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We present a control scheme for quantum systems coupled to a thermal bath. We demonstrate a state-to-state control between two Gibbs states. This scheme can be utilized to accelerate thermalization and to cool the open system. Starting from a microscopic description we derive the reduced system dynamics, leading to a non-adiabatic master equation. The equation contains non-trivial effects due to the non-adiabatic driving and bath interaction. These special features enable controlling the open system and accelerating the entropy changes. For a two-level system model, we obtain a general solution and introduce a reverse engineering scheme for control. The control problem is analyzed in the context of the theory of quantum control and the accompanied thermodynamic cost.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Thermalization, the dynamical approach of a system towards thermal equilibrium, is of utmost importance in contemporary physics. Typically, thermalization occurs once a system interacts with large thermal reservoir of a defined temperature. In the quantum world, this dynamical process is embedded within the theory of open quantum systems and is consistent with the laws of thermodynamics [1].

In present-day quantum physics, thermalization is commonly employed to initialize the system state before further manipulations take place. For example, the initialization step in circuit quantum computing is a thermalization step and adiabatic quantum computing completely relies on thermalization to carry out a computation protocol [2,3]. In these examples, experimentalists utilize the system-bath interaction to reduce the system temperature, suppressing the effective number of quantum states. Time domain pump-probe spectroscopy relies on thermalization to close the loop of repeated experiments [4]. Furthermore, thermalization is a vital step in quantum heat engines, and its timescale dictates the output power of the device [5,6,7].

Typically, thermalization is treated as a passive process. An interaction between a non-equilibrium system and the environment is introduced, and the thermal temperature of the environment and the system-bath coupling dictate the typical relaxation timescale. Moreover, usually after the initial thermalization step, the experimenter invests significant effort to isolate the system from environmental effects in order to attenuate the relaxation rate. In contrast to these approaches, the present study aims to harvest the environment interactions to actively control the system and accelerate the thermalization.

Quantum control relies on interference of pathways to achieve the control objective. Such interference requires non-stationary superposition of states i.e. quantum coherence. Commonly, coupling to a thermal bath causes decoherence which tends to suppresses the ability to control. Conversely, in the presented scheme, this interplay between coherence generation by the controller and decoherence by the bath will be shown to be the enabler of the control.

We have addressed this issue in a short letter [12]: Shortcut to Equilibrium (STE), where we described a procedure inducing swift thermalization by a rapid change of the system Hamiltonian. The process was demonstrated for a parametric harmonic oscillator coupled to a bath, and later combined with unitary strokes to study quantum analogues of the Carnot cycle at finite time [13]. In the present paper, we present a comprehensive account of the fast thermalization process. We emphasize the relation between quantum control and quantum thermodynamics, employing the thermalization of a qubit as the primary example. This allows for a detailed thermodynamics account of the related cost of rapid thermalization. We further extend the control scheme to include an initial non-equilibrium Gibbs state and a protocol cooling the system below the temperature of the bath. In addition, we elaborate on the connection to quantum coherent control.

The paper is organized as follows: We set the control framework and objective in Sec. [1]. Sec. [II] presents a first principle analysis of the open system dynamics. We begin by solving for the propagator of the isolated system utilizing the inertial theorem, then include a weak interaction between the system and bath, and present a brief construction of the Non-Adiabatic Master Equation (NAME). Following the dynamical construction, Sec. [IV] analyses the task of rapid thermalization within the framework of Quantum Control theory. Section [V] constructs the dynamical description of a two-level-system coupled to a thermal bath, demonstrating the general derivation. Next, we solve the two-level-system dynam-
ics and discuss its properties. Following the solution, we present a reverse engineering control scheme to obtain a shortcut to equilibrium protocol that induces rapid thermalization. Geralizations of the scheme are considered including an initial non-equilibrium Gibbs state and a target state which is colder than the bath. Section VII with a summary, and discuss relevant implications, and future prospects.

II. CONTROL OBJECTIVE AND FRAMEWORK

We aim to find a rapid thermalization protocol of a subsystem \( S \) coupled to a bath. This can be generalized to a state-to-state control from an initial Gibbs state \( \hat{\rho}_S = \frac{1}{Z_{\beta_i}} \exp \left( -\beta_i \hat{H}_S (t_i) \right) \) with Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_S (t_i) = \hat{H}_S \) and inverse temperature \( \beta_i \) towards the target state \( \hat{\rho}_S = \frac{1}{Z_{\beta_f}} \exp \left( -\beta_f \hat{H}_S (t_f) \right) \) with a final Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_S (t_f) = \hat{H}_S \) and inverse temperature \( \beta_f \). This objective falls in category of state-to-state control of open quantum systems [13].

The control framework lies in a composite Hilbert space partitioned into a system and bath. The combined system evolution is governed by the total Hamiltonian

\[
\hat{H}(t) = \hat{H}_S(t) + \hat{H}_B + \hat{H}_I,
\]

where \( \hat{H}_S(t) \) is the system time-dependent Hamiltonian which includes the external driving, \( \hat{H}_B \) is the bath Hamiltonian and \( \hat{H}_I \) is the system-bath interaction term. To proceed we assume three basic assumptions.

(a) Only the system Hamiltonian is controllable, via external driving.

(b) The bath is sufficiently large to maintain at all times a thermal state

(c) The system bath coupling is weak (given apriori).

A solution of the control problem consists of two major steps. First, obtaining accurate reduced dynamical equations of motion for the system variables. Second, find a framework where the control problem can be solved parametrically, based on the equations of motion.

III. DRIVEN DYNAMICS OF OPEN SYSTEM

To achieve control we require a dynamical equation of motion for a non-adiabatically driven system coupled to a bath. For this task, we employ a derivation based on first principles which complies with thermodynamic principles. The reduced dynamics are then formulated by a completely positive trace preserving map, generated by Gorini Kossakowski Lindblad Sudarshan (GKLS) master equation [15] [16]:

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \hat{\rho}_S(t) = -i\frac{\hbar}{\beta} [\hat{H}_S(t), \hat{\rho}_S(t)] + \mathcal{L}_D(t)\hat{\rho}_S(t)
\]

where \( \mathcal{L}_D \) is the dissipative part. The main issue lies in the fact that the dissipative part in the equations of motion depends on the system Hamiltonian, and therefore is influenced by the driving. Neglecting this contribution leads to inconsistencies with thermodynamics [1].

A. Inertial solution of the free dynamics

An accurate description of the open system dynamics requires first an explicit solution of the free dynamics \( \mathcal{U}_S(t) \). Obtaining such a solution is difficult when the free Hamiltonian does not commute at different times \( [\hat{H}_S(t), \hat{H}_S(t')] \neq 0 \). In this case, there is no common basis that diagonalizes \( \mathcal{U}_S(t) \). A formal solution is given by a time-ordering procedure,

\[
\mathcal{U}_S(t) = \mathcal{T} \exp \left( -i \int_0^t [\hat{H}_S(t'), \mathbf{\bullet}] dt' \right)
\]

where \( \mathcal{T} \) is the chronological time-ordering operator. However, this solution contains within it an infinite sum, thus, is impractical for our purpose. An explicit solution requires bypassing the time-ordering obstacle. This is achieved by utilizing the inertial theorem and solution. The inertial solution is a consequence of the theorem, it approximates the system dynamics under the condition of slow acceleration of the drive [17].

