

# Creation of long-lived states in interacting spins coupled to a thermal bath

Arnab Chakrabarti

*Department of Chemical and Biological Physics,  
Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot - 761001, Israel*

Rangeet Bhattacharyya\*

*Department of Physical Sciences, Indian Institute  
of Science Education and Research Kolkata,  
Mohanpur - 741246, West Bengal, India*

(Dated: March 30, 2021)

## Abstract

We study the classic problem concerning the dissipative dynamics of a system of two interacting spin-1/2 particles, coupled to a thermal bath. In particular, we consider the case of a resonant excitation of the initial single-spin coherences and examine the consequences of the interplay between this excitation and the spin-spin dipolar coupling. Using a fluctuation-regulated Quantum Master Equation (frQME) [Phys. Rev. A 97, 063837 (2018)] we show that the relevant dissipator consists of cross-terms between the drive and the dipolar Hamiltonian, apart from regular self-terms responsible for ordinary relaxation effects. The drive-dipole cross-correlations provide for a novel second-order coupling of single and two-spin observables in the Zeeman basis, which cannot be classified as a dissipative effect. We show that the presence of these unique second-order non-dissipative terms lead to the well-known spin-locked steady-states in dipolar spin-ensembles. Importantly, the mathematical form of the steady-state magnetization in the spin-locked phase, obtained from our theory, matches with the prediction of the traditional spin-temperature based methods used to describe such phenomena.

---

\* rangeet@iiserkol.ac.in

## I. INTRODUCTION

It is known that a resonant drive colinear with the existing spin coherences in dipolar coupled spin ensemble lead to significant enhancement of the lifetime of the spin coherence and the method is popularly known as spin-locking [1–3]. As a method for enhancing lifetimes of spin-coherences, the emergence of long-lived spin-locked states have found widespread application in various fields, enabling one to investigate and measure slow dynamic processes which would otherwise be obscured by dipolar relaxation [4–6]. Spin-locking forms the basis of all cross-polarization (CP) class of experiments and also finds applications in many recent qubit manipulation, preservation and noise analysis protocols including polarization transfer experiments on nitrogen vacancy (NV) centers in diamond [7–14]. The existing models which attempt at providing a theoretical basis for the origin of these steady-states, mostly rely on the assumption of an effective spin-temperature in a tilted rotating-frame [1–3, 15–20]. However, such formalisms cannot provide a dynamical picture of the creation of these long-lived states from given initial conditions. To this end, we use a recently-introduced fluctuation-regulated quantum master equation (frQME), which can efficiently handle the higher order effects of strong excitations as well as strong dipolar coupling [21].

Quantum Master Equations (QME-s) form the basis of all theoretical descriptions of irreversible dynamics observed in an ensemble of quantum systems [22–24]. A crucial step in the usual formulation of a QME requires a description in terms of the eigen-basis of the bare system Hamiltonian [22–24]. This choice of a proper eigen-basis, determines the frequencies at which the bath spectrum is sampled by the system, leading to the dissipative dynamics of the latter. It also indicates the terms which survive the secular averaging and as such, play a major role in the relaxation process [23]. But when the system consists of bipartite entities coupled together through their mutual interactions, the choice of such an eigen-basis is not always obvious. For example, in the case of a two spin ensemble coupled together by dipole-dipole interactions, the dipolar Hamiltonian involves spatial degrees of freedom as well, which are external to the two-spin unit. Moreover, in the usual spin-dynamics experiments (e.g. Nuclear Magnetic Resonance, NMR), measurements are made in the Zeeman basis, determined by an external bias field [24]. As such, in this work we assume that in presence of a strong Zeeman field, the individual Zeeman levels of the two interacting spins serve as good eigen-basis for the formulation of a QME. We incorporate

the effects of the relatively weak dipole-dipole interaction perturbatively, which essentially causes mixing of the individual Zeeman levels. This leads to the emergence of drive-dipole cross-terms in the frQME which takes into account the second-order effects of an external drive [21]. We show that such drive-dipole cross-terms can lead to the phenomenon of spin locking in appropriate limits. The most important feature of these cross-terms is that they are non-dissipative in nature i.e. they do not induce any net decay in the observed dynamics. On the contrary, under certain conditions, these terms tend to slow down the irreversible processes leading to a non-thermal dynamical steady state, which cannot be predicted from a QME having purely dissipative second-order terms.

## II. THEORETICAL PRELIMINARIES

Typically, a spin-locking experiment involves the application of a resonant external drive, in phase with the net transverse magnetization of an ensemble of spins placed in a static Zeeman field [1, 25]. An initial  $90^\circ$  pulse is required for the creation of this initial transverse magnetization. The effect of spin-locking is particularly spectacular in solid state NMR, where unlocked coherences decay within tens of microseconds, whereas, the spin-locked states lasts for tens of milliseconds, resulting in three orders of magnitude enhancement of the lifetime of the coherences.

