|^2 & C, 
\end{cases}
\]

for \(t \gg \tau_{\text{diss}}\). The open dynamics replaces the current structure of the pure initial state with the relaxed state with the decohered current, driven by the dragging force. A non-trivial structures is generated by the open dynamics in the rest of the \((x, x_d)\) plane, in particular introduces a non-trivial probability distribution for \(-2\hbar k/m\nu < x < 0\).
A similar construction can be carried out for the scattering on the potential the Dirac Delta potential, $U(x) = \lambda \delta(x)$. The only difference is the absence of the term $\pm iU_0/\hbar$ in the master equation and the matching condition, the first equation of (54) has to be imposed along the characteristic curve.

**VII. RECOHERENCE OF VIRTUAL AND BOUND STATES**

The physical plane wave of a free particle satisfies the dispersion relation $E = p^2/2m$. The plane waves violating the dispersion relation are called virtual, they arise for instance in tunneling or in bound states. The extension of the evolution of a real particle state to virtual states confronts us to an unexpected phenomenon: The wave function of a pure virtual states has imaginary wave number $q$ which turns the $\mathcal{O}(q^2)$ suppression factor of eq. (35) between pure plane waves into an enhancement factor. Thus the decoherence between real states turns into recoherence between virtual state.

It is easy to find the origin of recoherence for virtual state by recalling that decoherence is due to the small overlap of the relative environment state. Let us suppose that the observed system and its environment is in a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ and define environment state, relative to the system state $|\phi\rangle$ as

$$|R(\phi)\rangle = \sum_m |\chi_m\rangle \langle \phi | \otimes \langle \chi_m | \psi \rangle$$

where $\{|\chi_n\rangle\}$ is an environment basis set [34]. One can check that the relative state defined in such a manner is actually independent of the choice of the environment basis. The suppression of the reduced system density matrix elements, $\langle \phi_+ | \rho_+ | \phi_- \rangle = \langle R(\phi_+) | R(\phi_-) \rangle$, arises from the small overlap of the relative environment states. There is no decoherence if the relative environment states are identical for different pure system states, for instance in the absence of system excitations. But decoherence acts between two pure system states as soon as they lead to different environment excitations. Therefore a pair of real particle states decohere because different momentum states generate different environment excitations, the positive energy states tend to spread energy into the environment. However the virtual states with negative kinetic energy represent an energy sink and tend to deexcite the environment. The concentration of the relative state around the ground state increases the overlap and generates recoherence. Full decoherence between two state is reached when the overlap of the relative environment states reaches
zero. In a similar manner recoherence stops when the off-diagonal reduced matrix element reaches the value of the overlap between the pure system states.

The master equation (4) is derived within the one-loop approximation in the system-environment interaction, ignoring the feedback of the system to the environment. This is sufficient in the direction to disorder, the description of the emergence of environment excitations, decoherence. But recoherence, the pumping out energy from the environment, drives towards a more ordered environment and is a more delicate issue. Hence one expects a less accurate description of recoherence than of decoherence by (4). Our assumptions about the auxiliary conditions are more questionable in case of recoherence, as well.

It is not difficult to see how recoherence emerges in our calculation. The decoherence is driven in the previous calculation by $\Omega_q < 0$ in the interference terms. The tunneling state or a bound state has non-oscillatory probability distribution and $\Omega_{iq} > 0$ indicates recoherence. It is straightforward to extend the calculation of section VI B for $0 < E < U_0$ where a tunneling state with $q = 2i\sqrt{2m(U_0 - E)}/\hbar$ is formed in region $A$ by the closed dynamics. Such an initial state generates exponentially increasing density matrix because the asymptotic value of $k_q$ indicates a positive particle flux at $x = 0$. The errors of our approximations remain self consistent for decoherence where the open dynamics suppresses the interference contributions. However the increasing weight in a recohering solution amplifies the errors during and limits the time span where the solution is acceptable.

\section*{VIII. SUMMARY}

Some lessons of the use of a simple translation invariant harmonic master equation are discussed in this paper. The simplest limit of infinitesimal system-environment interaction leaves behind non-trivial relaxed solutions, hinting to universal laws, reminiscent of thermodynamics. It is pointed out that the decoherence and the recoherence run simultaneously in the form of excitation and deexcitation of the environment.