The proof of this property is established in the framework of the Liouville space representation and assumes a system with a closed Lie algebra. Liouville space is a Hilbert space of system operators, embedded with an inner product \( \langle \hat{A}, \hat{B} \rangle \equiv \text{tr} (\hat{A}^\dagger \hat{B}) \). In this space, the quantum system is represented in terms of a finite operator basis. These operators form a vector \( \vec{v} \) in Liouville space. The operator dynamics are calculated using the Heisenberg equation, and for a closed operator algebra, the dynamical equations are cast in a matrix vector form

\[
\frac{d\vec{v}(t)}{dt} = -i\mathcal{M}(t)\vec{v}(t)
\]

where \( \mathcal{M}(t) \) is the dynamical generator in Liouville space. For a varying Hamiltonian the generator has an explicit time-dependence.

The inertial theorem relies on an apriori decomposition of \( \mathcal{M}(t) \) into a time dependent scalar function \( \Omega(t) \) and a constant matrix \( \mathcal{B}(\vec{\chi}) \), dependent on constants \( \{\chi_i\} \), written in a short notation as \( \vec{\chi} = \{\chi_1, \chi_2, ..., \chi_m\}^T \):

\[
\mathcal{M}(t) = \Omega(t)\mathcal{B}(\vec{\chi})
\]
Such a decomposition is achieved by expressing the Liouville dynamics in terms of a suitable time-dependent operators basis \( \tilde{v}(t) = \{ \tilde{v}_1(t), ..., \tilde{v}_N(t) \}^T \) and control protocol \( \hat{H}_S(t) \).

Combining Eqs. (1) and (5) and diagonalizing \( \mathcal{B} \), we find the eigenvectors \( \{ \hat{F}_k \} \) of \( \mathcal{U}_S(t) = \exp \left( -i \mathcal{B} \int_0^t \Omega(t') \, dt' \right) \). These Liouville vectors define the eigenoperators, \( \{ \hat{F}_k \} \), of the free propagator, according to the mapping \( \hat{F}_k = \sum_{n=1}^N f_i \hat{v}_i \), where \( f_i \) and \( \hat{v}_i \) are the elements of \( \hat{F}_k \) and \( \tilde{v} \). The set of eigenoperators form a basis in Liouville space and satisfy an eigenvalue type equation

\[
\hat{F}_k(\tilde{\chi}, t) = \hat{U}_S^\dagger(t) \hat{F}_k(\tilde{\chi}, 0) \hat{U}_S(t) = e^{-i \lambda_k(t) \hat{\theta}(t)} \hat{F}_k(\tilde{\chi}, 0) ,
\]

where \( \hat{U}_S(t) \) is the free propagator in the Schrödinger representation, \( \lambda_k \) is the \( k \)’th eigenvalue of \( \mathcal{B} \) and \( \theta(t) = \int_0^t \Omega(t') \, dt' \). When decomposition (5) is found, for a slowly varying \( \{ \chi_i(t) \} (d\chi_i/d\theta \ll 1) \), the evolution of the eigenoperators are approximated by the inertial solution

\[
\hat{F}_k(t) \equiv \hat{F}_k(\tilde{\chi}, t), \quad e^{-i \sum_{n,k} \lambda_{nk}(\theta(t)) d\theta'} \hat{F}_k(\hat{\tilde{\chi}}(t), 0) .
\]

(7)

Here, \( \lambda_k(\theta(t)) \) are the instantaneous eigenvalues and \( \phi_k \) is a geometrical phase. Since \( \{ \hat{F}_k \} \) form a complete operator basis, under the condition of a slow varying, Eq. (8) fully determines the system dynamics. Finally, we introduce the instantaneous diagonalization matrix \( V(\tilde{\chi}(t)) \) of \( \mathcal{B}(\tilde{\chi}(t)) \), to obtain the inertial dynamics of the operators of \( \tilde{v}(t) \)

\[
\tilde{v}_i(t) = \sum_{i,k} V_{ik}^{-1} \hat{F}_k(t)
\]

\[
= \sum_k V_{ik}(\tilde{\chi}(t)) e^{-i \sum_{n,k} \lambda_{nk}(\theta(t)) d\theta'} \hat{F}_k(\hat{\tilde{\chi}}(t), 0)
\]

\[
= \sum_{k,j} V_{ik}(\tilde{\chi}(t)) e^{-i \sum_{n,k} \lambda_{nk}(\theta(t)) d\theta'} V_{kj}^{-1}(\tilde{\chi}(t)) \tilde{v}_j(0) .
\]

(8)

\[\text{B. Construction of the non-adiabatic master equation}\]

We are now ready to include the environmental influence and describe the dynamics of a non-adiabatically driven open quantum system. In this regime, when the typical driving time-scale is comparable to the system Bohr frequencies \( \Delta E/h \), the external driving dresses the interaction with the bath. As a result, for fast driving the adiabatic master equation \( [20-22] \) is inadequate \( [23] \).

In order to consistently describe the evolution of a non-adiabatically driven open quantum system, we construct the equation of motion utilizing a first principle derivation. In the spirit of the Davis construction \( [24] \), we begin with a complete description of the composite system, Eq. (1) and assume weak-system-bath coupling. The complete dynamics is governed by the Liouville equation, which, within the Born-Markov approximation \( [25] \), leads to the Quantum Markovian Master Equation

\[
d/dt \hat{\rho}_S(t) = -i \hbar^{-2} \int_0^\infty ds \, \text{tr}_B \left[ \hat{H}_I(t), \left[ \hat{H}_I(t - s), \hat{\rho}_S(t) \otimes \hat{\rho}_B \right] \right] .
\]

(9)

Here, \( \hat{\rho}_S(t) = \mathcal{U}_S(t) \hat{\rho}_S(t) \) is the reduced density matrix in the interaction representation, and a similar notation is applied for any system operator.

The interaction Hamiltonian can always be written as a sum of separable terms \( \hat{H}_I = \sum_n \hat{S}_n \otimes \hat{B}_n \), where \( \hat{S}_n \) and \( \hat{B}_n \) are system and bath operators. Expressing the interaction term in terms of the operators \( \tilde{v}_i \), \( \hat{S}_n = \sum_i s_{ni} \tilde{v}_i(0) \) and assuming inertial driving, the inertial solution, Eq. (8), leads to

\[
\hat{H}_I(t) = \sum_{n,k} c_{nk}(\tilde{\chi}(t)) e^{-i \sum_{n,k} \lambda_{nk}(\theta(t)) d\theta'} \hat{F}_k(\tilde{\chi}(t), 0) \otimes \hat{B}_n(t)
\]

\[
= \sum_{n,k} \xi_{nk}(\tilde{\chi}(t)) e^{-i \sum_{n,k} \lambda_{nk}(\theta(t)) d\theta'} \hat{F}_k(\tilde{\chi}(t), 0) \otimes \hat{B}_n(t) ,
\]

(10)

with \( \Lambda_{n,j}(t) \equiv \int_{\theta(0)}^{\theta(t)} \lambda_{nk}(\theta(t)) d\theta' + \eta_{nk}(t) \), where \( \eta_{nk} \) and \( \xi_{nk} \) are the phase and positive amplitude of \( c_{nk}(\tilde{\chi}(t)) = \sum_i s_{ni} V^{-1}_{ik}(\tilde{\chi}(t)) = \xi_{nk}(t) e^{-i \sum_{n,k} \lambda_{nk}(t) d\theta} \). Note, that the Schrödinger and interaction picture coincide when the operators are implicitly independent on time, \( \hat{F}_k(\tilde{\chi}(t), 0) = \hat{F}_k(\tilde{\chi}(t), 0) \).