Spin-locking leads to slowing down of the decay rate of the transverse magnetization, in presence of the in-phase drive (locking excitation). To illustrate how the fluctuation-regularized QME can predict spin-locking phenomena, we analyze the simple case of the dynamics of an ensemble of two homonuclear dipolar-coupled spin-1/2 systems, in an external Zeeman field, subjected to a transverse locking excitation. We note that in a solid sample, the dipolar coupling between spins establish a large network, yet for a single spin the largest contribution to its dynamics originates from the largest dipolar coupling from its neighbour. As such, – as a simple illustration – a two-spin formulation is undertaken and it is shown that spin-locking behaviour can be captured even for such a simple system.

We consider a single two-spin unit of the ensemble and denote the spin-angular momentum vector operators of the two nuclei, separated by a distance  $r$ , by  $\mathbf{I}$  and  $\mathbf{S}$ . The dipole-dipole interaction Hamiltonian of the two-spins (in frequency units) is then given by [2]

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{DD}} = \frac{\gamma^2}{r^3} \left\{ \mathbf{I} \cdot \mathbf{S} - 3 \frac{(\mathbf{I} \cdot \mathbf{r})(\mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{r})}{r^2} \right\} \quad (1)$$

where the vector  $\mathbf{r}$  has magnitude  $r$  and is along the line joining the two magnetic dipoles (nuclei having spins).  $\gamma$  denotes the gyro-magnetic ratio of the nuclei. Following the description introduced in our formulation of the QME, we assume that each two-spin unit of the ensemble is weakly coupled to its local environment and the collection of local environments constitute the heat bath which is at thermal equilibrium [21]. The local environments of each ensemble member experience equilibrium fluctuations as in our previous model [21]. The full Hamiltonian (in frequency units) of a single two-spin module along with its local environment, in presence of the locking field, is then given by

$$\mathcal{H}(t) = \mathcal{H}_{\text{S}}^{\circ} + \mathcal{H}_{\text{L}}^{\circ} + \mathcal{H}_{\text{SL}} + \mathcal{H}_{\text{DD}} + \mathcal{H}_{\text{S}}(t) + \mathcal{H}_{\text{L}}(t), \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{S}}^{\circ} = \omega_{\circ}(I_z + S_z)$  is the Zeeman Hamiltonian of the homonuclear two-spin system,  $\omega_{\circ}$  being the common Larmor frequency.  $I_{\alpha}, S_{\alpha} \forall \alpha \in \{x, y, z\}$  denote the corresponding components of  $\mathbf{I}$  and  $\mathbf{S}$ . The transverse drive,  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{S}}(t)$  involves the interactions of the spins with the locking field.  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{SL}}$  denotes the coupling Hamiltonian of the spin-systems with the local environment apart from the dipole-dipole interaction which we have introduced separately. As such  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{SL}}$  includes Chemical Shift Anisotropy (CSA) and other interactions which gives rise to spin-relaxation [31, 32].  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{L}}^{\circ}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{L}}(t)$  denote the bare Hamiltonian and fluctuations of the local environment respectively, having the same forms as in our previous derivation of frQME [21].

Following our previous analysis, the QME, in the interaction representation of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{S}}^{\circ} + \mathcal{H}_{\text{L}}^{\circ}$ , for such a two-spin ensemble is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \rho_{\text{S}}(t) = & -i \text{Tr}_{\text{L}} \left[ H_{\text{eff}}^{\text{new}}(t), \rho_{\text{S}}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{L}}^{\text{eq}} \right]^{\text{sec}} \\ & - \int_0^{\infty} d\tau \text{Tr}_{\text{L}} \left[ H_{\text{eff}}^{\text{new}}(t), \left[ H_{\text{eff}}^{\text{new}}(t - \tau), \rho_{\text{S}}(t) \otimes \rho_{\text{L}}^{\text{eq}} \right] \right]^{\text{sec}} e^{-|\tau|/\tau_c}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $H_{\text{eff}}^{\text{new}}(t) = H_{\text{eff}}(t) + H_{\text{DD}}(t) = H_{\text{SL}}(t) + H_{\text{S}}(t) + H_{\text{DD}}(t)$  and  $H_{\text{DD}}(t)$  denotes the interaction representation of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DD}}$  [21]. As before, the correlation time  $\tau_c$  is inversely proportional to the variance of the energy level fluctuations in the local environments and the superscript “sec” denotes that only secular contributions are retained [21]. Since the Zeeman levels are

assumed to provide for good quantum numbers describing the states of the quantum ensemble, we shall not enforce  $\text{Tr}_L \left[ H_{\text{eff}}^{\text{dd}}(t') \rho_S(t) \otimes \rho_L^{\text{eq}} \right] = 0$ , with  $H_{\text{eff}}^{\text{dd}}(t) = H_{\text{SL}}(t) + H_{\text{DD}}(t)$ , by modifying the Zeeman Hamiltonian  $\mathcal{H}_S^0$ , as in other QME formulations [26]. Also, in solid state systems, we cannot assume a vanishing contribution of the above trace on grounds of isotropicity. As a result the QME (3) retains the first-order effects of  $H_{\text{SL}}$  and  $H_{\text{DD}}$  as well as all possible auto and cross-correlations of  $H_{\text{SL}}$ ,  $H_S$  and  $H_{\text{DD}}$  in the second order.

