Time-rescaled quantum dynamics as a novel shortcut to adiabaticity
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The design of quantum control methods has been shown to greatly improve the performance of many evolving quantum technologies. Here, we develop a new mechanism to speed up the evolution of any quantum dynamical system by simply rescaling the time of a reference driving process; an approach which can also work as a shortcut to adiabaticity. It is shown that the fast process preserves the main characteristics of the work distribution of the reference (slow) process, which is an important ingredient for the construction of powerful thermal machines. Our findings are illustrated for two systems, namely the parametric oscillator and the spin-1/2 in a magnetic field.

PACS numbers:

Introduction. - The very act of controlling the dynamics of atomic systems has continuously changed its status from being an obscure dream in the first years of quantum theory to an indispensable tool in many evolving research areas [1–4]. One of the challenges in the emerging field of quantum thermodynamics is the optimization of the efficiency of microscopic thermal machines, while sacrificing the minimum of output power [10]. In this respect, it is of fundamental importance to devise quantum processes aiming to prepare and manipulate states in the shortest time possible. In the particular case of finite time thermodynamic transformations, there is a growing theoretical and experimental interest in the study of alternative fast processes that mimic adiabatic ones, the so-called shortcuts to adiabaticity (STA) [11]. With this motivation, many techniques have been developed. For example, using dynamical invariants [12], the fast-forward technique [13, 14], the inversion of scaling laws [15], and the counterdiabatic driving (CD) [16, 17].

Within this class of STA scenarios, CD, also known as transitionless quantum driving, is the one that allows applications in a variety of quantum systems, as long as the spectral structure is accessible [20–22]. In this technique, one has initially a reference time-dependent Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_0(t) \), with instantaneous eigenvalues \( \{E_n(t)\} \) and eigenkets \( \{|n_i\}\) and from it constructs an auxiliary Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_\text{f}(t) \), such that their collective effect, \( \hat{H}(t) = \hat{H}_0(t) + \hat{H}_\text{f}(t) \), drives the system exactly through the manifold generated by \( \hat{H}_0(t) \) in a shorter time. Therefore, when \( \hat{H}_0(t) \) generates an adiabatic evolution, \( \hat{H}(t) \) represents an STA. It can be demonstrated that \( \hat{H}_\text{f}(t) = i\hbar \sum_n (\partial_t \langle n_i| \langle \partial_t | n_i \rangle \langle n_i | n_i \rangle \langle | n_i \rangle | n_i \rangle) \), which shows that calculating \( \hat{H}(t) \) demands the instantaneous eigenkets \( |n_i\rangle \). However, the task of obtaining these eigenkets is usually very complicated, which has limited the usefulness of the method [23].

In this work, we introduce a new scheme to speed up an arbitrary quantum process, which is taken as the reference protocol, by simply rescaling the time dependence of the Hamiltonian. Similar to the CD case, when the reference is adiabatic, the method works as a STA protocol. After establishing the general theory, our findings are illustrated for two experimentally relevant systems, namely the parametric harmonic oscillator and the spin-1/2 in a magnetic field. Despite not being transitionless as the CD method, the construction of our fast protocol does not require knowledge about the spectrum of the system, and the work distribution function preserves all main features of the reference driving.

Time-rescaling method. - Consider a closed quantum system on which we desire to perform a protocol according to a unitary time evolution operator \( \hat{U}(t, 0) \), acting between an initial time 0 and a final time \( t_f \), with a time-dependent Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}(t) \). This operator must satisfy the Schrödinger equation,

\[
\hat{H}(t) \hat{U}(t, 0) = i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \hat{U}(t, 0).
\]  

The solution of Eq. (1) for the case in which the Hamiltonian is time-dependent but the \( \hat{H} \)'s commute at different times, subject to the initial condition \( \hat{U}(0, 0) = \mathcal{I} \), where \( \mathcal{I} \) is the identity operator, is \( \hat{U}(t_f, 0) = \exp \{-i \frac{\hbar}{\hbar} \int_0^{t_f} \hat{H}(t) dt \} \) (2).

