Jumptime unraveling of Markovian open quantum systems
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We introduce jumptime unraveling as a distinct method to analyze open quantum systems. In contrast to standard (Monte Carlo/quantum jump) unraveling of quantum master equations, where individual realizations of quantum trajectories are stochastically evolved to a specific time before taking the ensemble average, we terminate quantum trajectories at a given count of quantum jumps, and then average. The resulting quantum state then follows a discrete, deterministic evolution equation, with time replaced by the jump count. As we prove, this evolution equation represents a well-defined quantum (Kraus) map if and only if the underlying quantum master equation does not exhibit dark states. In the presence of dark states, on the other hand, the state decays and/or the jumptime evolution eventually terminates entirely. We illustrate the jumptime evolution along the examples of a two-level system undergoing amplitude damping or dephasing, a damped harmonic oscillator, and a free particle exposed to collisional decoherence.

INTRODUCTION

An isolated, unobserved quantum system follows Schrödinger dynamics and thus describes a smooth, deterministic evolution in state space, much in the spirit of classical field theories. In order to retrieve information about the system, however, we must measure it. We can do so at chosen, isolated times, forcing the quantum state into instantaneous, abrupt changes to comply with specific measurement outcomes. These probabilistic changes, formalized in Born’s rule, lie at the core of quantum mechanics, recasting it as a statistically predictive theory.

If a quantum system is continuously monitored, the measurement apparatus delivers an ongoing measurement record, now informing us about the stochastic evolution of the system, its quantum trajectory. This record/trajectory can either be of diffusive nature, such as in continuous homodyne measurements of light modes, or describe intervals of continuous, deterministic evolution, interrupted by sudden changes at random times, quantum jumps, such as in continuous photon counting measurements. Depending on the nature of the measurement process, part or even all of the probabilistic nature of quantum mechanics is then subsumed in the stochastically occurring jump times. Quantum jumps and the associated individual quantum trajectories have been successfully traced in various experimental platforms, ranging from atoms and ions [1,3], to electron cyclotrons [4], cavity photons [5], and superconducting circuits [6].

The theoretical foundation of quantum trajectories marks a milestone in the refinement of quantum theory [7–14], with numerous conceptual and practical implications (e.g., [15–21]). For instance, continuous measurements lie at the heart of quantum feedback control [22–24]. A deep conceptual relationship exists between quantum trajectories and Markovian quantum master equations: Any Markovian quantum master equation can be unraveled in terms of quantum trajectories, associated with a continuous measurement process, such that the ensemble average over all trajectories recovers the solution of the master equation. Vice versa, if measurement records are discarded in a continuous measurement, we must ensemble-average over all quantum trajectories, where the ensemble-averaged state then follows a quantum master equation.

In standard walltime quantum jump unraveling of a quantum master equation, quantum trajectories are ensemble-averaged at fixed times, where different trajectories have in general accumulated different numbers of quantum jump events, cf. Fig 1. Here, we demonstrate that quantum trajectories can also be consistently ensemble-averaged in an alternative way, by bundling them at fixed counts of jump events, jumptime, see Fig. 1. As we show, the such ensemble-averaged quantum states follow a discrete, deterministic evolution equation, retaining the resolution into jump events while removing the stochasticity of the jump occurrence. In this sense, jumptime unraveling represents a distinct way of analyzing open quantum systems, or, for that matter, continuous quantum measurements. Note that walltime and jumptime unraveling coincide for diffusive unravelings.

In this article, we derive the discrete jumptime evolution equation and analyze its most fundamental properties. Subsequently, we illustrate the jumptime evolution with several examples.
JUMPTIME UNRAVELING

Let us consider an open quantum system governed by a Markovian quantum master equation,

$$\dot{\rho} = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{H}, \rho] + \gamma \sum_{j \in I} (\hat{L}_j \rho \hat{L}_j^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{\hat{L}_j^\dagger \hat{L}_j, \rho\}),$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where the Lindblad operators $\hat{L}_j$ account for incoherent contributions to the dynamics, e.g., induced by an environment. In the context of continuous measurements, the Lindblad operators are specified by the nature of the measurement process.