### III. DYNAMICAL EQUATIONS

In order to obtain a system of differential equations describing the dynamics of the two-spin ensemble, that is easy to interpret and yet retains the features essential for spin-locked dynamics, we make several approximations that are common in literature [1, 2, 13]. First of all, we shall consider a semi-classical form of the dipolar Hamiltonian, retaining only its secular part [1, 2, 13]. That is, for simplicity, we treat  $\mathbf{r}$  in (1) to be a classical vector, that remains same for all ensemble members. For solid-samples composed of crystallites with different orientations of  $\mathbf{r}$ , a further averaging over all orientations is required [27, 28]. Here, in order to demonstrate the spin-locking effect, we shall not consider further averaging over different orientations. The secular part of the semiclassical dipolar Hamiltonian is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{DD}}^{\text{sec}} = \omega_d [2I_z S_z - I_x S_x - I_y S_y], \quad (4)$$

where the classical spatial degrees of freedom are absorbed in the factor  $\omega_d$ , which describes the strength of the dipolar coupling. In this semi-classical picture, if  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  denote the polar and azimuthal angles describing the average orientation of the dipolar vector  $\mathbf{r}$  with respect to a laboratory fixed coordinate system, then  $\omega_d$  is expressed in terms of the spherical harmonics  $Y_{\text{lm}}(\theta, \phi)$  as [2]

$$\omega_d = \frac{\gamma^2}{r^3} Y_{20}(\theta, \phi). \quad (5)$$

We shall only retain the part of the external drive (applied along  $\hat{x}$ ), that rotates in the same sense as the larmor precession of the net magnetic moment vector (co-rotating part), in order to further simplify our calculations and to obtain results, in agreement with previous theories. We note that this, in no way, forms a limitation of our approach, since our QME can in principle capture the effects of the counter-rotating drive terms as shown in our

previous work [21]. The assumption of neglecting the counter-rotating terms is justified in the regime where  $2\omega_o\tau_c \gg 1$  and  $\omega_1^2 \ll \omega_o$ , in the on-resonance case. Thus we choose

$$\begin{aligned} H_S(t) &= \omega_1 \mathcal{U}(\Delta\omega t) [I_x + S_x] \mathcal{U}^\dagger(\Delta\omega t) \\ &= \frac{\omega_1}{2} [(I_+ + S_+) e^{-i\Delta\omega t} + (I_- + S_-) e^{i\Delta\omega t}], \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathcal{U}(\Delta\omega t) = \exp[-i\Delta\omega t (I_z + S_z)]$ ,  $I_\pm = I_x \pm iI_y$ ,  $S_\pm = S_x \pm iS_y$  and  $\Delta\omega = \omega - \omega_o$ ,  $\omega$  being the frequency of the drive in the lab-frame. Since the quasi-equilibrium spin-locked state appears in a time-scale much smaller than the time-scale of irreversible dynamics leading to the relaxation effects, we shall further neglect the contributions of  $H_{SL}$  in the dynamical equations as is the common practice [1, 16, 17]. This condition is justified in the limit  $\omega_d \gg \omega_{SL}$  with  $\omega_{SL}$  denoting the strength of  $H_{SL}$ . Usually in solid state spin-dynamics experiments, two-spin and single spin coherences decay very fast leading to the emergence of a spin-locked state, while the  $T_1$  relaxation processes are very slow [1, 30]. It is in these systems that the regime  $\omega_d \gg \omega_{SL}$  is realized with the decay of coherences being dominated by the dipolar-relaxation mechanism. With these assumptions the relevant form of the QME becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \rho_s(t) &= -i \text{Tr}_L \left[ H_S(t) + H_{DD}^{\text{sec}}, \rho_s(t) \otimes \rho_L^{\text{eq}} \right]^{\text{sec}} \\ &\quad - \int_0^\infty \text{Tr}_L \left[ H_S(t), \left[ H_S(t-\tau), \rho_s(t) \otimes \rho_L^{\text{eq}} \right] \right]^{\text{sec}} e^{-\frac{|\tau|}{\tau_c}} d\tau \\ &\quad - \int_0^\infty \text{Tr}_L \left[ H_S(t), \left[ H_{DD}^{\text{sec}}, \rho_s(t) \otimes \rho_L^{\text{eq}} \right] \right]^{\text{sec}} e^{-\frac{|\tau|}{\tau_c}} d\tau \\ &\quad - \int_0^\infty \text{Tr}_L \left[ H_{DD}^{\text{sec}}, \left[ H_S(t-\tau), \rho_s(t) \otimes \rho_L^{\text{eq}} \right] \right]^{\text{sec}} e^{-\frac{|\tau|}{\tau_c}} d\tau \\ &\quad - \int_0^\infty \text{Tr}_L \left[ H_{DD}^{\text{sec}}, \left[ H_{DD}^{\text{sec}}, \rho_s(t) \otimes \rho_L^{\text{eq}} \right] \right]^{\text{sec}} e^{-\frac{|\tau|}{\tau_c}} d\tau, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where following our notation,  $H_{DD}^{\text{sec}} = \mathcal{H}_{DD}^{\text{sec}}$ , is the interaction representation of the secular dipolar Hamiltonian.  $\text{Tr}_L$  denotes partial trace over the local-environments of the two-spin

units as in the reference [21].