Here, we call it the reference evolution operator. At this point, if we rescale the time using the function \( t = f(\tau) \), the above equation can be rewritten as

\[
\hat{U}(t_f, 0) = \exp \left\{ -i \frac{\hbar}{\hbar} \int_{f^{-1}(t_f)}^{f^{-1}(0)} \hat{H}(f(\tau)) f'(\tau) d\tau \right\} = \exp \left\{ -i \frac{\hbar}{\hbar} \int_{f^{-1}(t_f)}^{f^{-1}(0)} \hat{H}(\tau) d\tau \right\},
\]  

where \( \hat{H}(\tau) = \hat{H}(f(\tau)) f'(\tau) \) is the time-rescaled (TR) Hamiltonian, with \( f'(\tau) \) and \( f^{-1}(\tau) \) being the first derivative and the inverse of \( f(\tau) \), respectively. Let us call the
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operator of Eq. 3 the TR evolution operator. From Eqs. 2 and 5, we observe that, when applied to an arbitrary initial state $|\psi(0)\rangle$, the reference and TR evolutions produce exactly the same final state, $|\psi(t_f)\rangle = \mathcal{U}(t_f, 0)|\psi(0)\rangle$. However, this equivalence is achieved only if the reference and TR Hamiltonians, $\hat{H}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$, are applied between the corresponding time (integration) intervals. In the latter case, the desired action of $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ materializes in the time interval between $\tau = f^{-1}(0)$ and $\tau = f^{-1}(t_f)$. As a consequence, if this integration interval is shorter than that of the reference driving, from $t = 0$ to $t = t_f$, we have that the TR evolution represents a shortcut to the final state.

Now, let us suppose that the reference evolution produces an adiabatic transformation in the quantum system from $|\psi(0)\rangle$ to $|\psi(t_f)\rangle$. If so, the TR protocol would represent a STA given that the following four requirements are fulfilled: (i) the initial times must be equal: $f^{-1}(0) = 0$, (ii) the TR protocol must be faster: $f^{-1}(t_f) < t_f$, (iii) the initial Hamiltonians must be equal: $\hat{\mathcal{H}}(f^{-1}(0)) = \hat{H}(0)$, and (iv) the final Hamiltonians must be equal: $\hat{\mathcal{H}}(f^{-1}(t_f)) = \hat{H}(t_f)$. Assuming that there exist such a TR Hamiltonian satisfying these four requirements, it is important to observe that a STA also takes place even if the $\hat{H}$’s do not commute at different times. In this case we have

$$\hat{U}(t_f, 0) = \mathcal{T} \exp \left\{ -\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^{t_f} \hat{H}(\tau) d\tau \right\} = \mathcal{T} \exp \left\{ -\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_{f^{-1}(0)}^{f^{-1}(t_f)} \hat{\mathcal{H}}(\tau) d\tau \right\}, \tag{4}$$

where $\mathcal{T}$ denotes the time-ordering operator.

As can be observed, the problem of satisfying the STA requirements lies in the choice of an appropriate time-rescaling function $f(\tau)$ to be used in Eq. 3 (or Eq. 1). The properties (i) and (ii) are explicit, and finding a function which satisfy both is trivial. On the other hand, properties (iii) and (iv) can be both fulfilled if $f'(f^{-1}(0)) = f'(f^{-1}(t_f)) = 1$. Thus, any candidate function $f(\tau)$ meeting these criteria can be used in the expression of Eqs. 3 or 4 to turn it into a STA protocol, as an alternative to the reference (adiabatic) evolution. For example, the function

$$f(\tau) = a\tau - \frac{t_f}{2\pi a}(a - 1)\sin\left(\frac{2\pi a}{t_f} \tau\right) \tag{5}$$

have the properties $f^{-1}(0) = 0$, $f^{-1}(t_f) = t_f/a$, $f'(0) = 1$ and $f'(t_f/a) = 1$. These elements qualify this function as an adequate time-rescaling function for any $a > 1$, which we call the time contraction parameter. That is to say that the reference protocol given in Eq. 2 can be realized $a$ times faster, with exactly the same effect, applying the TR protocol of Eq. 3 with $f(\tau)$ given as in Eq. 5. Therefore, under these conditions, the TR protocol gains the status of STA. We want to call attention to the fact that $f(\tau)$ of Eq. 5 is not unique, so that one can look for many other functions that satisfy the STA requirements. To illustrate the present proposal, we address two problems of fundamental and practical interest: the parametric oscillator and the spin-1/2 system in a magnetic field.