Overall, the interaction term in the interaction representation is given as an expansion of the instantaneous eigenoperators \( \hat{F}_k(\tilde{\chi}(t), 0) \), dependent weakly on time trough \( \tilde{\chi}(t) \). Now, we substitute Eq. (10) into Eq. (9) and expand \( \Lambda_{nk}(t - s) \) up to first order in \( s \) near the instantaneous time \( t \)

\[
\Lambda_{nk}(t - s) \approx \Lambda_{nk}(t) - \frac{d\Lambda_{nk}(t)}{dt} s .
\]

(11)

This approximation is justified if the bath dynamics are fast relative to the change in \( \Lambda_{nk}(t) \), or alternatively, the change in the driving. In this regime, when \( s \) is comparable to the bath typical timescale, \( s \sim T_B \), or greater, the contribution to the integral is negligible due to the fast decay of the bath correlation functions (Markovianity of the bath). In addition, from the inertial condition, the coefficients \( \xi_{nk} \) and eigenoperators \( \hat{F}_k \) depend weakly on time (only through \( \tilde{\chi}(t) \)) enabling the approximation \( \xi(t - s) \approx \xi(t) \) and \( \hat{F}_k(\tilde{\chi}(t - s)) \approx \hat{F}_k(\tilde{\chi}(t)) \). These approximations are justified for Markovian dynamics.

We now preform the rotating wave approximation, which terminates non-conserving energy terms. Finally, after some algebraic manipulations, in the spirit of Ref.
the non-adiabatic master equation is obtained
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \hat{\rho}_S (t) = \sum_k r_k \left( \hat{F}_k (\hat{\chi}(t)) \hat{\rho}_S (t) \hat{F}_k (\hat{\chi}(t)) - \{ \hat{F}_k (\hat{\chi}(t)) , \hat{F}_k (\hat{\chi}(t)) , \hat{\rho}_S (t) \} \right) , \tag{12}
\]
with
\[
r_k = \sum_{n,n'} \gamma_{nn'} (\Lambda_{n,k}^r (t)) \xi_{nk} (t) \xi_{n'k} (t)
\]
where \( \gamma_{nn'} (\alpha) = \int_0^\infty ds e^{i\alpha s} \langle B_{n'}^l (s) B_n^l (0) \rangle \) is the Fourier transformation of the bath correlation functions. The positivity of \( \xi_{nk} \) insures that the NAME is of the GKLS form, guaranteeing a complete-positive trace preserving map \[15, 16\]. For a more detailed derivation see Ref. \[23\].

C. Validity regime of the non-adiabatic master equation

The various approximation preformed throughout the construction determine the regime of validity of the final equation of motion. These approximations involve four timescales: (i) The system typical time scale \( \tau_S \sim \omega^{-1} \), which is proportionate to the inverse of the system’s Bohr frequencies. (ii) The timescale characterizing the decay of the bath correlation functions \( \tau_B \) (iii) The system relaxation timescale, that scales with the square of the system-bath coupling constant, \( \tau_R \propto g^2 \), in the weak coupling limit. (iv) The driving timescale is identified as \( \tau_d = \min_{n,k,t} \left( \left\{ \frac{d \Lambda_{n,k} (t)}{dt} \right\} / \left\{ \frac{d^2 \Lambda_{n,k} (t)}{dt^2} \right\} \right) \).

Typically, Master equations are valid under a course-graining of time, neglecting memory effects within the bath relaxation time. Thermodynamically, such an approach is related to the isothermal partition of system and bath, and is valid in the weak coupling regime and manifested by the Born-Markov approximation. Weak coupling between system and bath, \( g \ll 1 \), implies a slow relaxation relative to both system and bath internal dynamics, \( \tau_R \gg \tau_S , \tau_B \). Moreover, the Born-Markov approximation is valid when the bath dynamics is much faster than the system dynamics, implying \( \tau_B \ll \tau_S \).

Following these approximations, fast oscillating phases are terminated by the the rotating wave approximation, which requires that \( \tau_R \gg \tau_S \). Finally, the last assumption involves neglecting higher order terms in the expansion of \( \Lambda (t-s) \) and \( \xi (t-s) \). This assumption is justified when the bath correlation functions decay rapidly in comparison to the change in the driving, \( \tau_B \ll \tau_d \).

The hierarchy between the four time-scales determines the validity regime:
\[
\tau_R \gg \tau_B , \ \tau_S \gg \tau_B , \ \tau_R \gg \tau_S , \ \tau_d \gg \tau_B . \tag{13}
\]
This implies that the NAME is exact in the weak coupling limit and a delta-correlated bath.

D. Connection of the eigenoperators to the Lindblad jump operators

The eigenoperators of the free evolution operator play a key role in the description of open quantum system dynamics. For example, according to the Davis construction \[24\] of the static Master equation, populations changes are induced by the ladder operators connecting energy eigenstates \( | \xi_k \rangle \) and \( | \xi_j \rangle \). As the Hamiltonian is time-independent, the eigenstates of the free propagator and the Hamiltonian coincide and, as a result, the eigenoperators of the free propagator constitute the jump operators of the master equation. For a time-dependent Hamiltonian under periodic driving, the eigenoperators of the free propagator are the ladder operators between the Floquet states \[26\], which, according to a first principle derivation, constitute the jump operators of the Floquet Master equation \[26\].

Those examples lead us to interpret the eigenoperators of the free evolution under non-adiabatic driving as the ladder operators of the associated "time-global" eigenstates, which account for the integration and the time-ordering procedure in the free propagator. In fact, under non-adiabatic driving, the bath induces transformations with respect to those time-global states, and therefore, it is natural that the eigenoperators of the free propagator constitute the jump operators of the NAME.

E. Properties of non-adiabatic open system dynamics

Non-adiabtic examples appear in the kinetic coefficients and Lindblad jump operators. Both depend on the driving protocol, and differ from the equivalent terms in the adiabatic master equation \[20, 23\]. These terms define an instantaneous attractor \( \hat{\rho}_{I.A} \)
\[
\mathcal{L} (t) \hat{\rho}_{I.A} (t) = 0 . \tag{14}
\]
This attractor is a generalized Gibbs state beyond adiabatic limit. In general, any CP map has an invariant, which may not be unique \[24\]. Based on the Davis construction, we conjecture that for a non-degenerate Hamiltonian instantaneous attractor of the NAME is unique \[11\].

IV. QUANTUM CONTROL OF OPEN SYSTEMS

Fast thermalization can be formulated as a quantum control problem \[14\]. The task is classified as a state-to-state objective \( \hat{\rho}_S^i \rightarrow \hat{\rho}_S^f \), governed by open system dynamics:
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \hat{\rho}_S = \mathcal{L} (t) \hat{\rho}_S \tag{15}
\]
We consider a control problem where the reduced system dynamics is generated by the NAME Eq. \[12\].
Quantum control theory \cite{14, 28, 29} addresses three main topics:

- Controllability: what are the conditions on the dynamics which allow to obtain the state-to-state objective?
- Constructive mechanisms of control, the problem of synthesis.
- Optimal control strategies and quantum speed limits.

These topics will be employed to analyse the process of fast thermalization.

A. State-to-State Controllability

Under what conditions can an initial quantum state $\hat{\rho}_S$ be transformed into a final state $\hat{\rho}_S^f$, employing open systems dynamics? To prove controllability a single explicit solution for the control task is sufficient, under the dynamics of Eq. \cite{15}. In the context of the proof, the solution protocol has no time or energy restrictions. Entropy change is a necessary condition for open system controllability. This requirement leads to a natural decomposition of the protocol: an entropy changing dissipative part followed by a fast unitary conserving entropy:

1. For any initial state $\hat{\rho}_S$ couple the system to a bath of temperature $T_B$ and change the Hamiltonian to $\hat{H}_S^f$ until it reaches an equilibrium thermal state $\hat{\rho}_{S,T_B}^f$, which has common eigenvalue with $\hat{\rho}_S^f$.