In order to arrive at a set of differential equations describing the dynamics of the two-spin ensemble, from equation (7), we need to define the relevant two-spin observables. To this end, we note that all measurements on the two-spin ensemble are carried out in the Zeeman basis and as such all possible observables must be described in a product basis of spin-operators defined on the Hilbert spaces of individual spins. More over the choice of a homonuclear spin system, requires that the two spin-1/2 nuclei are nearly identical. Hence, the observables should be chosen to be symmetric with respect to the exchange of spin labels. Of the 16 independent elements of the product-basis of spin operators,  $\mathcal{B} : \{\mathbb{1}_i, I_x, I_y, I_z\} \times \{\mathbb{1}_s, S_x, S_y, S_z\}$ , one can construct only 9 independent symmetric observables, leaving out the overall identity operator  $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_i \otimes \mathbb{1}_s$  ( $\mathbb{1}_i$  and  $\mathbb{1}_s$  denote the identity operators on the Hilbert spaces of the spins labeled by  $\mathbf{I}$  and  $\mathbf{S}$  respectively). Since the measurement scheme, in magnetic resonance experiments, involves frequency heterodyning followed by low-pass filtering and is confined to the direct detection of  $x$ ,  $y$  and  $z$  components of the net magnetization, we define the relevant two-spin observables in the interaction representation, as [29]

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_\alpha(t) &= \mathcal{U}(\Delta\omega t) [I_\alpha + S_\alpha] \mathcal{U}^\dagger(\Delta\omega t) \\ \mathcal{F}_{\alpha\alpha}(t) &= \mathcal{U}(\Delta\omega t) [I_\alpha S_\alpha] \mathcal{U}^\dagger(\Delta\omega t) \\ \mathcal{F}_{\alpha\lambda}(t) &= \mathcal{U}(\Delta\omega t) [I_\alpha S_\lambda + I_\lambda S_\alpha] \mathcal{U}^\dagger(\Delta\omega t) = \mathcal{F}_{\lambda\alpha}(t),\end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha, \lambda \in \{x, y, z\}$ . The corresponding expectation values are defined as  $M_\alpha(t) = \text{Tr}_S[\mathcal{F}_\alpha(t) \rho_S(t)]$ ,  $M_{\alpha\alpha}(t) = \text{Tr}_S[\mathcal{F}_{\alpha\alpha}(t) \rho_S(t)]$  and  $M_{\alpha\lambda}(t) = \text{Tr}_S[\mathcal{F}_{\alpha\lambda}(t) \rho_S(t)] = M_{\lambda\alpha}(t)$ , where  $\text{Tr}_S$  denotes trace over the two-spin space. Using equation (7) we then arrive at the following set of differential equations describing the dynamics of these expectation values, in the on-resonance condition ( $\Delta\omega = 0$ ), where the two-spin observables (8) are time-independent:

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{M}_z &= \omega_1 M_y - \omega_1^2 \tau_c M_z + 3\omega_1 \omega_d \tau_c M_{zx} \\
\dot{M}_x &= -\frac{9}{4} \omega_d^2 \tau_c M_x - 6\omega_1 \omega_d \tau_c M_{yy} - 3\omega_d M_{zy} + 6\omega_1 \omega_d \tau_c M_{zz} \\
\dot{M}_y &= 3\omega_1 \omega_d \tau_c M_{xy} - (\omega_1^2 + \frac{9}{4} \omega_d^2) \tau_c M_y - \omega_1 M_z + 3\omega_d M_{zx} \\
\dot{M}_{zz} &= \frac{3}{4} \omega_1 \omega_d \tau_c M_x + 2\omega_1^2 \tau_c M_{yy} + \omega_1 M_{zy} - 2\omega_1^2 \tau_c M_{zz} \\
\dot{M}_{xx} &= 0 \\
\dot{M}_{yy} &= -\frac{3}{4} \omega_1 \omega_d \tau_c M_x - 2\omega_1^2 \tau_c M_{yy} - \omega_1 M_{zy} + 2\omega_1^2 \tau_c M_{zz} \\
\dot{M}_{zx} &= \omega_1 M_{xy} - \frac{3}{4} \omega_d M_y + \frac{3}{4} \omega_1 \omega_d \tau_c M_z - (\omega_1^2 + \frac{9}{4} \omega_d^2) \tau_c M_{zx} \\
\dot{M}_{zy} &= \frac{3}{4} \omega_d M_x + 2\omega_1 M_{yy} - (4\omega_1^2 + \frac{9}{4} \omega_d^2) \tau_c M_{zy} - 2\omega_1 M_{zz} \\
\dot{M}_{xy} &= -\omega_1^2 \tau_c M_{xy} + \frac{3}{4} \omega_1 \omega_d \tau_c M_y - \omega_1 M_{zx}, \tag{8}
\end{aligned}$$

In the above equations, the overhead dot “.” indicates time-derivative.