Quantum jump unraveling interprets the solution $\rho(t)$ of Eq. (1) as emerging from the ensemble average over stochastically evolving quantum trajectories. The unraveled solution can then be written as

$$\rho(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_0^{t_n} \int_0^{t_{n-1}} \ldots \int_0^{t_2} \int_0^{t_1} \rho^i_{j_n \ldots j_1} \{\{t_i\}\},$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where the (unnormalized) conditioned density operators

$$\rho^i_{j_n \ldots j_1} \{\{t_i\}\} = \mathcal{U}_{t_n} \mathcal{U}_{t_{n-1}} \ldots \mathcal{U}_{t_1} \rho_0$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

describe the non-unitary time evolution of an initial state $\rho_0$, interrupted by $n$ quantum jumps of type $j_i$ at times $t_i$ with $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Here, we define $\mathcal{U}_t \rho = e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \hat{H}_0 t} \rho e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \hat{H}_0 t}$, $\mathcal{J}_i \rho = \gamma \hat{L}_j \rho \hat{L}_j^\dagger$, and the (non-hermitian) effective Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}} = \hat{H} - \frac{i}{\hbar} \sum_{j \in I} \hat{L}_j^\dagger \hat{L}_j$. Note that diffusive unravelings, which are also conceivable, are excluded here.

In standard walltime unraveling (2), quantum trajectories are averaged over at specific times $t$. In general, $\rho(t)$ then contains contributions from any jump order $n$. Jumptime unraveling, instead, harnesses the insight that quantum trajectories can alternatively be bundled together at a given jump order $n$, i.e., by averaging over quantum trajectories immediately after they have completed $n$ jump events (irrespective of their type). Importantly, different trajectories in general arrive at the $n$th jump at different times. Time $t$ is then replaced by the jump order $n$, $\rho(t) \to \rho_n$, and

$$\rho_n = \int_0^\infty dt_n \int_0^{t_n} dt_{n-1} \ldots \int_0^{t_2} \int_0^{t_1} \sum_{j_1 \ldots j_n \in I} \rho_{j_n \ldots j_1}^n \{\{t_i\}\},$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

with the modified conditioned density matrices

$$\rho_{j_n \ldots j_1}^n \{\{t_i\}\} = \mathcal{J}_{j_n} \mathcal{U}_{t_n} \mathcal{U}_{t_{n-1}} \ldots \mathcal{J}_{j_1} \mathcal{U}_t \rho_0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

Note that the upper limit of the integral over the final jump time $t_n$ in (1) is shifted to infinity, as the occurrence of the last jump is now unconstrained in time. Moreover, the quantum trajectories terminate immediately after the indicated number of jumps is reached.

By construction, the jumptime state $\rho_n$ describes a well-defined (i.e., normalized and positive) quantum state, as long as every quantum trajectory reaches $n$ jumps. As we show below, the latter is the case if and only if the master equation (1) does not exhibit dark states. Moreover, we stress that $\rho_n$ is operationally accessible in continuous monitoring schemes, where individual trajectories are observed and quantum jumps detected.

We can further simplify (1) by switching to waiting times $\tau_n = t_n - t_{n-1}$ between jumps, which yields

$$\rho_n = \int_0^\infty d\tau_n \int_0^{\infty} d\tau_{n-1} \ldots \int_0^{\infty} d\tau_1 \sum_{j_1 \ldots j_n \in I} \rho_{j_n \ldots j_1}^n \{\{\tau_i\}\},$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where all waiting times decouple and extend to infinity, as the time ordering required in the walltime unraveling (2) is here ineffective. It is now straightforward to extract the recursive relation

$$\rho_{n+1} = \int_0^{\infty} \gamma d\tau \sum_{j \in I} \hat{L}_j e^{-\gamma \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} \tau} \rho_n e^{\gamma \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} \tau} \hat{L}_j^\dagger,$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

where we have returned to standard operator notation. We emphasize that (7) is derived without approximations.

The jumptime evolution equation (7) is our main result. It constitutes a distinct, operationally meaningful
way to bundle the stochastically evolving quantum trajectories into a discrete, deterministic evolution, preserving the quantum jumps while absorbing their stochasticity in the jump order. As such, it provides a novel window into the dynamics of open quantum systems.

