Projective quantum measurements in a tight-binding chain: Stochastic localization and Zeno effect
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We address here the issue of quantum measurement in which the interaction between the system at hand and the measuring apparatus causes a collapse of the wave function or the associated density operator. The analysis is carried out for the prototypical tight-binding chain involving a quantum particle hopping between nearest-neighbour sites on a lattice, with the system subject to repeated projective measurements to a given detector site. However, unlike previous work, the measurements are performed at random times. In the absence of measurement, the particle while starting from a site is known to spread out to farther and farther sites as time progresses, thus leading to complete delocalization of the particle in time. In presence of measurements, by using a stochastic Liouville equation approach, we derive exact results for the probability at a given time for the particle to be found on different sites and averaged with respect to different realizations of the dynamics. We consider the representative case in which the time gap between successive measurements are sampled independently from an exponential distribution. The novel result of our findings is the revelation of the striking dynamical effect of Stochastic Localization, whereby the particle has at long times time-independent probabilities for it to be found on different sites, and thus achieved classical stochasticity with involving with sampled of the random times for measurements. An extreme case of such localization is attained if the measurements are done very frequently, when the particle is at long times completely localized at the detector site! We also point out the stochastic version of the quantum Zeno effect, whereby the dynamical evolution of a quantum system is arrested through repeated measurements at frequent-enough time intervals. In the wake of recent experiments on projective measurements at random times achieved through randomly-pulsed sequences, our proposition of Stochastic Localization is amenable to experimental realization.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum measurement is an important topic of contemporary interest in the context of measurement theory as well as quantum information. Unlike classical measurement processes, quantum measurements are characterized by non-negligible and irreversible interaction between the measuring apparatus and the system of interest. For instance, the spin of a fundamental particle such as an electron can point in an arbitrary direction but when led to a measurement by way of an applied magnetic field, the spin is forced into an eigenstate corresponding to it being aligned along or opposite to the field direction. Projective measurements are a class of experiments in which the system is subject to repeated measurements at each of which it is projected into a given quantum state dictated by the apparatus. When such measurements are carried out at regular intervals of time, Misra and Sudarshanshad shown in a landmark paper that the system gets stuck in a given state in the limit in which the measurements are sufficiently frequent. This is called the quantum Zeno effect [1].

A similar effect was discussed by Simonius that goes by the name of the Watched Pot Effect – a pot that is being continually watched will not boil at all [2]. A realization of the watched pot effect can be found in the condensed matter example of a quantum particle finding itself in a symmetric double-well. The left and the right well can be mapped into the ‘boiled’ and the ‘un-boiled’ state, respectively. The quantum particle will ordinarily tunnel back and forth between the two wells – a completely coherent process. However, when brought in contact with a quantum environment – akin to a measuring apparatus – with which the particle couples strongly, tunneling becomes incoherent and the particle gets localized into one of the wells [3]. Unlike the Zeno effect, this problem is however one in which the measurements (or environmental interactions) are at random, mimicking the dissipative nature of the environment.

The double-well problem can be abstracted into a two-state (or a two-site) system, and random or stochastic projective measurements in such a two-state system have been considered [4], thereby providing a stochastic version of the quantum Zeno effect. In this paper, we treat a non-trivial multisite generalization of the two-site case in the form of an infinite tight-binding chain (TBC) described by a tight-binding Hamiltonian. The tight-binding model (TBM) [5, 6] is a textbook description of a quantum solid in which an electron is assumed mostly localized on the sites of a lattice but because of spontaneous quantum fluctuations makes occasional tunnelling to nearest-neighbour sites. Specifically, the tight-binding Hamiltonian modeling the motion of a quantum particle, e.g., an electron, between the nearest-neighbour sites of a one-dimensional lattice is given by

\[ H = -\frac{\hbar \Delta}{2} \sum_{n=\pm \infty} (|n\rangle\langle n+1| + |n+1\rangle\langle n|), \]

where \( \Delta > 0 \) is the nearest-neighbour intersite hopping integral, and \( |n\rangle \) is the so-called Wannier state denoting the state of the particle when located on site \( n \). The Wannier states form a set of complete basis states satisfying \( \langle m|n \rangle = \delta_{mn} \) and
\[ \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} |m\rangle\langle m| = \mathbb{I}. \] Here, we have taken the lattice spacing to be unity, without loss of generality. From now on, we will set the Planck’s constant to unity.