Examples. - The parametric oscillator is described by the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}(t) = \frac{\dot{\rho}^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2} m\omega(t)\dot{x}^2, \tag{6}$$

where $\dot{x}$ and $\dot{\rho}$ are the position and momentum operators, respectively. The parameter $m$ is the mass of the oscillator, and $\omega(t)$ is the time-dependent frequency. Note that the time dependence of $\hat{H}(t)$ is due only to $\omega(t)$. Let us consider that we perform a given protocol during a time interval from $t = 0$ to $t = t_f$, by varying the frequency of the oscillator under a prescribed scheme, which is ruled by the transformation in Eq. 2. Suppose now that we want to shorten the time duration of the process to last from $\tau = 0$ to $\tau = t_f/a$, producing the same final state, by using the TR protocol. In this case, the reference Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ must be replaced by the TR Hamiltonian

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}}(\tau) = f'(\tau)\frac{\dot{\rho}^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2} m\tilde{\omega}(\tau)\dot{x}^2, \tag{7}$$

with $f(\tau)$ as given by Eq. 5 and the TR frequency as $\tilde{\omega}(\tau) = f'(\tau)\omega(f(\tau))$. The realization of $\tilde{\omega}(\tau)$ takes place by simply changing the intensity and the time dependence of the fields that generate the harmonic potential. However, depending on the quantum system we deal with, the modulation of the kinetic energy term with the function $f'(\tau)$ in Eq. 7 might be cumbersome in practice. For example, if the trapped particle has a net charge $q$, the momentum can be controlled with the application of a time-dependent magnetic field $\mathbf{B}(\tau)$ to cause the transformation $\dot{\rho} \rightarrow \dot{\rho} - q\mathbf{A}(\tau)$, where $\mathbf{A}(\tau)$ is the time-dependent potential vector satisfying $\nabla \times \mathbf{A}(\tau) = \nabla \times \mathbf{x} \times \tilde{\omega}(\tau)$. However, for this momentum control to occur it is necessary that the particle momentum and the magnetic field have components perpendicular to the trapping direction $x$.

Now we turn to the study of a spin-1/2 particle in a time-varying magnetic field $\mathbf{B}(t)$. In this case, the Hamiltonian is given by

$$\hat{H}(t) = \gamma \mathbf{B}(t) \cdot \mathbf{S}, \tag{8}$$

where $\gamma$ is the gyromagnetic ratio and $\mathbf{S}$ is the vector spin operator for the particle, i.e., $\mathbf{S} = \hbar/2 (\hat{\sigma}_x, \hat{\sigma}_y, \hat{\sigma}_z)$, involving the Pauli matrices. Assuming that the Hamiltonian of Eq. 8 generates the reference process, we have that the TR time evolution operator is given as in Eq. 4 with the TR function according to Eq. 5. That is,

$$\hat{U}(t_f, 0) = \mathcal{T} \exp \left\{ -\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^{t_f} \hat{H}(\tau) d\tau \right\} = \mathcal{T} \exp \left\{ -\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^{t_f/a} \hat{\mathcal{H}}(\tau) d\tau \right\}. \tag{9}$$
with

\[ \hat{H}(\tau) = \gamma \left[ a - (a - 1)\cos \left( \frac{2\pi a}{t_f \gamma} \right) \right] \]

\[ B \left( a\tau - \frac{b}{2\pi a} (a - 1) \sin \left( \frac{2\pi a}{t_f \gamma} \right) \right) \cdot \hat{S}. \]  

(10)

As a simple demonstration, we now consider the familiar case of a spin-1/2 particle in a constant magnetic field oriented along the z-axis, \( B(t) = B_0 \hat{z} \), as the reference protocol. The Hamiltonian is given simply by

\[ \hat{H}(t) = H = \Omega \hat{S}_z, \]

with \( \Omega = \gamma B_0 \). In this form, the evolution operator becomes \( \hat{U}(t_f, 0) = \exp(-i \Omega \hat{S}_z t_f / \hbar) \).