2. Apply a fast unitary transformation $\hat{U}_S$ such that $\hat{\rho}_S^f = \hat{U}_S \hat{\rho}_{S,T_B}^f \hat{U}_S^\dagger$.

In the first stage, a dissipative transformation that leads to common eigenvalues with $\hat{\rho}_S^f$ is obtained by reaching a thermal state $\hat{\rho}_{S,T_B}^f = \sum \lambda_j |\phi_j\rangle \langle \phi_j|$, determined by the Hamiltonian: $\hat{H}_S^f = \sum j \epsilon_j |\phi_j\rangle \langle \phi_j|$, where $\epsilon_j = kT(\log Z + \lambda_j)$. This state is unitarily equivalent to the target state, since unitary transformations do not alter the eigenvalues of the density matrix.

The protocol can be achieved under the following conditions:

1. The isolated quantum system is completely unitary controllable, i.e. any unitary transformation $\hat{U}_S$ is admissible.

2. There is a complete freedom in modifying the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_S(t)$ of the system, embedded in the bath of temperature $T_B$.

The first controllability condition, open system entropy changing control, can be addressed in the framework of the GKLS dynamical equations Eq. \cite{2}. The control of a target state $\hat{\rho}_S^f$ requires engineering the asymptotic invariant of $\mathcal{L}$ to become unitarily equivalent to the target state \cite{30, 34}. In the adiabatic limit under the Davis construction, the thermal state with the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_S^f$ becomes the invariant of the GKLS equation \cite{24}.

The second condition, unitary control of a closed quantum system, has been formulated employing a Lie algebra \cite{28, 35, 36}. In this case, the Hamiltonian of the system is separated into drift and control terms,

$$\hat{H}_S(t) = \hat{H}_0 + \sum_j u_j(t) \hat{H}_j$$

where $\hat{H}_0$ is the free system Hamiltonian, $u_j(t)$ are the control fields and $\hat{H}_j$ are control operators. The system is unitary controllable provided the Lie algebra, spanned by the nested commutators of $\hat{H}_0$ and $\hat{H}_j$, is full rank \cite{28, 35, 36}. Under this condition, an arbitrary unitary propagator can be achieved. Such transformation necessarily preserves the eigenvalues of $\hat{\rho}_S$.

Controllability of open systems has previously been addressed assuming the dissipative generator $\mathcal{L}_D$ which is independent of the system Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_S$. This case has limited controllability \cite{14, 37}, since there is no control on the invariant of $\mathcal{L}$. In the control community the dependence of $\mathcal{L}$ on the Hamiltonian has been mostly overlooked (an exception is \cite{38}). This dependency is required for a consistent thermodynamic description \cite{11}. An exception arises for a singular bath (infinite temperature), then $\mathcal{L}_D$ is independent of $\hat{H}_S$ \cite{39}. In this case the generator becomes $\mathcal{L}_D = -\gamma \{ \hat{G}, \hat{G}, \bullet \}$. Then, if $\hat{G}$ belongs to the set of control operators \cite{10}, control is limited to a wedge in the state space \cite{37}. A similar result is obtained if $\mathcal{L}_D$ is unital \cite{40}.

B. Constructive mechanisms for control

There are two limiting opposing mechanism of control: adiabatic and quench. The adiabatic protocol interpolates between $\hat{H}_S^0$ and $\hat{H}_S^f$, implying the general form $\hat{H}_S(t) = \lambda(t) \hat{H}_S^0 + (1 - \lambda(t)) \hat{H}_S^f$, where $\lambda(t)$ is a slowly varying function of time. In this limit, the state remains in the canonical state $\hat{\rho}_S(t) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \{-\beta \hat{H}_S(t)\}$, and no coherence is generated throughout the control procedure. This procedure is reversible, $\Delta S_U = 0$, implying null dissipation of work $W_{\text{sys}} = W - \Delta F_S = 0$, where $\Delta F_S$ is the change in free energy and $S_U$ is the entropy of the universe. However, optimal work cost, obtained in the adiabatic limit, is never practical since it requires an infinitely long execution time.

The other extreme mechanism is a quench: a sudden jump from the initial $\hat{H}_S^0$ to the target Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_S^f$, followed by a relaxation towards equilibrium \cite{41}. Whenever $[\hat{H}_S^0, \hat{H}_S^f] \neq 0$ the protocol is irreversible. For such a case, the sudden quench generates significant coherence,
requiring additional work that is eventually wasted by dissipation to the bath. This leads to an increased work cost $W = \text{Tr} \{ \hat{\rho}_S (\hat{H}_S^f - \hat{H}_S^a) \}$ relative to the adiabatic work. The timescale of the quench protocol is dictated by the bath relaxation rates.

In the present study we propose a fast control mechanism that serves as an intermediate between the adiabatic and sudden limits. In this protocol the state follows a generalised canonical form $\hat{\rho}_S (t) = \exp \left( \sum_j \lambda_j (t) \hat{A}_j \right)$, where $\lambda_j$ are time dependent coefficients and $\{ \hat{A}_j \}$ are members of a closed Lie algebra which include $\hat{H}_S (t)$. Asymptotically, for long protocol duration this protocol converges to the adiabatic one. The fast protocol can achieve fast thermalization at low entropic cost. The basic idea, underlining the control scheme, is to reverse engineer the control Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_S (t)$ such as to maintain a specific trajectory defined by the generalised canonical form.

C. Optimal control and quantum speed limit

Optimal control theory aims to find an accurate transformation of the system to the target state, subject to constraints of finite resources such as time and external power. Optimal control algorithms have been applied to open system dynamics. Previously, in all cases studied, the dissipator $L_D$ was independent of the control Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_S (t)$ [12][15]. In the present study, we do not impose optimality, nevertheless our fast thermalization protocol reaches very close to the target. For the existing protocols, we can compare the actual protocol speed to theoretical bounds that limit the change in purity $P (t) = tr (\hat{\rho}_S^2 (t))$.

The speed limit of purity change is given by

$$\ln \left( \frac{P (t_f)}{P (t_i)} \right) \leq 4 \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \sum_k ||r_k (t') \hat{F}_k (t') ||^2_{sp} dt' \quad \text{(17)}$$

where $\hat{F}_k$ and $r_k$ are the Lindblad jump operators and rates, Eq. (12) and $|| \cdot ||_{sp}$ denotes the spectral norm.

V. SHORTCUT TO EQUILIBRICATION OF A TWO-LEVEL-SYSTEM

We demonstrate the construction of a shortcut to equilibration (STE) protocol for a two-level-system embedded within a thermal bath. The general derivation follows the steps explicitly given in Sec. [13]. The first crucial step is to solve the free dynamics of the system, so to obtain the propagator $U_S (t)$.

A. Inertial dynamics of the isolated two-level-system

We consider a two-level-system (TLS), in the presence of two orthogonal modulated fields. The system is represented by the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_S (t) = \omega (t) \hat{S}_z + \varepsilon (t) \hat{S}_x \quad \text{(18)}$$

where $\hat{S}_i$, $i = x, y, z$ are the spin operators. Generally, the dynamics of a system with a time-dependent Hamiltonian is given by the time-ordered propagator, Eq. (3). However, this expression is only formal and is impractical for our analysis. We circumvent the time-ordering problem by utilizing the inertial theorem and solution [17].