The TBM plays a critical role in the band theory of solids. With the advent of mesoscopic physics, the TBM finds relevance in a one-dimensional nanowire [7–9]. Our aim in this paper is to put the subject of projective quantum measurements in the context of the TBM and derive certain exact conclusions that can be tested experimentally in a nanowire.

Experimentally, as it turns out, it is more convenient to implement a random or a stochastic sequence of measurement protocol [10–14] rather than the regular set of measurements as envisaged in the original paper of Misra and Sudarshan [1]. Indeed, experiments aiming to implement projective measurements to demonstrate the Zeno effect would typically employ a timer to time the gap between successive measurements, and because the timer would invariably be of finite precision that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to ensure that measurements are performed at exactly uniform time intervals. This motivates studying the case of measurements at random times, and we adopt this scheme and formulate our problem thus: The quantum particle, e.g., the electron, is taken to begin its journey at time \( t = 0 \) from an arbitrary site \( n_0 \) of the TBC, so that the corresponding density operator is \( \rho(0) = |n_0\rangle\langle n_0| \). It then streams unitarily under the Hamiltonian (1) until time \( t_1 \) at which an instantaneous projective measurement takes place due to a detector placed on an arbitrary site \( N \); the time \( t_1 \) is random in the sense that it is sampled from an underlying probability distribution. The measurement projects the density operator into the form \( |N\rangle\langle N| \). Subsequent to the measurement, the sojourn of the particle begins anew from the site \( N \) and an unitary evolution follows until time \( t_2 (t_2 > t_1) \), again random, when a second projective measurement takes place due to the detector on site \( N \) and subsequent to which the particle evolution is renewed a second time. This ongoing ‘renewal’ process, much akin to the random walk scenario of Montroll et al. [15–17], continues at a sequence of random times \( t_1 < t_2 < t_3 < \ldots t_p < \ldots \), and finally, we may ask at time \( t \) about the probability \( P_m(t) \) for the particle to be on an arbitrary site \( m \) of the lattice.

Our aforementioned stochastic model of projective measurements follows in the footsteps of Clauser and Blume [18], in which the said authors, interested in spectral lineshape calculations, imagined a quantum system to be subject to a random set of delta-function (in time) pulses governed by an exponential distribution. The treatment [19, 20] is adapted here for deriving a stochastic Liouville equation, as in Refs. [21] and [4], for the Laplace transform of the averaged density operator \( \overline{\rho}(t) \). The averaging is with respect to different realizations of the time sequence \( \{ t_p \} \) subject to the constraint that the site occupation probability \( P_m(t) \) for the different realizations is computed at the same fixed time \( t \). A key ingredient, apart from the free TBC Hamiltonian, is a projection or a transition operator in the form of a ‘superoperator’ that is suitably tailored to yield the assumed nature of each projective measurement. The final target is to calculate the averaged site occupation probability \( \overline{P}_m(t) \). An expression for \( P_m(t) \) is known exactly for the TBC in the case of no measurement, when obviously no averaging of the density operator needs to be performed; this exact result offers a check of our derived analytical results.

Our central findings concern the revelation of the remarkable effect of Stochastic Localization of a quantum particle evolving according to our scheme of projective measurements at random times. To appreciate the striking nature of this effect, let us refer to Fig. 1, where the upper panel depicts known results for the site occupation probability \( P_m(t) \) in the absence of any measurement, with the particle starting at time \( t = 0 \) from site \( n_0 = 25 \). As may be seen from the plot, the particle spreads out to farther and farther sites as time progresses. This phenomenon, aptly dubbed Delocalization of the quantum particle, is of course a purely quantum effect, being induced by the unitary evolution of the particle under the Hamiltonian (1). Delocalization is best quantified by the behavior of the mean-squared displacement (MSD) of the particle about its initial location, defined as \( S(t) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} (m - m_0)^2 P_m(t) \). Concomitant with the spreading of the particle is observed a quadratic growth of \( S(t) \) with time, leading to its eventual divergence. One may ask: Is there a way to contain this ever-spreading motion of the particle? In a classical setting, application of a bounded potential that creates an effective restoring force towards a spatial point or region naturally arrests the free spreading of a particle. In the same vein, it was revealed in Ref. [5] that application of an electric field varying sinusoidally with time serves to localize the particle and have a bounded MSD, provided the ratio of the field magnitude and the field frequency has a very special value, namely, a root of the ordinary Bessel function of order zero; the particle is delocalized for all other values of the ratio. It is immediately pertinent to ask: Can we do any better? And if we can, we ought to do that better, since fine-tuning the ratio of the field magnitude and frequency to be precisely a root of the Bessel function could be but a theorist’s dream not easy to achieve in experiments.