The relaxation of a wave packet is followed by underlining the differences with respect to the closed dynamics. But the solution of the master equation is more difficult to complete in the presence of spatial inhomogeneities when the auxiliary conditions, needed to find a unique solution, are more involved owing to reflection.

These results show the fragility of the Lindblad structure in preserving the physical
features of the density matrix furthermore point to the need of a more complete derivation of the master equation involving some elements of the auxiliary conditions and finally hint at the possibility of enhancing coherence of a ground state by increasing the gap in the energy spectrum.

Appendix A: Effective equation of motion

The simplest characterization of the open dynamics of a test particle is in terms of the effective action of the CTP formalism. This is a CQCO scheme, treating the classical (C), quantum (Q), closed (C) and open (O) dynamics equal footing by the help of the CTP action [26]. A local Markovian dynamics is described by an effective Lagrangian which in turn can be used to derive the equation of motion for the reduced density matrix. These steps are briefly reviewed in this appendix for a quantum particle.

1. CTP formalism

The observed system and its environment are supposed to be described by the coordinates, $x$ and $y$, respectively and we assume that the closed dynamics for the full system, including the observed subsystem and the environment, is defined in the path integral formalism by the help of the action $S[x,y] = S_s[x] + S_e[x,y]$. The time evolution of the density matrix is given by the path integral expression,

$$
\rho(x_+, y_+, x_-, y_-, t_f) = \left(\frac{\sqrt{m_s m_e}}{2\pi i \Delta t \hbar}\right)^{2N+2} \prod_{n=0}^{N} \int d\hat{x}_n d\hat{y}_n \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar} S[x_+, y_+] - \frac{i}{\hbar} S^*[x_-, y_-]\right] \rho(x_{+0}, y_{+0}, x_{-0}, y_{-0}, t_i), \quad (A1)
$$

over the pair of trajectories $\hat{x} = (x_+, x_-)$, $\hat{y} = (y_+, y_-)$. This expression can be obtained by following the usual derivation of the path integral formula for the time evolution operator $U$ and $U^\dagger$, appearing in the full density matrix, $\rho = U \rho_0 U^\dagger$, by means of the trajectories $x_+, y_+$ and $x_-, y_-$. An infinitesimal imaginary part is introduced in the action,

$$
\text{Im} S[x,y] = \frac{\epsilon}{2} \int dt [x^2(t) + y^2(t)], \quad (A2)
$$

to split the degeneracy of the integrand for $x_+(t) = x_-(t)$ or $y_+(t) = y_-(t)$ and render the integral convergent [32]. This scheme might be called Open Time Path formalism because the pair of paths have freely chosen final points.
The time evolution of the full density matrix, (A1), preserves the factorizability and can be split into the trivial product of the matrix elements of $U$ and $U^\dagger$. The power of the CTP formalism becomes evident in calculating the reduced density matrix, $\rho_s = \text{Tr}_e \rho$. In fact, the trace operation closes the environment trajectories, $y^+(t_f) = y^-(t_f)$, thereby establishing correlations between the system trajectories $x_\pm(t)$, which encode the system-environment entanglement and dissipative forces [30]. Let us choose the initial state at time $t_i$ factorizable for the sake of simplicity, $\rho_s(x_+, x_-, y_+, y_-, t_i) = \rho_s(x_+, x_-, t_i) \rho_e(y^+, y^-, t_i)$. The reduced density matrix can be written in the form

$$\rho_s(x_+, x_-, t_f) = \left(\frac{m_e}{2\pi i \Delta \hbar}\right)^{N+1} \prod_{n=0}^N \int d\hat{x}_n e^{i \frac{S_{eff}[\hat{x}]}{\hbar}} \rho_s(x_{+,0}, x_{-,0}, t_i), \quad (A3)$$

involving the effective action, $S_{eff}[\hat{x}] = S_s[x_+] - S_s[x_-] + S_{inf}[\hat{x}]$, and the influence functional [17],

$$e^{i \frac{S_{inf}[\hat{x}]}{\hbar}} = \left(\frac{m_e}{2\pi i \Delta \hbar}\right)^{N+1} \prod_{n=0}^N \int d\hat{y}_n \rho_e(\hat{x}^+_{y^+}, \hat{x}^-_{y^-}) \rho_e(y_0^+, y_0^-, t_i), \quad (A4)$$

where the pair of paths have the same final point, $y_{N+1}^+ = y_{N+1}^-$. This is the Closed Time Path formalism. Note the difference in the handling way of the observed and the non-observed coordinates, they are part of the Open and Closed Time Path schemes, respectively.