#### IV. SOLUTIONS OF THE DYNAMICAL EQUATIONS

Spin-locking involves the application of a resonant drive in-phase with the net transverse magnetic moment created after an initial  $90^\circ$  pulse. Thus, in order to analyze the spin-locked dynamics from equations (8), we choose the initial condition  $M_x = M_o, M_z = 0, M_y = 0, M_{zz} = 0, M_{yy} = 0, M_{xx} = 0, M_{zx} = 0, M_{zy} = 0, M_{xy} = 0$ , where  $M_o$  denotes the equilibrium value of net magnetic moment. The choice of the initial conditions pertains to the situation just after the pulse, when the net magnetic moment vector lies in the transverse plane while the two-spin order terms have not grown appreciably and hence, can be neglected. By construction,  $\mathcal{F}_x(t)$  commutes with  $H_S(t)$  and as such defines the magnetic moment component  $M_x(t)$ , in-phase with the external drive. Inspecting equations (8) we find that the dynamics of the initial in-phase magnetic moment  $M_x(t)$ , is governed by a set of 4 first-order coupled differential equations which can be further reduced to a set of 3 differential equations by defining  $M_{zz}^{yy} = M_{zz} - M_{yy}$ . The relevant equations are,



$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{M}_x &= -\frac{9}{4}\omega_d^2\tau_c M_x + 6\omega_1\omega_d\tau_c M_{zz}^{yy} - 3\omega_d M_{zy} \\
\dot{M}_{zz}^{yy} &= \frac{3}{2}\omega_1\omega_d\tau_c M_x - 4\omega_1^2\tau_c M_{zz}^{yy} + 2\omega_1 M_{zy} \\
\dot{M}_{zy} &= \frac{3}{4}\omega_d M_x - 2\omega_1 M_{zz}^{yy} - (4\omega_1^2 + \frac{9}{4}\omega_d^2)\tau_c M_{zy}.
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

We note that the terms proportional to  $\omega_d^2$ , arising from the second-order contributions of the dipolar Hamiltonian in equation (7), induces damping effects in the dynamics. On the other hand, the terms proportional to  $\omega_1\omega_d$ , resulting from the cross-correlations of the drive and the dipolar Hamiltonians, couple the dynamics of the different two-spin expectation values. That is, the initial  $x$ -magnetic moment  $M_x(t)$  grows into the two-spin order term  $M_{zz}^{yy}(t)$ , through the drive-dipole cross-correlations. At the same time, the drive-dipole cross-correlations convert these two-spin order terms into  $M_x(t)$  and as such, partially compensates for the decay of the latter. This, vicious cycle continues until a dynamical steady-state is reached, where  $M_x(t)$ , and  $M_{zz}^{yy}(t)$  have a non-vanishing magnitudes. Hence, it appears that the measured magnitude of  $M_x(t)$  remains locked into the steady-state value following a short transient, as long as the locking field is kept on. Of course in an actual experiment, the locked magnetization experiences a slow decay due to the presence of the coupling to the local environment,  $\mathcal{H}_{SL}$ , which we have ignored in this analysis to simplify our equations. Also, presence of counter-rotating parts of the drive, which are not in-phase with the locked magnetization, may lead to additional decay of the signal, through couplings (leakage) to the dynamics of the other 5 two-spin variables which presently do not appear in (9).

To illustrate how the spin-locking effect arises as a consequence of equations (9), we numerically solve these equations using  $M_o = 1$  for different values of the drive strength  $\omega_1$ . We choose  $\omega_d = 2\pi \times 5$  kilo-rad/s,  $\tau_c = 10^{-6}$  s and plot the time-series of the relevant two-spin expectation values for a period of 0 to 50 ms. Our choice of parameters is based on the fact that it is numerically easy to showcase the spin-locking phenomenon in this regime, without any loss of essential features of the dynamics. The chosen value of  $\tau_c$  is common in (NV) centers of diamond [13]. As will be shown later, the steady-state value of the locked magnetization is independent of  $\tau_c$ . The numerically solved time-series solutions of the variables in equations are shown the figure 9 both in presence and in absence of the locking field.




FIG. 1. Dynamics of the two-spin observables in absence of a locking field i.e.  $\omega_1 = 0$  kilo-rad/s. The time-axis is in log scale. The legends ‘X’, ‘ZZ-YY’, ‘ZZ’, ‘YY’ and ‘ZY’ denote  $M_x(t)$ ,  $M_{zz}^{yy}(t)$ ,  $M_{zz}(t)$ ,  $M_{yy}(t)$  and  $M_{zy}(t)$  respectively.  $\omega_d = 2\pi \times 5$  kilo-rad/s.