We will also assume that at \( t = 0 \) the particle is in the state \( |\psi(0)\rangle = |S_x, +\rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}(|+\rangle + |-\rangle) \), where \( \hat{S}_z |\pm\rangle = \pm \hbar/2 |\pm\rangle \). Accordingly, we have \( \hat{U}(t_f, 0) = e^{-i \Omega t_f / 2} |+\rangle \langle +| + e^{i \Omega t_f / 2} |-\rangle \langle -| \), which provides that the state of the system after a time \( t_f = \pi/\Omega \) is \( |\psi(\pi/\Omega)\rangle = \hat{U}(\pi/\Omega, 0) |\psi(0)\rangle = -i/\sqrt{2} (|+\rangle - |-\rangle) = |S_x, -\rangle \), up to a global phase factor \(-i\). Overall, we observe that \( \Delta \tau = \pi/\Omega \) is the shortest time interval for which the constant magnetic field \( B = B_0 \hat{z} \) causes a spin flip in the \( x \)-direction. The uncertainty in energy of the initial state \( |\psi(0)\rangle \) can be found to be \( \Delta E = \sqrt{\langle \hat{H}^2 \rangle - \langle \hat{H} \rangle^2} = \hbar \Omega / 2 \).

Hence, this configuration satisfies the relation \( \Delta t \Delta E = \hbar \pi / 2 \), which is the limit of the Mandelstam-Tamm bound \[27\], i.e., the quantum speed limit \[28\].

Now we investigate the effect of the TR protocol obtained from the reference process above. In this regards, for us to achieve an identical spin flip with the same initial and final Hamiltonians, in a shorter time interval, we should apply the Hamiltonian

\[ \hat{H}(\tau) = \left[ a - (a - 1)\cos \left( \frac{2\pi a}{t_f \gamma} \right) \right] \Omega \hat{S}_z \]

(11)

between \( \tau = 0 \) and \( \tau = t_f / a = \pi/\Omega a \), with the contraction factor \( a > 1 \). Indeed, if we have again the initial state as \( |\psi(0)\rangle = |S_x, +\rangle \), the TR evolution generated by \( \hat{H}(\tau) \) produces

\[ |\psi(\pi/\Omega a)\rangle = \hat{U}(\pi/\Omega a, 0) |\psi(0)\rangle = \exp \left\{ -\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^{\pi/\Omega a} \hat{H}(\tau) d\tau \right\} |S_x, +\rangle \]

\[ = \exp \left\{ -\frac{i \hat{S}_z}{\hbar} \pi \right\} |S_x, +\rangle = |S_x, -\rangle, \]

(12)

up to the same global phase factor \(-i\) of the original protocol. As we desired, the TR protocol had the same effect of the reference one, with the same final Hamiltonian. Similar to the previous example, the reference protocol with Hamiltonian \( \hat{H} \) does not have to be necessarily adiabatic. In such case, as already mentioned, the TR process generated by \( \hat{H}(\tau) \) satisfy all STA requirements. About the time energy uncertainty relation, we have now that \( \Delta t \Delta E = \hbar \pi / 2a \). This result is not a violation of the Mandelstam-Tamm limit because this bound is not valid for driven dynamics, i.e., parametrically varying Hamiltonians \[28, 29\]. For the sake of comparison, in Fig. 1 we show the time dependence of the magnetic fields for the reference and TR processes with different values of \( a \).

**FIG. 1:** Time dependence of the magnetic field intensity for some values of the contraction factor \( a \). We observe that the shorter the time interval of the TR protocol, the higher the intensities involved. As required in the STA criteria, all fields have the same intensity \( B_0 \) of the reference \((a = 1)\) protocol at the initial and final times. It can be verified that the areas under all curves are equal.