**ROLE OF DARK STATES**

We now prove that the jump-time evolution \( \hat{V} \) describes a well-defined, i.e., trace preserving and completely positive, quantum, or Kraus, map, if and only if the master equation \( \dot{\rho} = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}, \rho] + \sum \mathbf{E}_\mu \mathbf{F}_\mu \rho \mathbf{E}_\mu^\dagger \) does not exhibit dark states. The integral only if there are no dark states. First, we realize that in the absence of dark states, where we have introduced the projector \( \rho_\lambda = \langle \lambda | \rho | \lambda \rangle \) such that \( \rho_\lambda \) is an ordinary eigenstate of \( \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} \), the integrals equal \( \langle \lambda | \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} | \lambda \rangle = \langle \lambda | \hat{H} | \lambda \rangle + i \hbar \frac{\gamma}{2} \langle \lambda | \hat{V} | \lambda \rangle \). Since both \( \hat{H} \) and \( \hat{V} \) are hermitian and thus real on the diagonal, and since \( \hat{V} \) is in addition positive, \( \text{Im} z_\lambda = \hbar \frac{\gamma}{2} \langle \lambda | \hat{V} | \lambda \rangle \geq 0 \) follows immediately.

We now show that an ordinary eigenstate \( | \lambda \rangle \) of \( \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} \) is a dark state if and only if \( \text{Im} z_\lambda = 0 \). One direction is trivial: If \( | \lambda \rangle \) is a dark state, then by definition \( \langle \lambda | \hat{V} | \lambda \rangle = 0 \), and hence \( \text{Im} z_\lambda = 0 \). On the other hand, if \( \langle \lambda | \hat{V} | \lambda \rangle = 0 \), we infer \( \hat{V} | \lambda \rangle = 0 \) \( \forall \lambda \). Since \( | \lambda \rangle \) is an ordinary eigenstate of \( \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} \), we also infer \( \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} | \lambda \rangle = \hat{H} | \lambda \rangle = z_\lambda | \lambda \rangle \), that is, \( | \lambda \rangle \) is also an eigenstate of \( \hat{H} \) and hence a dark state.

Now let us assume that a state \( | \mu \rangle \) is a dark state. Then \( \hat{V} | \mu \rangle = 0 \) and \( \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} | \mu \rangle = H_{\text{eff}} | \mu \rangle = \hat{H} | \mu \rangle = \varepsilon | \mu \rangle \) with \( \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R} \), i.e., \( | \mu \rangle \) is an eigenstate of both \( \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} \) and \( \hat{H} \). Consequently,

\[
\lim_{\tau \to \infty} \langle \mu | e^{i \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} \tau} e^{-i \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} \tau} | \mu \rangle = 1 \tag{10}
\]

which contradicts \( \langle \mu | \hat{V} | \mu \rangle = 0 \).

On the other hand, if there are no dark states, we can infer that all eigenvalues of \( \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} \) have strictly positive imaginary parts. If \( | \lambda \rangle \) denotes the Jordan block associated with the eigenvalue \( z_\lambda \), we can write

\[
e^{i \lambda \tau} = e^{i z_\lambda \tau} \tilde{F}_\lambda (\tau) = e^{-\text{Im} z_\lambda \tau} \left( e^{i \text{Re} z_\lambda \tau} \tilde{F}_\lambda (\tau) \right) \tag{11}
\]

where the matrix function \( \tilde{F}_\lambda (\tau) \) scales at most polynomially in \( \tau \) for large \( \tau \). Thus, at large \( \tau \), all Jordan blocks decay to zero. Consequently, \( e^{i \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} \tau} \) vanishes in the limit \( \tau \to \infty \). The same holds for \( e^{-i \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} \tau} \), which can be proven similarly. Therefore, Eq. \( \langle \mu | \hat{V} | \mu \rangle \) is fulfilled in absence of dark states. This completes our proof.