In this work, we show that we can certainly do better, in that we do not need to apply even an external field but just subjecting the system to repeated projective measurements at random times leads to an efficient localization of the particle and an MSD that is bounded in time. A key result of our analysis is shown in the lower panel of Fig. 1. Here, we plot our exact results derived in this paper for the averaged site occupation probability \( \overline{P}_m(t) \) for four values of time \( t \). The data are for the case of evolution involving measurements at exponentially-distributed time gaps due to a detector placed at the same location as the initial position of the particle, i.e., with \( N = n_0 \). Note that in this case, a source of randomness in addition to the one related to quantum measurements is the classical stochasticity associated with sampling of the random times at which projective measurements are performed. It is evident from the plots in the lower panel that as time progresses, the site occupation probability attains a stationary form, implying thereby that at long times, the particle has time-independent probabilities for it to be found on different sites. Consequently, there is no spreading of the particle at long times. This effect is what we call Stochastic Localization. An extreme case of such localization ensues if the
measurements are done very frequently, i.e., with the average time gap between successive measurements approaching zero. In this case, the particle is at long times completely localized at the measurement site and remains so for all times to come! Thus, in stark contrast to the case in the upper panel, the ever-spreading behavior of the particle motion is arrested, not through application of external field with magnitude and frequency satisfying special conditions, but merely through subjecting the system to repeated projective measurements at random time instances. As has been mentioned earlier, the latter scenario is now very much an experimental reality, and so our proposition offers straightforward amenability to experimental realization.

![Figure 1](image)

**FIG. 1.** The figure shows for the tight-binding model (3) the site occupation probability $P_m(t)$ as a function of $m$ and for four values of time $t$. The upper panel shows the results in the absence of any measurement, given by Eq. (14), while the lower panel shows the averaged site occupation probability (45) corresponding to the system being subject to instantaneous projective measurements at random times. Here, the initial position of the particle is $n_0 = 25$, the detector position is $N = n_0$, while the dynamical parameters (see text) have values $\Delta = 1.0$ and $\lambda = 0.25$. While the upper panel suggests a spreading of the particle to farther and farther sites as time progresses (Delocalization), the data in the lower plot imply relaxation to a stationary state in which the particle has time-independent probabilities to be found on different sites (Stochastic Localization). In the lower panel, we see that the data for $t = 15$ and $t = 20$ fall on top of each other (and therefore represent the stationary state), and match with those for $t = 5$ only for values of $m$ around $n_0$. The latter fact reveals that while the region around the peak of $P_m(t)$ for $t = 5$ has relaxed to the stationary state, its tails are yet to relax.

The TBM (and related systems) when subject to projective measurements has in recent years been extensively studied in the context of detection problem corresponding to a quantum particle evolving under the dynamics to arrive at a chosen set of sites [22–35]. However, all these papers focus on the first time the quantum particle arrives at a chosen set of detection sites, unlike our treatment in which repeated detections are taken into account. Further, barring [36], the aforementioned contributions almost exclusively deal with measurements at uniform intervals of times in contrast to the scheme considered in this work in which sequence of measurements at random times is considered that, for reasons mentioned above, may be more in tune with an experimental protocol. In addition, none of the papers mentioned in the foregoing address the issue of localization when subject to repeated projective measurements at random times and its exact analytical description via a stochastic Liouville equation approach, the subject matter of this work.