The equations of motion for the $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ algebra can be cast into the desired form, Eq. (5), by choosing an appropriate time-dependent operators basis and protocol. To this end, we introduce two additional operators: $\tilde{L} (t) = \varepsilon (t) \hat{S}_z - \omega (t) \hat{S}_x$ and $\tilde{C} (t) = \Omega (t) \hat{S}_y$, where $\Omega (t) = \sqrt{\omega^2 (t) + \varepsilon^2 (t)}$ is the generalized Rabi frequency of the TLS, and define the Liouville vector

$$\vec{\nu} (t) = \{ \hat{H}_S (t), \tilde{L} (t), \tilde{C} (t) \}^T \quad \text{(19)}$$

Along with the identity $\hat{I}$, the elements of vector $\vec{\nu} (t)$ form a basis of the Liouville space, completely determining the system dynamics. For a protocol satisfying a constant adiabatic parameter

$$\mu \equiv \frac{\omega \varepsilon - \omega \varepsilon}{\Omega^2} \quad \text{(20)}$$

the dynamical equation in Liouville space is of the form $\frac{d\vec{\nu}}{dt} = \left( \frac{\ddot{\Omega}}{\Omega^2} \mathcal{I} + \Omega (t) \mathcal{B} (\mu) \right) \vec{\nu}$, where $\mathcal{I}$ is the identity matrix in Liouville space. Expressing the dynamics in terms of the scaled vector, $\vec{\nu} (t) = \frac{\Omega (0)}{\Omega (t)} \vec{\nu} (t)$, leads to the required decomposition, Eq. (5) $\frac{d\vec{\nu}}{dt} = \mathcal{M} (t) \vec{\nu}$, with $\mathcal{M} (t) = \Omega (t) \mathcal{B} (\mu)$. $\mathcal{B} (\mu)$ and the diagonalizing matrix $\mathcal{V}$ are given by

$$\mathcal{B} (\mu) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mu & 0 \\ -\mu & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathcal{V} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\mu & -\mu \\ 0 & i\kappa & -i\kappa \\ \mu & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{(21)}$$

Such solution contains a single constant parameter, $\tilde{\chi} = \chi = \mu$.

Next, we utilize the inertial theorem to obtain the dynamics of the eigenoperators of the free propagators $\hat{F}_k = \{ \xi, \hat{\sigma}, \hat{\sigma}^\dagger \}$

$$\dot{\xi} (\mu, 0) = \frac{1}{\kappa \Omega (0)} \left( \hat{H}_S (0) + \mu \hat{C} (0) \right)$$

$$\dot{\sigma} (\mu, 0) = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2 \Omega (0)} \left( -\mu \hat{H}_S (0) - i\kappa \hat{L} (0) + \hat{C} (0) \right) \quad \text{(22)}$$
and \( \sigma^\dagger (\mu, 0) \), with corresponding eigenvalues \( \lambda_1 = 0, \lambda_2 (t) = \kappa (\mu (t)) \) and \( \lambda_3 (t) = -\kappa (\mu (t)) \), where
\[
\kappa (\mu (t)) = \sqrt{1 + \mu^2 (t)} .
\] (23)

For a slow change in \( \mu \) the eigenoperators evolve according to the inertial solution \( \vec{v} (t) \), with vector elements
\[
\dot{v}_i (t) = \frac{\vec{\Omega} (t)}{\Omega (0)} \sum_{j, k = 1}^3 V_{jk} (\mu (t)) e^{-i \int_0^t \lambda_k (t') \left( \frac{dt' \epsilon}{\gamma_e} \right) dt'}
\times V_{kj}^{-1} (\mu (t)) \dot{v}_j (0) ,
\] (24)
with \( \vec{F}_k (\mu (t), 0) = V_{kj}^{-1} (\mu (t)) \dot{v}_j (0) \) and \( \vec{\theta} (t) = \int_0^t \vec{\Omega} (t') dt' \). In the regime \( \frac{d \mu}{dt} \ll 2 \kappa^2 \left( \frac{d \mu}{dt} \right) \), this solution describes the system dynamics accurately and is analogous to Eq. (3) of the general derivation.

The understand the practical implication of the inertial condition recall the role of the adiabatic parameter \( \mu \). This parameter naturally characterizes the qualitative accuracy of the adiabatic solution, evaluating the driving speed relative to the system Bohr frequencies. Hence, a slow change in \( \mu \) corresponds to slow ‘acceleration’ in the drive. Note that Eq. (24) is also valid for fast driving (non-adiabatic), with large \( \mu \), as along as the inertial condition is satisfied.

**B. Inertial Open system dynamics for the two-level-system**

For the studied example, we consider a system interacting with an Ohmic Boson bath at temperature \( T_B \), through a single spin component
\[
\hat{H}_I = g \hat{S}_y \otimes \hat{B} .
\] (25)

Similarly, an alternative interaction can be assumed, leading to the same qualitative results. To derive the NAME we first preform a transformation to the interaction representation. This is achieved by noticing that \( \hat{S}_y = \hat{C} (t) / \Omega (t) = \hat{v}_3 / \Omega (t) \), and gathering Eqs. (22) and (24). Following the derivation described in Sec. III B the explicit expression for \( \hat{H}_I (t) \) leads a non-adiabatic Master equation which is analogous to Eq. (12). The Master equation for the two-level-system reads
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \hat{\rho}_S (t) = k_1 (t) \left( \hat{\sigma} (\mu) \hat{\rho}_S \hat{\sigma}^\dagger (\mu) - \frac{1}{2} \left[ \hat{\sigma}^\dagger (\mu) \hat{\sigma}, \hat{\rho}_S \right] \right)
+ k_\gamma (t) \left( \hat{\sigma}^\dagger (\mu) \hat{\rho}_S \hat{\sigma} - \frac{1}{2} \left[ \hat{\sigma} (\mu) \hat{\sigma}^\dagger (\mu), \hat{\rho}_S \right] \right) ,
\] (26)
with kinetic coefficients
\[
k_1 (t) = \frac{2 \alpha (t)}{\hbar c} N (\alpha (t)) = k_4 (t) e^{-\alpha (t)/k_B T} ,
\] (27)
\[
\alpha (t) = \kappa (t) \Omega (t)
\] (28)
and \( \hat{\sigma} (\mu) \equiv \hat{\sigma} (\mu (t), 0) \) depends on the instantaneous adiabatic parameter \( \mu (t) \). Equation (27) has a similar structure to the detailed balance relation exhibited in the adiabatic master equation (26). However, beyond the adiabatic regime the transition frequency is increased by \( \kappa (t) \), Eq. (28) which is always greater than unity, Eq. (23). This property is a consequence of the influence of the external driving on the dissipation.

**C. Solution and properties of driven open systems**

To solve the dynamics, we choose to parameterize the density operator as a generalized Gibbs state in the product form (26) in a generalized canonical form
\[
\hat{\rho}_S (t) = Z^{-1} e^{\gamma (t) \hat{\rho}_S (t) \hat{\sigma} (\mu (t)) e^{\hat{\beta} (t)} \hat{\xi} (\mu (t)) e^{\gamma (t) \hat{\sigma} (\mu (t))} \}
\] (29)
where \( \hat{Z} \equiv \hat{Z} (t) = tr (\hat{\rho}_S (t)) \) is the partition function, with time-dependent parameters \( \gamma (t) \) and \( \beta (t) \). Since \{ \hat{\xi} (\mu), \hat{\sigma} (\mu), \hat{\sigma}^\dagger (\mu), \hat{I} \} span the operator Hilbert space, Eq. (29) serves as a complete description of the TLS state. A linear parameterization is in an additional option, leading to an alternative set of coupled equations [16].

Another common solution strategy is a formulation of the dynamics in the Heisenberg representation. However, when the Liouvillian \( \mathcal{L} (t) \) (generator of the reduced open system dynamics) depends explicitly on time, as in Eq. (29), this framework requires a time ordering procedure [9,20].