Figure 1 shows the dynamics of the relevant two-spin variables, following the initial  $90^\circ$  pulse, when no locking field is applied i.e.  $\omega_1 = 0$  kilo-rad/s. We find that in this case, after an initial transience, the magnitude of  $M_x(t)$  becomes vanishingly small in the steady state and as such no spin-locking effect is observed. We note that the values of  $M_{zz}(t)$  and  $M_{yy}(t)$  remain zero through out the dynamics, since these terms are not created in absence of the locking field as drive-dipole cross-correlations are non-existent.

The case in which the locking field has a non-zero value of  $\omega_1 = 2\pi \times 2$  kilo-rad/s, is shown in Figure 2. We find that unlike Figure 1, here we have a non-zero steady-state value of  $M_x(t)$  after the initial transience, illustrating the phenomenon of spin-locking. The steady-state values of  $M_{zz}(t)$  and  $M_{yy}(t)$  are also non-zero in this case, as expected. A careful inspection of the features of the transients indicates the inter-conversions between  $M_x(t)$  and  $M_{zz}(t)$  as




FIG. 2. Dynamics of the two-spin observables in presence of a locking field i.e.  $\omega_1 = 2\pi \times 2$  kilo-rad/s. The time-axis is in log scale. The legends ‘X’, ‘ZZ-YY’, ‘ZZ’, ‘YY’ and ‘ZY’ denote  $M_x(t)$ ,  $M_{zz}^{yy}(t)$ ,  $M_{zz}(t)$ ,  $M_{yy}(t)$  and  $M_{zy}(t)$  respectively.  $\omega_d = 2\pi \times 5$  kilo-rad/s. The colour-bar shows the various motional regimes starting from the initial  $x$ -magnetization to a quasi-equilibrium spin-locked state.

well as  $M_x(t)$  and  $M_{yy}(t)$ , prior to the establishment of the steady-state, as discussed before. The different phases of the dynamics, in presence of the locking field, are indicated with the help of a colour-bar in Figure 2. The initial  $M_x$  gets rapidly converted to  $M_{yy}$  and  $M_{zz}$  in the transient phase. When the variables  $M_{yy}$  and  $M_{zz}$  have appreciable magnitude, they get re-converted to  $M_x$  to a large extent, resulting in the oscillatory dynamics illustrated in Figure 2, which mark the onset of the spin-locking phenomena. Finally the oscillations die down to result in a quasi-equilibrium spin-locked state.

The most remarkable feature of this formalism lies in the fact that the steady-state value of  $M_x(t)$  predicted from equations (9) is

$$M_x^{\text{ss}} = M_o \frac{\omega_1^2}{\omega_1^2 + \frac{9}{16}\omega_d^2}, \quad (10)$$

which exactly matches with the form of the quasi-equilibrium  $x$ -magnetization, obtained from spin-temperature theory [2, 16]. In our case,  $\frac{9}{16}\omega_d^2$  plays the role of the squared amplitude of the local-field, which appears in the denominator of this quasi-equilibrium expression [2, 16]. As illustrated in Figure 3, our equations predict a faster establishment of the spin-locked quasi-equilibrium state by increasing the strength of the locking field. This dynamical feature, though intuitive, can not be predicted from energy conservation arguments in the quasi-equilibrium state [1].




FIG. 3. Emergence of the spin-locked dynamics of  $M_x$  at different values of the drive strength,  $\omega_1$ . The time-axis is in log scale and  $\omega_d = 2\pi \times 5$  kilo-rad/s.

We thus conclude that, not only does our approach provide for a dynamical explanation of the origin of spin-locking phenomena, it also predicts the correct behaviour of the

steady-state locked magnetization, which has been previously obtained from non-dynamical approaches.

## V. DISCUSSIONS

We emphasize that the presence of drive-dipole cross-correlations in the second-order, essentially leads to spin-locked dynamics through a mechanism outlined in the previous section. An important feature of these cross-terms is that they are not positive definite i.e. by reversing the direction of the locking field, one can, in principle, change the sign of these terms. But the cross-correlations do not lead to any divergence in the steady state-behaviour of the system since they couple different dynamical variables. As such these terms cannot be classified as ordinary relaxation (dissipative) terms per se. Rather, they introduce non-Hamiltonian second order oscillations between two-spin and single-spin observables, which is usually not present in other QME formulations.