**Work Distribution Properties.** - We now investigate the properties of the work realized on the system in both the reference and TR protocols. For this purpose, we begin analyzing the work cost necessary to cause a given transformation in a quantum system. Let us suppose that initially the system is in thermal equilibrium with a heat bath at a temperature \( T \), such that the initial state is the Gibbs thermal state. If we let \( \hat{H}_i \), \( E_n^i \) and \( |n\rangle \) denote the initial Hamiltonian and the respective eigenvalues and eigenkets, the initial state is \( \hat{\rho}(0) = \sum_n e^{-\beta E_n^i} / Z |n\rangle \langle n| \), where \( Z = \text{tr}(e^{-\beta \hat{H}_i}) \) is the partition function, and \( \beta = 1/T \) in units of Boltzmann’s constant. The first step to capture some information about the work realized on the system is to make a measurement of its energy at \( t = 0 \). In this case, we obtain an outcome \( E_n^i \) with probability \( P_n^i = e^{-\beta E_n^i} / Z \).

After this measurement, we immediately disconnect the system from the bath and apply the desired evolution protocol, \( \hat{U}(t_f, 0) \). At the end of the process, at \( t = t_f \), we make a second measurement of the energy of the system. At this moment the Hamiltonian is \( \hat{H}_f \), with \( E_m^f \) and \( |m\rangle \) being the respective eigenvalues and eigenkets. Thus, the probability to find an outcome \( E_m^f \) in this new measurement is \( P_{m \rightarrow n}^f = \langle m | \hat{U}(t_f, 0) | n \rangle \). Since the systems is closed during its evolution, we attribute all energy variation to the work performed in the process from \(|n\rangle \) to \(|m\rangle \), i.e., \( W = E_m^f - E_n^i \). Because \( E_m^f \) and \( E_n^i \)
vary for each run of the protocol due to both thermal and quantum mechanical influence, we understand that $W$ is a fluctuating quantity. Taking all these elements into account, the work probability distribution in this two-point measurement scheme is

$$P(W) = \sum_{n,m} P_n^i P_m^f \delta[W - (E_m^f - E_n^i)],$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

where $\delta(x)$ is the Dirac delta function.

In many cases of interest, it is cumbersome to work with $P(W)$ due to the large number of possible transitions $|n\rangle \rightarrow |m\rangle$, and hence energy differences $E_m^f - E_n^i$. This problem usually becomes simpler if we access the characteristic function given by the Fourier transform of $P(W)$,

$$\chi(r) = \langle e^{i r W} \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P(W) e^{i r W} dW. \hspace{1cm} (14)$$

By substitution of Eq. (13) into Eq. (14) after some mathematical manipulations, we obtain

$$\chi(r) = tr\{\hat{U}^\dagger(t_f,0) e^{ir\hat{H}_f} \hat{U}(t_f,0) e^{-ir\hat{H}_i} \hat{\rho}(0)\}. \hspace{1cm} (15)$$

From the definition of $\chi(r)$ in Eq. (15) we can rewrite it in terms of the statistical moments of $W$,

$$\chi(r) = 1 + i r \langle W \rangle - \frac{r^2}{2} \langle W^2 \rangle - i \frac{r^3}{3!} \langle W^3 \rangle + \cdots. \hspace{1cm} (16)$$

Now, if we use the expansions $e^{ir\hat{H}_f} = 1 + i r \hat{H}_f - r^2 \hat{H}_f^2 / 2 + \mathcal{O}(r^3)$ and $e^{-ir\hat{H}_i} = 1 - i r \hat{H}_i - r^2 \hat{H}_i^2 / 2 + \mathcal{O}(r^3)$ in Eq. (15) and compare the result with Eq. (16) we can make the following identifications:

$$\langle W \rangle \equiv \langle \hat{H}_f \rangle_{t_f} - \langle \hat{H}_i \rangle_{t_0} \hspace{1cm} (17)$$

and

$$\langle W^2 \rangle \equiv \langle \hat{H}_f^2 \rangle_{t_f} + \langle \hat{H}_i^2 \rangle_{t_0} - 2tr\{\hat{U}^\dagger(t_f,0) \hat{H}_f \hat{U}(t_f,0) \hat{H}_i \hat{\rho}(0)\}, \hspace{1cm} (18)$$

where we have defined the average of a given operator $A$ at a time $t$ as $\langle A \rangle_t = tr\{\hat{U}^\dagger(t,0) A \hat{U}(t,0) \hat{\rho}(0)\}$. Observe from Eq. (17) that $\langle W \rangle$ is the average value of the transitionless Hamiltonian at $t = t_f$ and the average energy at $t = 0$, which is not surprising. Yet, Eqs. (17) and (18) allows us to calculate the variance of work $\langle (\Delta W)^2 \rangle = \langle W^2 \rangle - \langle W \rangle^2$ as