To solve Eq. (29), we substitute Eq. (29) into the Eq. (26) and obtain a set of coupled differential equations in terms of \( \gamma (t) \) and \( \beta (t) \)
\[
\dot{\beta} = \frac{\gamma^6 e^6}{2\kappa^2} \gamma^* - k_1 \frac{4\kappa^2 (e^6 + 1) + |\gamma|^2 e^8}{16\kappa^4} + k_\gamma \left( |\gamma|^2 e^{-8\kappa^2} (4 (e^6 + 1) \kappa^2 + e^8 |\gamma|^2) \right) \]
\[
\dot{\gamma} = k_1 \frac{\gamma^6 e^6}{8\kappa^2} - k_1 \frac{\gamma^6 (2 (1 + 2e^{-6}) \kappa^2 + |\gamma|^2)}{16\kappa^4} ,
\] (30)
where the \( \beta, \gamma, k_1 \) and \( k_\gamma \) are explicitly time-dependent and \( \kappa (t) \) varies slowly with \( \mu (t) \). These equations are an alternative representation of the open system dynamics.

The evolution is given in the interaction picture relative to the free dynamics. In this picture, the system rotates with the isolated driven system, so any change to the density operator is induced solely by the interaction with the bath.

**D. Design of the control protocol**

The driving generated by the control has both a direct impact on the state through the unitary part as well as an
indirect influence through the dissipative part, Sec. III B
and IV. To overcome this convoluted control scenario, we
employ a reverse engineering method.

We consider the following control scenario: Initially, the
system is in a Gibbs state, characterized by \( \gamma (0) = 0 \)
with Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_S (0) = \hat{H}^i_S \) and temperature \( T_i \). At
initial time, the system is coupled to a thermal bath of
temperature \( T_B \). We wish to construct a control protocol
\( \hat{H}_S (t) \) that drives the system to a Gibbs state at tempera-
ture \( T_f \) with the target Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_S (t_f) = \hat{H}^f_S \). In
general, \( T_B, T_i \) and \( T_f \) may differ from one another, that
is, the initial and final states are not required to be in equi-
librium with the the bath, just in a Gibbs form. The
assumption of an initial Gibbs state simplifies the analy-
sis but does not modify the system’s behaviour qualita-
tively.

Since Eq. (31) vanishes when \( \gamma (0) = 0 \), the state con-
serves the form

\[
\hat{\rho}_S (t) = \hat{Z}^{-1} e^{\hat{B}(t)\hat{\xi}(\mu)}
\]

throughout the evolution, and the equation of motion reduces
to a single differential equation

\[
\dot{\hat{B}}(t) = -\frac{1}{4\kappa^2 (\mu (t))} \left[ k_\uparrow (t) \left( 1 + e^{-\hat{B}(t)} \right) - k_\downarrow (t) \left( e^{\hat{B}(t)} + 1 \right) \right]
\]  

(33)

This equation is the basis for the suggested control
scheme.

The control strategy goes as follows: We perform a
change of variables \( y(t) = e^{\hat{B}(t)} \), and introduce a poly-
nomial solution for \( y(t) \) which satisfies the boundary
conditions of the control. The initial and target Gibbs
states correspond to values \( \hat{B}(0) = -h\Omega_i / k_B T_i \), \( \hat{B}(t_f) =
-h\Omega_f / k_B T_f \), where \( \Omega_i = \Omega (0) \) and \( \Omega_f = \Omega (t_f) \) are
the generalized Rabi frequencies of the initial and final
Hamiltonians. In addition, the values of \( \dot{\hat{B}}(0) \) and \( \dot{\hat{B}}(t_f) \) are set by Eq. (33) and the requirement that the control
is stationary at initial and final times, \( \mu (0) = \mu (t_f) = 0 \).

Since the stationary condition implies \( \dot{\alpha} (0) = \dot{\alpha} (t_f) = 0 \),
the second derivatives \( \dot{\hat{B}} (0), \dot{\hat{B}} (t_f) \) are determined as well
through the kinetic coefficients \( k_\uparrow (\alpha(t)), k_\downarrow (\alpha(t)) \), Eq.

A fifth order polynomial for \( \gamma \) is sufficient to satisfy
the boundary condition of Eq. (33), leading to

\[
\hat{B}(t) = \ln \left( \sum_{k=0}^{5} b_k t^k \right)
\]

(34)

where the coefficients \( \{b_k\} \) are presented in Appendix A.

Next, we substitute the solution, Eq. (34), and the ki-
netic coefficients Eq. (27), into Eq. (33), which leads to
an equation in terms of \( \alpha (t) \). We solve for \( \alpha (t) \) using
a standard numerical solver. Finally, by numerically re-
versing Eq. (28), we obtain the control protocol \( \hat{\Omega} (\alpha (t)) \).

In order to gain some insight about the dynamics, we
compute the instantaneous attractor of the Eq. (33).
The attractor \( \hat{B}_{I,A} (t) \) is defined as the value of \( \hat{B} (t) \) for
which \( \dot{\hat{B}} (t) = 0 \) (simply calculated by setting the LHS
of Eq. (33) to zero). When \( \hat{B} (t) = \hat{B}_{I,A} (t) \) the system is
 stationary. As the dynamical map is a semi-group, the
contraction property \( ||\hat{\Omega}\| \leq 1 \), implies that at each
instant the system propagates towards the instantaneous
attractor state \( \hat{\rho}_S (\hat{B}_{I,A} (t)) \).

For sufficiently slow driving, \( \mu \ll 1 \) (adiabatic regime), \( \hat{\xi} (\mu (t)) \) converges to the instantaneous Hamil-
tonian \( \hat{H}_S (0) / \hat{\Omega} (0) \), and Eq. (33) describes a decay towards the adiabatic attractor, \( \hat{B}_{I,A} (t) \rightarrow
-h\Omega (t) / k_B T_B \). Meaning that at long times the sys-

tem state converges to the adiabatic result \( \hat{\rho}_S (t) \rightarrow
\exp \left( -h\Omega (t) \hat{H}_S (0) / [ \hat{\Omega} (0) k_B T_B ] \right) \). Moreover, in
the adiabatic limit the relaxation rate towards the instan-
taneous thermal state reduces to the adiabatic rate, \( k = k^{adi} \rightarrow k^{adi} \) where \( k^{adi} = k_{\uparrow \downarrow} (\Omega (t)) \), as \( \alpha (t) \rightarrow \hat{\Omega} (t) \) (see Eq. (27)).

Conversely, beyond the adiabatic limit, \( \mu \ll 1 \), \( \hat{\xi} (\mu (t)) \)
is a linear combination of \( \hat{H}_S (0) \) and \( \hat{C} (0) \) (see Eq. (22)).
As a result, the instantaneous attractor state is a rotated
squeezed Gibbs state that differs from the instantaneous
thermal state. Thus, due to the non-adiabatic driving,
the map propagates the system towards a state that dif-
fers from the equilibrium state. Overall, this behaviour

In practice, when \( \mu \sim 1 \), \( \hat{\xi} (t) \) does not vary sufficiently
fast so to follow \( \hat{B}_{I,A} (t) \). As a result, the system in the in-

teraction picture remains a rotated squeezed Gibbs state
with a varying temperature throughout the evolution.

The relaxation rates are also altered by the non-
adiabatic driving. Beyond the adiabatic regime do not
depend on the instantaneous generalized Rabi frequency,
but on the effective frequency \( \alpha (t) \), Eq. (27). This leads to
a skewed detailed balance and modifies the dissipation
of energy and coherence.

a. Control protocol The control protocol is defined
in terms of the generalized Rabi frequency \( \hat{\Omega} (t) \), leaving
an ambiguity concerning the values of \( \omega (t) \) and \( \varepsilon (t) \), Eq.