To be specific, we note that the self-terms of  $H_{\text{DD}}^{\text{sec}}$  and  $H_{\text{S}}(t)$  introduce dissipative effects in the dynamics of  $M_x(t)$  and  $M_{zy}(t)$  as explained before. They do not lead to any signal growth since their coefficients are positive definite. Since  $H_{\text{DD}}^{\text{sec}}$  commutes with  $\mathcal{F}_{zz}(t)$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{yy}(t)$ , the expectation values  $M_{zz}(t)$  and  $M_{yy}(t)$  are immune to dipolar-relaxation. Also, the auto-correlation of  $H_{\text{S}}(t)$  introduces dissipative contributions leading to signal decay, in equations (9). On the other hand, the cross-terms between the  $H_{\text{S}}(t)$  and  $H_{\text{DD}}^{\text{sec}}$  never return the same observable in its dynamics and as such do not result in a rate equation unlike the dissipative terms. Their sole contribution is to couple the dynamics of different variables as is evident from equations (9) and (8). To see this we note that the secular part of the dipolar-Hamiltonian transforms as a component of a rank 2 spherical tensor,  $T_0^2$  while the drive Hamiltonian is proportional to  $(J_+ + J_-)$  in the on resonance case, with  $\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{S}$ ,  $J_{\pm} = J_x \pm i J_y$  and  $[J_z, T_0^2] = 0$  [31, 32]. Thus the drive dipole cross-terms, appearing in the dynamics of any observable expressed as a component of a general spherical tensor,  $L_m^q$ , with  $q \in \{0, 1, 2\}$  and  $m \in \{-q, -q + 1, \dots, q\}$ , involve double commutators,  $[J_+ + J_-, [T_0^2, L_m^q]]$  and  $[T_0^2, [J_+ + J_-, L_m^q]]$ . From the properties of the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients, we note that the product of  $T_0^2$  with  $L_m^q$  has an overall lower index of  $m + 0 = m$  [33]. Further commutation with  $J_{\pm}$ , in the first form of the double commutator, raises or lowers the net lower index by 1, so that we can never arrive at a rate equation

for  $L_m^q$  [33]. Similarly it can be established that the second form of the cross-term will also not have a part proportional to  $L_m^q$ . Although such cross-terms between two-spin and single-spin Hamiltonians do not cause any net relaxation, they can differentially affect the transitions between the Zeeman levels of individual spins leading to features like Differential Line Broadening (DLB) and unequal  $T_1$  relaxation times of the doublets [34].

We note that, the different simplifying assumptions used in this paper to describe the phenomenon of spin-locking from a set of coupled differential equations (9), are not a necessity for this theory. They have been made purely with the aim of explaining the essential physics from a simplified perspective. For example, the dipolar relaxation term proportional  $\omega_d^2$  should be scaled by the spectrum of the spatial part of the dipolar Hamiltonian, in the fully quantum-mechanical picture. Nonetheless, the essential physics of the origin of dynamical steady-state is not altered by our semi-classical simplification. Also, our approach is capable of handling both co-rotating as well as counter-rotating parts of an external drive and can also explain the the relaxation effects of other spin-local environment interactions.

Importantly, the relaxation rate of the locked magnetization is usually much slower than the initial rapid decay of coherences dominated by the dipolar-relaxation mechanism. Since the locked magnetization is essentially a quasi-equilibrium steady state immune to the dipolar-relaxation, the only other mechanism responsible for its decay is governed by the spin-local environment coupling. Since we are working in a regime where  $\omega_d \ll \omega_{SL}$ , the latter mechanism offers a much slower decay rate in comparison to the dipolar channel. The time-constant of the decay rate of the spin-locked magnetization,  $T_{1\rho}$  is usually of the order of  $T_1$  – the decay rate along  $z$  – since  $M_z$  is also immune to dipolar relaxation.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have formulated a QME to describe the dynamics of two interacting spin-1/2 systems coupled to a heat bath, under a resonant excitation. A description of the QME in the eigen-basis of the individual Zeeman levels of the spins and a perturbative treatment of all other Hamiltonians leads to cross-correlations between the drive and dipolar Hamiltonians in the second order. We have shown that these cross-terms, which cannot be classified as ordinary dissipative terms, lead to the establishment of non-thermal dynamical steady-states (spin-locked states) in suitable limits. The key points in obtaining such time-non-local

drive-dipole cross terms in a QME involves a judicious choice of the eigen-basis describing the problem as well as accounting for the effects of thermal fluctuations in the heat bath, to which the systems are coupled. In this context, we note that recently Farfurnik *et al.* were able to provide numerical signatures of the spin-locking effect using a cluster-based simulation, where dissipative features originated from a fluctuating part of the spin Hamiltonian [13]. Our method is considerably different from theirs, since we consider the effect of thermal fluctuations in the bath, while the fluctuations in system Hamiltonian is negligible, as in common NMR experiments. Moreover, our method provides a clear dynamical picture of the origin of spin-locking without the requirement of any additional assumptions, transformations or expansions. The most striking feature of our approach is the fact that the expression for the steady-state locked magnetization obtained from our method matches exactly with the form obtained from spin-temperature theory. As such, we envisage that considering the effects of such drive-interaction cross-terms in the QME, may provide a deeper insight into the mechanisms of dynamic nuclear polarization (DNP) experiments, which are of considerable theoretical and practical interest [35–39].