We remark that, if there are no dark states, the trace of the integrand in \( \langle \mu | \hat{V} | \mu \rangle \) delivers the waiting time distribution \( w_{n \to n+1} (\tau) \) between jump \( n \) and jump \( n+1 \),

\[
w_{n \to n+1} (\tau) = \gamma \text{Tr} \left[ e^{i \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} \tau} \sum_{ j \in \mathbb{I}} \tilde{L}_j e^{-i \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} \tau} \rho_n \right] \tag{12}
\]

Indeed, \( \text{Tr} \left[ \sum_{ j \in \mathbb{I}} \tilde{L}_j e^{-i \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} \tau} \rho_n e^{i \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} \tau} \tilde{L}_j \right] \geq 0 \ \forall \lambda, \tau, \) and \( \int_0^\infty d\tau \ w_{n \to n+1} (\tau) = \text{Tr} \rho_{n+1} = 1 \). Note that the waiting time distribution is not restricted to stationary states and may vary substantially between different jump orders, depending on whether \( \rho_n \) resides in a long- or a short-lived state.
EXAMPLES

Two-level system undergoing amplitude damping.— Our first example is a single qubit exposed to amplitude damping, characterized by a single Lindblad operator $\hat{L} = \hat{\sigma}_- = |0\rangle\langle 1|$. This describes, e.g., a two-level system in a zero temperature bath. A general Hamiltonian can be written as $\hat{H} = \hat{h} \cdot \hat{\sigma}$, with the Pauli operators $\{\hat{\sigma}_x, \hat{\sigma}_y, \hat{\sigma}_z\}$. The effective Hamiltonian then reads $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}} = -i\hbar \frac{2}{\gamma} \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} + \hat{h}_{\text{eff}} \cdot \hat{\sigma}$, with $\hat{h}_{\text{eff}} = (\hat{h}_x, \hat{h}_y, \hat{h}_z - i\hbar \frac{2}{\gamma} \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a})$. The evolution operator describing the deterministic dynamics between consecutive jumps equals $e^{-\hat{H}_{\text{eff}} \tau} = e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2} \hat{a} \hat{a}^\dagger \tau} \left\{ \cos \left[ \frac{\gamma}{\hbar} \frac{\tau}{\hbar} \right] \mathbf{1}_2 - i \frac{\gamma}{\hbar} \sin \left[ \frac{\gamma}{\hbar} \frac{\tau}{\hbar} \right] \hat{h}_{\text{eff}} \cdot \hat{\sigma} \right\}$, where $h_{\text{eff}} = \sqrt{h_x^2 + h_y^2 + h_z^2 - \hbar^2 \gamma^2 / 16 - i\hbar \gamma h_z / 2}$, and $\sin x = x^{-1} \sin x$.

Clearly, the ground state $|0\rangle$ is a dark state of the system if and only if $\hat{H} = \hbar \gamma \hat{\sigma}_z$, since $\hat{L}|0\rangle = 0$ and $[\hat{h}_z, \sigma_z]|0\rangle = 0$. Indeed, if $\hat{H} = 0$, the jumptime evolution $e^{-i\hat{h} \tau}$ evaluates as $\rho_{n+1} = (1/|\rho_0\rangle\langle 0|) \rho_0$, i.e., $\rho_1 = (1/|\rho_0\rangle\langle 0|) \rho_0$ and $\rho_2 = 0$; the jumptime evolution ends after the first jump latest.

On the other hand, if $\hat{H} = \hbar \gamma \hat{\sigma}_x (h_x \neq 0)$, then $[\hat{H}, |0\rangle\langle 0|] \neq 0$ and the dark state is removed. Let us examine the special case $h_x = \hbar \gamma / 4$, i.e., the “exceptional point” where $h_{\text{eff}} = 0$, and hence $e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2} \hat{a} \hat{a}^\dagger \tau} = e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2} \tau} \left\{ \mathbf{1}_2 - i \frac{\gamma}{\hbar} \left[ \hat{a} \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{\sigma}_x - i \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} \hat{\sigma}_x \right] \right\}$. The jumptime evolution $e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2} \hat{a} \hat{a}^\dagger \tau}$ now equals $\rho_{n+1} = |0\rangle\langle 0|$, i.e., the ground state becomes the steady state right after the first jump, with the waiting time distribution $w_{n \rightarrow n+1}(\tau) = \frac{\gamma^2 \hbar^2}{16} e^{-\gamma^2 \tau}$. Similar jumptime evolutions hold for general $h_x \neq 0$ (or any Hamiltonian that does not commute with $|0\rangle\langle 0|$). In contrast, the stationary states of the corresponding walltime master equation lie on the surface of an ellipsoid in the Bloch sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$.