For the current model, we choose

\[
\omega (t) = \hat{\Omega} (t) \cos (\Phi (t)) \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon (t) = \hat{\Omega} (t) \sin (\Phi (t)) \]

(35)

where \( \Phi \) is taken as a simple polynomial. Substitut-
ing Eq. (35) into \( \mu, \) Eq. (20), leads to the relation
\( \hat{\Phi} = -\mu (t) \hat{\Omega} (t) \), which determines a solution of the form
\( \Phi (t) = a (t^2 + b t^3) \), satisfying the stationary condition at
initial and final times. Here, \( b = -2/3 t_f \) and \( a \) is a free
parameter which should be sufficiently small so to compl-
y with the inertial condition \( d\mu / dt \ll 2\kappa^2 (d\theta / dt) \). For
the modelling it is chosen as \( a = 10/t_f^4 \), leading to \( \mu \rightarrow 0 \)
for \( t_f \rightarrow 0 \).
VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Control

The control scheme allows addressing various control tasks:

1. Transformation between two equilibrium states with different Hamiltonians (STE).

2. Transformation between an initial non-equilibrium state to an equilibrium state, accompanied by a change in the Hamiltonian (STE).

3. Transformation to a final state which is colder than the bath, \( T_f < T_B \).

We study two classes of STE protocols, expansion and compression, with bath temperature \( T_B = 5 \). The expansion varies the generalized Rabi frequency from \( \Omega_i = 12 \) to \( \Omega_f = 5 \) (atomic units). Compression involves an increase in the generalized Rabi frequency: \( \Omega_i = 5 \rightarrow \Omega_f = 12 \). During the expansion (compression) protocols, the effective temperature \( T_{eff} = -\Omega(t)/\beta(t) \) reduces below (increases above) the bath temperature at transient times. At the final stage of the protocol, the effective temperature returns back and obtains \( T_{eff} = T_B \) at the final time, Fig. 1.

The shortcut to equilibrium protocols achieve high fidelity relative to the quench protocols for both expansion and compression procedures. Figure 2 shows the accuracy \( A \) of the target state for varying protocol time. Within the inertial approximation the control is precise and the fidelity \( F \) approaches unity. As a result, the inertial approximation is the limiting factor of the protocol accuracy. The fidelity is therefore evaluated by comparing the inertial solution for an isolated solution, under the shortcut protocol, to an exact numerical solution.

FIG. 2: Accuracy with respect to the control target as a function of protocol duration. The STE results correspond to PE and PC protocol. These are compared to the analog quench procedures. The accuracy is defined as \( A = -\log_{10}(1 - F(\hat{\rho}_S(t_f), \hat{\rho}_S,T)) \), it increases with the fidelity, given by \( F(\hat{\rho}_1, \hat{\rho}_2) = \left| \frac{\text{tr} \left( \sqrt{\hat{\rho}_1} \hat{\rho}_2 \sqrt{\hat{\rho}_1} \right)}{\sqrt{\text{tr} \left( \sqrt{\hat{\rho}_1} \hat{\rho}_2 \sqrt{\hat{\rho}_1} \right)}} \right|^2 \).

In the calculation, \( \hat{\rho}_S(t_f) \) accounts for the deviations from the inertial approximation. The reference Rabi frequency is given by \( \Omega_{ref} = 5 \) a.u.

As the protocol duration increases the inertial approximation improves and the accuracy increases. In comparison, the quench protocol leads to slow relaxation towards equilibrium, Sec. IV B. Shortcut protocols show an improvement up to 5 folds in accuracy, relative to the quench procedure for the same protocol duration.

The state trajectory in the \( \{S_z, S_y, S_z\} \) space, Fig. 3, displays the change in purity imposed by the control protocol. Increase of purity for compression and a decrease for expansion. The change in purity can be related to the speed limit Eq. (17), for the expansion and compression protocol the bound on the purity change is 1.58, while the STE protocols obtain a value of 0.34. This value shows that although the STE is not optimum, nevertheless is within the range of the speed limit.

The dynamics are imposed by non-trivial protocols, Fig. 4, of \( \omega(t) \) and \( \varepsilon(t) \). These time-dependent frequencies are a single option from a family of procedures that correspond to the protocol \( \hat{\Omega}(t) \), see Sec. V D.

We find that the different protocols of compression and expansion for various initial states (Gibbs states with different temperature), are all characterized by an overshoot.
FIG. 3: Two-levels system trajectory in the Spin operator space \( \{\langle \hat{S}_x \rangle, \langle \hat{S}_y \rangle, \langle \hat{S}_z \rangle \} \). The ball represents purity of 1. Compression trajectory (PC), red to blue, increases the purity and expansion trajectory (PE), cyan to purple, decreases purity.

relative to the target frequency. As seen in Fig. 4 tl expansion protocol (reduction in the generalized Rabi frequency \( \Omega(t) \)) achieves values above the target frequency while the compression first increases \( \Omega \), before a fast decline to \( \Omega(t_f) \). A similar behaviour was witnessed for tl STE protocol for the Harmonic oscillator [12]. Formally, this behaviour is connected to the proposed ansatz, and a different ansatz may alter this result. Nevertheless, this outcome matches the necessity to generate coherence, which in turn allows controlling the energy via a unitary transformation.

The STE protocol can be employed for an initial non-equilibrium Gibbs state. For example, protocols PE1 and PE2, begin in a Gibbs state with \( T_i \neq T_B \), see Figs. 1 and 4. These STE protocols induce energy exchange with the bath so to lead the state towards an equilibrium state, with \( T_{eff}(t_f) = T_B \). The Fidelity of these processes are comparable with protocols PE and PC, see caption of Fig. 1 or Table II in the Appendix.

Cooling is demonstrated in Fig. 1 where the system reaches a final temperature of \( T_f = 4 \text{ a.u.} \), below the bath temperature \( T_B \). The final state is unstable once the driving ceases, that is, if the system remains in contact with the bath it will equilibrate. This effect is witnessed in Fig. 8. We find that this control task is sensitive to the protocol, further analysis is required to map the accessible cooling regime.

B. Thermodynamic Analysis

The manipulation of a system Hamiltonian by external fields is accompanied by an associated work cost or gain, (gain or extracted work is considered as a negative work cost). This cost can be connected to quantum friction [9, 50], which implies that quicker transformations are accompanied by a higher energy cost [51–55]. We identify this cost with the microscopic work, defined as the time integral over the instantaneous power \( \mathcal{P}(t) \equiv \left\langle \frac{\partial H_S(t)}{\partial t} \right\rangle \). This interpretation is motivated by the correspondence between work and energy for an isolated system. In absence of environmental interactions the change in the system energy can be formulated as \( \Delta E_S(t) = \int_0^t \mathcal{P}(t') dt' = W \), utilizing the Heisenberg picture for an isolated system. An extended definition
also accounts for the cost of the external controller \[56\], this additional cost requires an explicit description of the controller which is beyond the scope of this study.

From conservation of energy, heat is then determined as \( Q = \Delta E_S - W \), with \( \Delta E_S = \text{tr} \left( \hat{H}_S(t_f) \hat{\rho}_S(t_f) \right) - \text{tr} \left( \hat{H}_S(0) \hat{\rho}_S(0) \right) \). Utilizing the linearity of integration and the trace, this relation becomes \( Q = \int_0^t J(t') dt' \), where \( J(t') \equiv \text{tr} \left( \hat{H}_S(t') \frac{d}{dt} \hat{\rho}_S(t') \right) \) is the heat current.