The final time has been identical for the system and its environment in the previous expressions. Such a restriction can be relaxed by exploiting the unitarity of the time evolution of a closed system which amounts to causality, namely the possibility that the final time can be chosen arbitrarily after the observation,

$$\langle A(t_o) \rangle = \text{Tr}AU(t_o, t_i)\rho(t_i)U^\dagger(t_o, t_i) = \text{Tr}U(t_f, t_o)AU(t_o, t_i)\rho(t_i)U^\dagger(t_o, t_i)U^\dagger(t_f, t_o), \quad (A5)$$

with $t_f \geq t_o$. We take $U(t_f, t_o)$ and $U^\dagger(t_f, t_o)$ in this expression as the time evolution operator of the environment in the absence of the system, allowing the set $t_o$ and $t_f$ as the final time in eqs. (A3) and (A4), respectively. The possibility of having $t_f \geq t_o$ is specially important for dissipative systems where the environment has a continuous spectrum, requiring $t_f \to \infty$ for $t_o < \infty$.

We note by passing that the unitarity of the full, closed dynamics, implies important restrictions: Any CTP action, in particular the influence functional, satisfies the relation

$$S_{inf}[x_+, x_] = -S_{inf}[x_-, x_+], \quad (A6)$$
and the diagonal part of the influence functional is vanishing,

\[ S_{int}[x, x] = 0. \]  

(A7)

The first property is a trivial result of the structure of the integrand in eq. (A1) and the second follows by considering the system trajectory \( x_\pm(t) = x(t) \) as an external source to the environment, realizing unitary dynamics and preserving \( \text{Tr}_e \rho_e \). Note that \( \langle x_+(t) \rangle = \langle x_-(t) \rangle \) for unitary dynamics.

The distinguishing feature of the CTP formalism is the reduplication of the degrees of freedom and the representation of the classical dissipative forces and the system-environment entanglement as a coupling between the members of the CTP doublets. While this an unusual procedure in classical physics its origin is rather obvious in the quantum case: The expectation value of an observable \( A \) in a pure state \( |\psi\rangle \) of unit norm,

\[ \langle A \rangle = \sum_{nm} \langle \psi|n \rangle \langle n|A|m \rangle \langle m|\psi \rangle, \]  

(A8)

\( \{|n\} \) being a basis set, contains two independent sums over the components which represent the quantum fluctuations of the state \( |\psi\rangle \). The formal analogy with the probability distribution functions indicates that the quantum fluctuations of the bra and the ket are treated independently in this expression. Thus quantum mechanics represents a pure state by two independent set of quantum fluctuations which is obvious when the density matrix is used. The two set of fluctuations are time reversed of each other hence the pure state dynamics can be described in terms of kets, \( |\psi\rangle \). This is not the case anymore for mixed state where the correlated fluctuations for the bra and the ket requires the use of the ket-bra direct product states, \( |\psi\rangle\langle\psi'| \). In closed dynamics the initial condition, the Hermicity of the initial density matrix relates the fluctuations in the bra and the ket by complex conjugation, time reversal. The interaction with the environment in an open dynamics introduces correlations during the time evolution as well. The comparison of the derivation of the master equation of section II with the derivation of the Schrödinger’s equation shows that the “wave function” for the redoubled coordinate is actually the density matrix. The independent variation of the two CTP trajectory pair gives rise the semi-holonomic forces in the variational principle of classical mechanics [30] and the equation of motion makes the two trajectories identical.

The space of the CTP dynamics is larger than the space where the physical motion takes place. The former is defined by the help of the reduplicated variables and the latter is its
subset, selected by the initial conditions. The initial conditions are time reversed of each other and the of one member of the CTP doublet, \( x^- \) (bra) in the classical (quantum) case, is time reversed, as well, hence the physical space contains each degree of freedom only once. This is reminiscent of gauge theory where the physical states cover a subspace of the full Fock space and some insight into the dynamics can be gained in both cases by regarding the full, non-physical space.