Alternatively, we can remove the dark state by increasing temperature, which adds $\hat{L}' = \sqrt{\beta} \hat{\sigma}_z$ as a jump operator, where $x > 0$ denotes the ratio between the rates of the two processes. Even for $\hat{H} = 0$, we then obtain $\rho_{n+1} = \hat{\sigma}_- \rho_n \hat{\sigma}_+ + \hat{\sigma}_+ \rho_n \hat{\sigma}_-$, describing ongoing population inversion. Note that the jumptime evolution is “universal”: it is independent of $x$. Moreover, in contrast to the stationary states in walltime, the system here assumes a limit cycle. At the same time, the waiting time distribution $w_{n \rightarrow n+1}(\tau) = \frac{\gamma^2 \hbar^2}{16} e^{-\gamma^2 \tau}$. Similar jumptime evolutions hold for general $h_x \neq 0$ (or any Hamiltonian that does not commute with $|0\rangle\langle 0|$). In contrast, the stationary states of the corresponding walltime master equation lie on the surface of an ellipsoid in the Bloch sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$.

Two-level system with dephasing.— Another paradigmatic process is the dephasing of a qubit, described by the single Lindblad operator $\hat{L} = \hat{\sigma}_z$. Clearly, there are no dark states, independently from the Hamiltonian. For a general Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \hbar \cdot \hat{\sigma}$, the effective Hamiltonian reads $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}} = -i\hbar \frac{2}{\gamma} \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} + \hbar \cdot \hat{\sigma}$, and the conditioned time evolution operator is given by $e^{-\hat{H}_{\text{eff}} \tau} = e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2} \hbar \gamma} \left\{ \cos \left[ \frac{\gamma}{\hbar} \frac{\tau}{\hbar} \right] \mathbf{1}_2 - i \frac{\gamma}{\hbar} \sin \left[ \frac{\gamma}{\hbar} \frac{\tau}{\hbar} \right] \hbar \cdot \hat{\sigma} \right\}$, with $\hbar = |\hbar|$. The jumptime evolution can be determined analytically for arbitrary $\hat{H}$. For simplicity, we focus on $\hat{H} = h_z \sigma_z$, which gives

$$\rho_{n+1} = \sigma_z \rho_n \sigma_z + \frac{2 h_z^2}{4 h_z^2 + h_z^2} (\rho_n - \sigma_z \rho_n \sigma_z) + \frac{h_z}{4 h_z^2 + h_z^2} i[\sigma_z, \rho_n].$$

(13)

The waiting time distribution takes, for any $\hat{H}$, the state-independent form $w_{n \rightarrow n+1}(\tau) = \gamma e^{-\gamma \tau}$. For $\hat{H} = 0$, i.e., pure dephasing, further simplifies to $\rho_{n+1} = \sigma_z \rho_n \sigma_z$, or $\rho_n = \sigma_z \rho_n \sigma_z$, which again describes a cyclic evolution. Remarkably, we find that purity $\rho$ is conserved, $\rho_n = \text{Tr} (\rho_n^2) = \text{Tr} (\rho_0^2)$, in stark contrast to the monotonous purity decay in walltime.

Damped harmonic oscillator.— In this (finite-dimensional state-space) example, the Hamiltonian is given by $\hat{H} = \hbar \omega (\hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} + \frac{1}{2})$, where the annihilation operator $\hat{a}$ also represents the single jump operator, $\hat{L} = \hat{a}$. This describes, e.g., a lossy cavity mode. The effective Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}} = \hbar \omega (\hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} + \frac{1}{2}) - i\hbar \frac{2}{\gamma} \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a}^\dagger$ is then diagonal in the Fock basis $|m\rangle$, since $\hat{a}^\dagger |m\rangle = \hat{a}^\dagger \sqrt{m} |m-1\rangle = m |m\rangle$. Moreover, the ground state $|0\rangle$ describes a dark state, as $\hat{a}^\dagger |0\rangle = 0$ and $[\hat{H}, |0\rangle\langle 0|] = 0$.