$$\langle (\Delta W)^2 \rangle = \langle \hat{H}_f^2 \rangle_{t_f} + \langle \hat{H}_i^2 \rangle_{t_0} - 2tr\{\hat{U}^\dagger(t_f,0) \hat{H}_f \hat{U}(t_f,0) \hat{H}_i \hat{\rho}(0)\} - \langle \hat{H}_f \rangle_{t_f}^2 - \langle \hat{H}_i \rangle_{t_0}^2 + 2\langle \hat{H}_f \rangle_{t_f} \langle \hat{H}_i \rangle_{t_0}, \hspace{1cm} (19)$$

where, for simplicity, the time dependence of the evolution operator has been omitted. Here, we can also define the work fluctuation simply as $\Delta W = \sqrt{\langle (\Delta W)^2 \rangle}$.

At this point, having defined the quantities that characterize the work distribution $P(W)$, we shall compare such results for an arbitrary reference protocol (adiabatic or not) with the corresponding TR (STA or not) process. First, we observe that the expressions for $\langle W \rangle$ and $\langle W^2 \rangle$ in Eqs. (17) and (18) depend uniquely upon the initial and final Hamiltonians, $\hat{H}_i$ and $\hat{H}_f$, and the evolution operator $\hat{U}$. Hence, the work fluctuation $\Delta W$ also depends only on these three operators. However, as has been discussed, the reference and TR processes have precisely the same expressions for these three operators. Therefore, we have that

$$\langle W \rangle_{\text{tr}} = \langle W \rangle_{\text{ref}} \hspace{1cm} (20)$$

and

$$\Delta W_{\text{tr}} = \Delta W_{\text{ref}}. \hspace{1cm} (21)$$

These two important results indicate that the mean work done on the system and the broadening of the work distribution are the same for both the reference and TR protocols. Comparatively, it was shown in Ref. [32] that the $\langle W \rangle$ are equal for the adiabatic and CD driving, but $\Delta W_{\text{CD}} > \Delta W_{\text{ad}}$. Presumably, it happens in that case because, in general, the auxiliary fields must be suddenly turned on and off at the beginning and the end of the CD process, respectively [11], which unavoidably increase the work fluctuations. This is not the case here, since the TR fields are continuously controlled in a well behaved fashion. On the other hand, a point which must be mentioned is that, contrary to CD processes, our TR protocol is not transitionless. In fact, if we observe Eqs. (2) and (3) we see that the reference and TR evolution operators are only equivalent for those specific limits of integration, i.e., they differ from each other at intermediate times [32]. In practice, this fact could make the TR protocol more sensitive to deviations from the correct driving than CD.

Conclusion. - We have proposed a mechanism to speed up the evolution of a quantum state by rescaling the time dependence of a reference evolution protocol. In comparison with the reference protocol, the time duration of the proposed (TR) process can be shortened by an arbitrarily large contraction factor. Moreover, the initial and final Hamiltonians are preserved, and no information about the spectrum of the system is needed. For the case in which the reference protocol is adiabatic, it is shown that the TR protocol works as a shortcut to adiabaticity, which has been proven to have a number of practical applications in the quantum control of many-body systems. To illustrate the present findings, we discussed our approach under the perspective of the parametric oscillator and the spin-1/2 particle in a magnetic field. In regards to the quantum thermodynamic properties, we demonstrated that the work distribution of the reference and TR protocols have the same characteristics. In this context, it has recently been shown that the CD method does not have this feature because it generates a broadening in the work distribution when compared to the adiabatic process. As a result, we believe that the present speed up operation has potential applications in many quantum technologies as finite-time quantum thermodynamics and many-body state engineering.
The author acknowledges financial support from the Brazilian funding agencies CAPES/Finance Code 001, and CNPq, Grant Number 309292/2016-6.

[24] The same argument is valid relating the reference and TR processes in Eq. 8.
[33] It means that if the reference protocol is adiabatic, i.e., the physical system remains in its instantaneous eigenstate along the whole evolution, the corresponding TR process will only provide this effect at the final time.