2. Effective equation of motion

It is worthwhile to recall that Schrödinger’s equation appears as a “Fokker-Planck equation” in the framework of the path integral formalism. In fact, the Lagrangian (1) yields the time evolution for the wave function,

\[
\psi(x,t) = \left( \frac{m}{2\pi i \Delta t \hbar} \right)^{N+1} \prod_{n=0}^{N} \int dx_n e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \Delta t \sum_n \left[ \frac{m}{2} (x_{n+1}^{-} - x_n) - U(x_n) \right]} \psi(x_0, t_i)
\]

with \( x = x_{N+1} \), \( \Delta t = (t - t_i)/(N + 1) \) in the limit \( N \to \infty \). The derivation of a local differential equation in time needs the last time step only \([?]\),

\[
\psi(x, t + \Delta t) = \sqrt{\frac{m}{2\pi i \Delta t \hbar}} \int dx' e^{\frac{im}{\hbar} \Delta t (x - x')^2 - \hbar \Delta t U(z)} \psi(x', t),
\]

with a small jump in space, \( u = x - x' = O(\sqrt{\Delta t}) \). The expansion in \( u \) up to \( O(\Delta t^2) \),

\[
\psi(x, t + \Delta t) = \sqrt{\frac{m}{2\pi i \Delta t \hbar}} \int du' e^{\frac{im}{\hbar} \Delta t u'^2} \left[ 1 - \frac{i}{\hbar} \Delta t U(x) \right] \left[ 1 - u \nabla + \frac{1}{2} (u \nabla)^2 \right] \psi(x, t)
\]

reproduces Schrödinger’s equation.

The generalization of the derivation of the equation of motion for the density matrix is straightforward, the only subtle point being an operator ordering problem. One starts with the effective Lagrangian (2), given in the formal limit, \( \Delta t \to 0 \), however its use requires the \( O(\Delta t) \) prescription to handle the operator mixing ambiguity. The careful derivation of the influence Lagrangian with \( \Delta t \neq 0 \) reveals that \( \dot{x} \) is coupled to the \( x \)-dependent factor, given by the mid-point prescription \([?]\), yielding the bare Lagrangian, \( L_{eff} = m \frac{x - x'}{\Delta t} + \frac{k}{2} \frac{x_d + x'_{d} x - x'}{\Delta t} - U(x_+) + U(x_-) \).
\[-im \frac{x_d + x_d'}{2} \Delta t + \frac{i}{2} \left( d_0 x_d^2 + d_2 \left( \frac{x_d - x_d'}{\Delta t} \right)^2 \right), \quad (A12)\]

with \( \hat{x} = \hat{x}_{n+1}, \hat{x}' = \hat{x}_n \), valid for \( \Delta t \neq 0 \). The non-derivative terms can be evaluated anywhere in between \( \hat{x} \) and \( \hat{x}' \), the present choice simplifies the calculation that follows.

Once the Lagrangian is found one performs a single time step evolution for the reduced density matrix,

\[
\rho(\hat{x}, t + \Delta t) \approx \frac{m}{2\pi \Delta t \hbar} e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \Delta t [U(x_+) - U(x_-)] - \frac{2m \Delta t}{\hbar^2} d_0 x^2} \times \int dy e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \left( \frac{m}{2} y^2 + \frac{\hbar}{2m} (2x_d y + y^2) - \frac{m}{2} (2x_d + y_d) y_d - \frac{d_2}{2\Delta t} y^2 \right)} \times \left[ 1 + \hat{y} \hat{\nabla} + \frac{1}{2} (\hat{\nabla}^2) \right] \rho(\hat{x}, t). \quad (A13)\]

The Gaussian integral is easy to calculate and the result is eq. (4).

3. Ideal gas environment

In the case of a large, many body environment, the coordinate \( y \) is replaced by a field and it is easy to find the perturbative series for the influence functional by expanding in the system-environment and the internal environment interactions. The former is spelled out in ref. [?] where the effective action of a test particle interacting with a non-relativistic ideal gas is considered and the latter can be taken into account by the standard perturbation expansion within the environment. Such a perturbative scheme is specially well suited to a large environment which remains in equilibrium during the interaction with a small system.