If we evaluate the jumptime evolution $e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2} \hbar \gamma \tau}$ in the Fock basis, we obtain $\langle m | \rho_{n+1} | m' \rangle = K(m, m')(m+1) |\rho_n|m'+1\rangle$, with the propagator

$$K(m, m') = \frac{2 \gamma \sqrt{(m+1)(m'+1)}}{(2 + m + m') \gamma - 2 i \omega (m'-m)}.$$ (14)

The explicit solution then reads $\langle m | \rho_n | m' \rangle = K(m, m')^n (m + n | \rho_0 | m' + n)$, where $K(m, m) = 1$. Due to the presence of the dark state, the trace of the jumptime-evolved state is in general not preserved: $\text{Tr} (\rho_n) = \sum_{m=0}^\infty \langle m | \rho_n | m \rangle = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} | \rho_0 | m \rangle \leq 1$. Instead, $\text{Tr} (\rho_n)$ here describes the probability that $n$ jumps occur/can be observed, i.e., the fraction of quantum trajectories that arrive at the nth jump.

For instance, an initial Fock state $\rho_0 = |N\rangle\langle N|$ is reduced in its excitation number, $\rho_n = |N-n\rangle\langle N-n|$, until it reaches the ground/dark state, where the jumptime evolution ends, $\rho_n = 0$ for $n > N$. The jumptime evolution of an initial coherent state, $\rho_0 = |\alpha\rangle\langle \alpha|$, is shown in Figure 2. In contrast to the corresponding walltime evolution, the jumptime-evolved state deviates from a coherent state.

Collisional decoherence.— As our final example, we consider a free particle exposed to an environment exerting momentum kicks, e.g., a heavy test particle immersed in a background gas of light particles. This situation is governed by the master equation $\partial_t \rho = -i\hbar \left[ \hat{H}, \rho \right] + \sum_q \hbar \left[ d_q G(q) \left\{ \hat{L}_q \rho \hat{L}_q^\dagger - \rho \right\}, \rho \right]$, where the jump operators $\hat{L}_q = e^{i \pi q \hat{\sigma}}$ describe momentum kicks, controlled by...
the momentum transfer distribution $G(q)$. In momentum representation, the jumptime evolution evaluates as

$$
\langle p | \rho_{n+1} | p' \rangle = \int dq G(q) K(p-q, p'-q) \langle p-q | \rho_n | p'-q \rangle,
$$

with the propagator

$$
K(p, p') = \left[ 1 + it \frac{(p-p')(p+p')}{2m\hbar\gamma} \right]^{-1}. \tag{15}
$$

There are no dark states present in this open continuous-variable system, giving rise to an ongoing jump progression. In line with the walltime evolution, the momentum expectation value is invariant, $\langle \hat{p} \rangle_{n+1} = \langle \hat{p} \rangle_n$, while the momentum variance stroboscopically grows, $\langle (\Delta \hat{p})^2 \rangle_{n+1} = (\langle (\Delta \hat{p})^2 \rangle_n + \Delta_0^2$), with $\Delta_0^2 = \int dq q^2 G(q)$. Similarly, the position expectation value evolves in steps $\langle \hat{x} \rangle_{n+1} = (\langle \hat{x} \rangle_n + \langle \hat{p} \rangle_n / (m\gamma)$. The state-independent waiting time distribution between jumps reads $w_{n\rightarrow n+1}(\tau) = \gamma e^{-\gamma \tau}$. Note that, in the quantum Zeno limit, $\gamma \to \infty$, the jumptime motion comes to a halt: $\langle \hat{x} \rangle_{n+1} = \langle \hat{x} \rangle_n$.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Quantum jump trajectories emerge—physically—from continuous quantum measurements, or—formally—from unraveling Markovian quantum master equations. If they are ensemble-averaged in walltime, a quantum master equation is recovered. We demonstrated that they can also be consistently ensemble-averaged at jump counts, resulting in a discrete, deterministic evolution equation. The latter keeps track of the signature quantum jumps and thus represents a hybrid between the individual (stochastic) quantum trajectories and the associated (deterministic but jump-oblivious) walltime master equation. As such, it delivers a novel way to analyze ensembles of quantum jump trajectories and quantum master equations, both conceptually and practically.

The examples discussed above show that the jumptime and walltime evolutions can be quite dissimilar. The jumptime dynamics may demonstrate curious universality and limit cycle behavior. The proposed approach is useful, for instance, for studies of dynamical phase transitions, dissipative transport, and topological features in open systems. Moreover, it may provide a new perspective on non-Hermitian physics. Ultimately, it may be seen as an alternative way of approaching and interpreting continuous quantum measurements, be it in theory or experiment.
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