The shortcut procedures accelerate the thermalization rate by investing additional work. Comparing to the adiabatic protocol, the STE harvests less work in extraction (compression for the TLS) and requires an additional work cost under expansion, Fig. 5 \[57\]. The additional cost can be traced back to the transformation of invested work to coherence, which is then dissipated to the bath. As the protocol duration increases coherence generation is suppressed and the STE work cost converges to the adiabatic result. To evaluate the relative performance we define the work efficiency \( \eta_W \), for an expansion of the two-level system \( \eta_W = W_{\text{adi}}/W \), and for compression \( \eta_W = W/W_{\text{adi}} \), where \( W_{\text{adi}} \) is the adiabatic work. For fast protocols \( t_f \sim 6 \left( 2\pi/\Omega_{\text{ref}} \right) \) the work efficiency obtains values of \( \eta_W = 0.71 \) for expansion and \( \eta_W = 0.5 \), see Fig 6 for larger protocol duration, the work efficiency improves in accordance with the work.

When the open quantum system, initially at thermal equilibrium, expands, heat flows from the bath to the system, increasing its entropy. Figure 7 shows the increase in system von-Neumann entropy \( S_{VN} \) along the expansion protocol, accompanied by a reduction of the bath entropy \( S_B = -Q/T_B \). Their sum gives the total change in the entropy of the universe \( S_{U} \), which is strictly positive for any irreversible process. As expected, the fast driving during the STE protocol induces irreversible dynamics that increase \( S_U \).

To evaluate the coherence generation we compare between \( S_{VN} \) and energy entropy \( S_E = -k_B \sum_i p_i \ln p_i \), where \( \{p_i\} \) are the populations in the energy representation. As seen in figure 7, the two are very close, demonstrating that for protocol duration \( t_f = 6 \left( 2\pi/\Omega_{\text{ref}} \right) \) the dynamics is dominated by the energy. Nevertheless, the two entropies differ at intermediate times when the state exhibits maximal coherence. At the beginning and final times \( S_{VN} = S_E \) since the state is diagonal in the energy representation.

Another measure of the irreversibility is the entropy production \( \Sigma \). Close to equilibrium it can be defined as \( \Sigma = S_{VN} - Q/T_B \) or equivalently as \( W - \)
\[ \Delta F_S \] For the general case, quantum entropy production rate is recognized with the negative derivative of the Kullback-Leibler divergence between the system state and the fixed point of the dynamical map (the instantaneous attractor). The divergence is a measure of difference between two quantum states \[ D(\rho_1||\rho_2) = \text{tr}(\rho_1(\ln(\rho_1) - \ln(\rho_2))). \] It is non-negative and it decreases as the system evolves under Eq. (2) [27]. This property implies the positivity of the entropy production rate \[ \Sigma(\dot{\rho}_S(t)) \equiv -\frac{d}{dt} D(\dot{\rho}_S(t)||\rho_S) \geq 0. \] Figure 8 presents the entropy production rate during a STE expansion protocol. As expected the entropy production rate is positive. It obtains maximum values at intermediate times, when coherence builds up and dissipates to the bath. This dissipation leads to the increase of the total entropy and irreversibility. When the initial or final states are not in equilibrium with the bath (procedures PE1, PE2 and PEC), the entropy production at corresponding boundary.

The cooling mechanism is analogous to a power driven refrigerator, where the two-level-system mimics a cold bath with finite heat capacity. The driving supplies the power to pump heat from the cold bath and dump in the hot bath. In such cooling scenario, consistency with thermodynamics requires a positive entropy production and investment of work. This is verified in Fig. 8.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

Thermalization is typically considered a spontaneous process, which rate is determined by the system-bath coupling strength. We have demonstrated that thermalization can be actively controlled, resulting in acceleration of the thermalization rate. Our control is achieved by implementing external driving that modifies the system Hamiltonian directly. A first principle treatment, Sec. [11] shows that the time-dependence of the system Hamiltonian dresses the system bath interaction, modifying the dissipative part indirectly. This structure is vital for a dynamical description that complies with thermodynamic principles [11]. The dissipative part adjusts to the change in Hamiltonian and is therefore indirectly controlled.

Alternatively, direct control on dissipation can be obtained in the 'singular bath limit', i.e., an additional delta correlated noisy driving with a fast timescale with respect to all other considered timescales [55]. In this case the dissipation is independent of the system Hamiltonian. A recent study showed that a Langevin type term, rising from momentum kicks, can lead to acceleration of the thermalization rate [59]. Another suggestion, is to include a counter diabatic term to engineer the Hamiltonian and dissipative part [60].

In a more generalized context, we incorporate the open system control task into the theme of quantum control theory, Sec. [1V]. Adopting the principles of the thermalization control scheme, the analysis has led to the formal conditions of complete state-to-state controllability of open systems, Sec. [IV A].

Speeding up the thermalization rate comes with a thermodynamic cost, with a minimum work cost achieved in the adiabatic limit. Any additional cost is associated with the emergence of friction. When the Hamiltonian does not commute with itself at different times, driving at non-vanishing speed generates coherence and is manifested by additional work which is dissipated to the bath. Dissipated energy heats the bath and leads to positive entropy production and irreversibility. The first principle analysis conducted here demonstrates the quantum origin of friction.

To demonstrate the control scheme we utilize a two-level-system model, characterized by an \(\mathfrak{su}(2)\) algebra. Similarly, the analysis can be straightforwardly generalized to any system described by the same algebra and a Hamiltonian of the form Eq. (18). For instance, the four level system described in Refs. [19] [61] [63]. The present study originated from our previous analysis of the shortcut to equilibration (STE) of a Harmonic oscillator [12]. These control schemes have common properties: in both models the fast protocols are characterized by an overshoot with respect to the final control frequency. Furthermore, the thermodynamic cost shows a similar trend. In this study, we explored additional control protocols, extending the applicability of the control scheme. We show that the control allows for non-equilibrium initial Gibbs
states. Moreover, adding additional fast unitary transformations at initial and final time, allows to extend the control to a broad family of states containing the same initial and final entropies. Another surprising result, is a protocol which leads to a final state colder than the bath ($T_f < T_B$). At first glance, this seems like a violation of thermodynamic principles, as this cannot be achieved under adiabatic driving. However, the fast driving generates conditions analogous to a power driven refrigerator, where heat is pumped from the two-level-system to the thermal bath by consuming external power. The mechanism requires generation of coherence which dissipation to the bath generates entropy, that compensates the negative entropy change of the system. We emphasis that this cold state is a transient.

Experimental realization of quantum heat engines have emerged recently [63]. The platform employed in these experiments includes various controlled quantum systems. The protocols introduced above can be directly employed in the current devices to realize quantum heat engines at finite time. Particularly, these protocols can be used to realize a quantum Carnot engine with a qubit as a working medium [10].

A natural extension of the present study, involves incorporating optimal control theory in the control of open quantum system. The novelty of such an approach is the incorporation of control on the dissipation via an external driving.
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Appendix A: Control protocol

TABLE I: Model parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Value [atomic units]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bath temperature</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coupling prefactor</td>
<td>$g^2/2\hbar c = 0.02$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerical integrating step</td>
<td>$10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control parameters</td>
<td>$a = 10/t_f^2$ and $b = -2/3t_f$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II: Typical protocols for state-to-state transformations in atomic units. All the procedures were performed employing a thermal bath with temperature $T = 5$. $\Omega_i$ and $\Omega_f$ are the initial and final generalized Rabi frequencies of the TLS. The initial and final Gibbs state temperatures are $T_i$ and $T_f$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>$\Omega_i$</th>
<th>$\Omega_f$</th>
<th>$T_i$</th>
<th>$T_f$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE (Expansion)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC (Compression)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[57] Unlike typical working mediums, work is extracted from the TLS in a compression process and invested under expansion.