The general argument, leading to the effective Lagrangian (2), can be realized in a simple three dimensional model, namely a test particle moving in an arbitrary potential \( U(x) \) and interacting with an ideal gas,

\[
S_s[\mathbf{x}] = \int dt \left[ \frac{m}{2} \dot{x}^2(t) - U(x) \right]
\]
\[
S_e[\mathbf{x}, \psi^\dagger, \psi] = \int dt d^3 y \psi^\dagger(t, \mathbf{y}) \left[ i\hbar \partial_t + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \Delta_y + \mu + V(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}(t)) \right] \psi(t, \mathbf{y}), \quad (A14)\]

where \( \mu \) denotes the chemical potential, and the static potential,

\[
V(x) = \int \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} e^{i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{x}} V_q, \quad (A15)\]
describes the test particle-gas interaction. The $O(V)$ and $O(\partial^2_t)$ influence functional yields (2) [? ] with

$$\delta m = \frac{1}{12\pi^2} \int_0^\infty dq q^2 V^2_q \partial^2_\omega D^0_{0,q}$$
$$k = = -\frac{1}{6\pi^2} \int_0^\infty dq q^2 V^4_q \partial_\omega D^f_{0,q}$$
$$d_0 = = -\frac{1}{6\pi^2} \int_0^\infty dq q^2 V^2_q D^i_{0,q}$$
$$d_2 = = \frac{1}{12\pi^2} \int_0^\infty dq q^2 V^2_q \partial^2_\omega D^i_{0,q},$$

in terms of the propagator $D_{\sigma,\sigma'}(x,y) = -i\hbar \text{Tr}[\psi_\sigma(x)\psi^\dagger_{\sigma'}(y)\rho]$ of the gas particles. The CTP propagator assumes the form

$$\hat{D}_{\omega,k} = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{1}{\omega - \epsilon_k + i\epsilon} & -i2\pi\delta(\omega - \epsilon_k)n_k & -i2\pi\delta(\omega - \epsilon_k)n_k \\
-i2\pi\delta(\omega - \epsilon_k)(1 + n_k) & \frac{1}{\epsilon_{k+\omega} - \epsilon_k} & -i2\pi\delta(\omega - \epsilon_k)n_k
\end{pmatrix}$$

in the momentum space where $\epsilon_k = \hbar^2 k^2 / 2m$, $n_k = \xi / (e^{\beta(\epsilon_k - \mu)} - 1)$ for a gas of temperature $T_e = 1/k_B\beta$ and exchange statistics $\xi = \pm 1$. The near, far, and the imaginary components of the propagator, $D^n(x), D^f(x)$ and $D^i(x)$, respectively are defined by the CTP block structure,

$$\hat{D} = \begin{pmatrix}
D^n + iD^i & -D^f + iD^i \\
D^f + iD^i & -D^n + iD^i
\end{pmatrix}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A18)

The polarization of the gas by the test particle is the dynamical source of the renormalization of the test particle dynamics on the leading order influence functional. The localized part of the polarization cloud gives rise to a conservative system-environment interaction encoded by the diagonal $\pm D^n + iD^i$ blocks and leads to the mass renormalization. The decoherence arises from the difference of the polarization clouds in the $U$ and the $U^\dagger$ time evolution operator of eq. (A5) and is generated by the block $D^i$. Finally, the dissipation is due to the mass-shell excitations within the gas, made by the test particle, and is described by the off-diagonal blocks $\pm D^f + iD^i$. The expansion in the time derivative assumes that the gas is considered in the thermodynamic limit where it has a continuous spectrum since there is no dissipation and $\delta m$ and $d_2$ are strongly suppressed in the case of a discrete spectrum.

The quantum fluctuation induced temperature [27] reduces to $k_B T_q = \hbar d_0 / 2m\nu$ in the universal, infinitesimal system-environment interaction limit. The ratio

$$\frac{\hbar d_0}{2m\nu} = \frac{\hbar}{2} \int_0^\infty dq q^2 |V|_q^2 |G^i_{0,q}|$$

in the momentum space.
can easily be calculated,

\[ \frac{\hbar d_0}{2m\nu} = \frac{m^2}{\pi\hbar^3} \int_0^\infty dq |V_q|^2 \frac{q^4}{1 + e^{\beta (\frac{q^2}{2m} - \mu)}} \]

and indicates \( k_B T_q = 1/\beta \). We find thereby a thermal equilibrium between the relaxed state of the test particle and the infinitely large environment, providing a simple, generic model of thermalization in closed quantum systems [35–44].
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