Given this background, the paper is section-wise organized as follows. In Sec. II, we recollect known results for the TBC. This allows us to set up in Sec. III via the stochastic Liouville equation approach a Liouville or a superoperator treatment of the averaged density operator *a la* Refs. [18] and [20]. Though the use of Liouville operators is well-known in the literature, we collate in Appendix A a brief summary of associated properties and notations for the sake of completeness, together with a reminder on the notion of superoperators. Section III contains inter alia the crucial input of the transition operator in consonance with our projective measurement scheme. Section IV contains our main results for $P_m(t)$, both analytically derived and numerically verified, for the case of an exponential distribution for the probability of the time sequence \{$t_p$\}. In this section, we allude to the stochastic version of the quantum Zeno effect. Section V discusses the stationary state that $P_m(t)$ attains at long times and its associated properties, and in particular, revelation of the phenomenon of Stochastic Localization. Our principal conclusions are summarized in Sec. VI.

In Appendix B, we outline the method we employ to numerically simulate the dynamics of the TBC subject to projective measurements at random times.

**II. QUANTUM MECHANICS OF TIGHT-BINDING CHAIN (TBC)**

In this section, we collect relevant results for the quantum mechanics of a tight-binding chain. Although most of these results are already documented in the literature vide the work of Dunlap and Kenkre [5], we nevertheless systematically collate them here in order to have a proper setting for the analysis of projective measurements on the system, as discussed in Sec. III onwards.

A particle moving under the Hamiltonian (1) has a motion akin to the ballistic motion of a classical particle. To see this explicitly, we introduce the operators

$$K ≡ \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |n\rangle \langle n+1|, \quad K^\dagger ≡ \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |n+1\rangle \langle n|,$$

(2)
in terms of which we have

\[ H = -\frac{\Delta}{2}(K + K^\dagger). \]  

(3)

Note that \( K \) and \( K^\dagger \) commute with each other, with their product being equal to the unit operator: \( KK^\dagger = K^\dagger K = 1 \). Also, one has \( K^2 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |n\rangle\langle n+2 | \) and \( (K^\dagger)^2 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |n+2 \rangle\langle n| \). That \( K \) and \( K^\dagger \) commute implies that we can find a representation in which \( K \) and \( K^\dagger \) can be simultaneously diagonalized. Such a representation is elicited through the so-called Bloch states, defined in the reciprocal momentum-space as

\[ |k\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-ink} |n\rangle, \]  

(4)

so that we have \(|n\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2\pi}) \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk \exp(ink)|k\rangle\). It is easily verified that

\[ K|k\rangle = e^{-ik}|k\rangle, \quad K^\dagger|k\rangle = e^{ik}|k\rangle, \]  

(5)

thus proving that the Bloch state \(|k\rangle\) is indeed an eigenstate of \( K \) and \( K^\dagger \), with eigenvalues \( \exp(-ik) \) and \( \exp(ik) \), respectively. We therefore have

\[ e^{Hi}\frac{m}{2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi \cdot \pi}} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk \ e^{ikm} e^{Hi}|k\rangle \]

\[ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk \ e^{ikm} e^{-i\Delta \cos k}|k\rangle, \]  

(6)

where in obtaining the last equality, one uses Eq. (5). We therefore have on using \( \langle k'|k\rangle = \delta(k-k') \) that

\[ \langle m|e^{Hi}\frac{m}{2}|m'\rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk \ e^{-ik(m-m')-i\Delta \cos k}. \]  

(7)

Let us now ask the question: what is the probability \( P_m(t) \) that the particle is on site \( m \) at time \( t > 0 \), given that the particle was on site \( n_0 \) at time \( t = 0 \)? By definition, we have

\[ P_m(t) = \langle m|\rho(t)|m\rangle. \]  

(8)

Here, \( \rho(t) \) is the density operator of the system, which time evolution follows the Liouville equation

\[ \frac{\partial \rho(t)}{\partial t} = -i\mathcal{L} \rho(t), \]  

(9)

where \( \mathcal{L} \) is the Liouville operator defined as \( \mathcal{L} \rho \equiv [H, \rho] \).