- 
- [1] C. P. Slichter, *Principles of Magnetic Resonance* Springer-Verlag, Hiedelberg, Germany, 1990.
  - [2] A. Abragam, *The Principles of Nuclear Magnetism* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2006.
  - [3] A. G. Redfield, *Phys. Rev.* **98**, 1787, (1955).
  - [4] A. Sharafi, D. Xia, G. Chang and R. R. Regatte, *NMR Biomed.* **30**, e3760, (2017).
  - [5] A. A. Marchione and E. L. Diaz, *J. Magn. Reson.* **286**, 143, (2018).
  - [6] P. Porion and A. Delville, *Magnetochemistry* **3**, 35, (2017).
  - [7] S. R. Hartmann and E. L. Hahn, *Phys. Rev.* **128**, 2042, (1962).
  - [8] W. Kolodziejski and J. Klinowski, *Chem. Rev.* **102**, 613, (2002).
  - [9] F. Yan, S. Gustavsson, J. Bylander, X. Jin, F. Yoshihara, D. G. Cory, Y. Nakamura, T. P. Orlando and W. D. Oliver, *Nat. Commun.* **4**, 2337, (2013).
  - [10] S. J. DeVience, R. L. Walsworth and M. S. Rosen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 173002, (2013).
  - [11] C. M. Chow, A. M. Ross, D. Kim, D. Gammon, A. S. Bracker, L. J. Sham and D. G. Steel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 077403, (2016).
  - [12] F. Yan, D. Campbell, P. Krantz, M. Kjaergaard, D. Kim, J. L. Yoder, D. Hover, A. Sears, A.

- J. Kerman, T. P. Orlando, S. Gustavsson and W. D. Oliver, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 260504, (2018).
- [13] D. Farfurnik, Y. Horowicz and N. Bar-Gill, Phys. Rev. A **98**, 033409, (2018).
- [14] Y. Hovav, B. Naydenov, F. Jelezko and N. Bar-Gill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 060405, (2018).
- [15] R. E. Walstedt, Phys. Rev. **138**, A1096, (1965).
- [16] P. Mansfield and D. Ware, Phys. Rev. **168**, 318, (1968).
- [17] P. Mansfield, K. H. B. Richards and D. Ware, Phys. Rev. B **1**, 2048, (1970).
- [18] B. Bandyopadhyay, G. B. Furman, S. D. Goren, C. Korn and A. I. Shames, Z. Naturforsch. **51a**, 357, (1995).
- [19] G. B. Furman, A. M. Panich and S. D. Goren, Solid State Nucl. Magn. Reson. **11**, 225, (1998).
- [20] A. Gregorovič and T. Apih, J. Chem. Phys. **129**, 214504, (2008).
- [21] A. Chakrabarti and R. Bhattacharyya, Phys. Rev. A. **97**, 063837, (2017).
- [22] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, 2002)
- [23] C. Cohen-Tannoudji, J. Dupont-Roc and G. Gilbert, *Atom-Photon Interactions: Basic Processes and Applications* WILEY-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim, Germany, 2004.
- [24] R. K. Wangsness and F. Bloch, Phys. Rev. **89**, 728, (1953).
- [25] E. Fukushima and S.B.W. Roeder, *Experimental Pulse NMR, A Nuts and Bolts Approach* Westview Press, Advanced Book Program, USA, 1981.
- [26] G. Schaller and T. Brandes, Phys. Rev. A. **78**, 022106, (2008).
- [27] R. Brüschweiler, Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc. **32**, 1, (1998).
- [28] M. Edén, Concepts. Magn. Reson. Part A **17A**, 117, (2003).
- [29] P. T. Callaghan, *Translational Dynamics & Magnetic Resonance: Principles of Pulsed Gradient Spin Echo NMR* (Oxford, New York, 2011), Chap. 4.
- [30] R. G. DeVoe and R. G. Brewer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1269, (1983).
- [31] S. A. Smith, W. E. Palke and J. T. Gerig, Concepts. Magn. Reson. **4**, 107, (1992).
- [32] S. A. Smith, W. E. Palke and J. T. Gerig, Concepts. Magn. Reson. **4**, 181, (1992).
- [33] J. J. Sakurai, *Modern Quantum Mechanics* Pearson, Dorling Kindersley (India) Pvt. Ltd., Eighth Impression, 2011.
- [34] L. P. Hwang, P. L. Wang and T. C. Wong, J. Phys. Chem. **92**, 4753, (1988).
- [35] S. Foletti, H. Bluhm, D. Mahalu, V. Umansky and A. Yacoby, Nat. Phys. **5**, 903, (2009).



- [36] J. B. Pedersen and J. H. Freed, *J. Chem. Phys.* **58**, 2746, (1972).
- [37] T. Maly, G. T. Debelouchina, V. S. Bajaj, K-N. Hu, C-G. Joo, M. L. MakJurkauskas, J. R. Sirigiri, P. C. A. van der Wel, J. Herzfeld, R. J. Temkin, and R. G. Griffin, *J. Chem. Phys.* **128**, 052211, (2008).
- [38] J. Puebla, E. A. Chekhovich, M. Hopkinson, P. Senellart, A. Lemaitre, M. S. Skolnick, and A. I. Tartakovskii, *Phys. Rev. B*, **88**, 045306, (2013).
- [39] A. S. L. Thankamony, J. J. Wittmann, M. Kaushik and B. Corzilius, *Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc.* **102**, 120, (2017).