See Appendix A for a short introduction to Liouville operators. Equation (9) has the formal solution

\[ \rho(t) = e^{-i\mathcal{L}t} \rho(0) = e^{-iHt} \rho(0) e^{iHt}, \]  

(10)

where the last equality follows from the rule of evolution of the density operator in the Heisenberg picture, see Appendix A. Equation (10) implies unitary evolution of the density operator that preserves its trace: \( \text{Tr}[\rho(t)] = 1 \forall t \). In our case, we have \( \rho(0) = |n_0\rangle\langle n_0| \), so that it may be shown on using Eq. (7) that

\[ P_m(t) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk' \ e^{i(m-n_0)(k-k')} e^{-i\Delta \cos k't}, \]  

(11)

with

\[ \Gamma_{kk'} \equiv \Delta(\cos k' - \cos k). \]  

(12)

It may be checked that as desired, \( \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} P_m(t) = 1 \). Using the identities \( \exp(-i\Delta \cos k) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \exp(-im\pi/2 + ink)J_m(\Delta) \) [5], with \( J_n(x) \) the Bessel function of the first kind, and \( \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk \ e^{im(k-n)k} e^{-i\Delta \cos k't} = \frac{2\pi}{\Delta} \delta_{mn} \), one may straightforwardly show that

\[ \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{dk}{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{dk'}{\pi} \ e^{im(k-k')} e^{-i\Delta \cos k't} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \delta_{kk'}, \]  

(13)

Then, from Eq. (11), we get [37]

\[ P_m(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi m-n_0}(\Delta), \]  

(14)

implying that \( \Delta \) sets the intrinsic time scale in the model. The Fourier transform of the function \( P_m(t) \), given by \( \tilde{P}(k,t) \equiv 1/(\sqrt{2\pi}) \sum_{m=\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-i\Delta km)P_m(t) \), is obtained as

\[ \tilde{P}(k,t) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3/2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{dk}{\pi} \ e^{-i\Delta (\cos(k+k')-\cos k')}, \]  

(15)

using \( \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-i(k+k_1-k_2)m) = 2\pi \delta(k+k_1-k_2) \).

Equation (11) implies that the particle while starting from the site \( n_0 \) eventually spreads out to other sites of the lattice. The average displacement from the initial location \( n_0 \) is given by

\[ \mu \equiv \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} (m-n_0) \frac{1}{2\pi} \left( \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{dk}{\pi} \right) \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{dk}{\pi} \ e^{im(k-n_0)k} e^{-i\Delta \cos k'}, \]  

(16)

since Eq. (11) implies that \( P_m(t) \) is invariant under \( m-n_0 \rightarrow -(m-n_0) \). Let us then compute the mean-squared displacement (MSD) of the particle about \( n_0 \):

\[ S(t) \equiv \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} (m-n_0)^2 P_m(t) \]

\[ = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} m^2 P_m(t) + n_0^2 - 2n_0 \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} m P_m(t), \]  

(17)

where we have used \( \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} P_m(t) = 1 \). Now, we have \( \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} m P_m(t) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} (m-n_0) P_m(t) = n_0 \), so that \( S(t) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} m^2 P_m(t) - n_0^2 \). In terms of \( \tilde{P}(k,t) \), we get \( S(t) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} m^2 P_m(t) = -\sqrt{2\pi} \Delta^2 \left( \frac{\tilde{P}(k,t)}{\frac{dk}{2\pi}} \right) |k=0, \) using which it may be shown straightforwardly that

\[ S(t) = \frac{\Delta^2 t^2}{2}. \]  

(18)

Thus, we see that the MSD has a quadratic time dependence similar to the case of the ballistic motion of a free classical particle but with a ‘quantal’ speed equal to \( \Delta/\sqrt{2} \). In interpreting Eq. (18), note that we have set the lattice spacing to unity at the outset.
III. REPEATED PROJECTIVE MEASUREMENTS AND AVERAGED DENSITY OPERATOR

In this section, we first discuss in detail our scheme of measurement sequence for a general quantum system, and follow it up with its application to the TBC. We also set up via the stochastic Liouville equation approach a Liouville or superoperator treatment of the averaged density operator. We consider the quantum system to be undergoing unitary evolution in time that is subject to instantaneous projective measurements at random times, up to a certain fixed time. Specifically, a typical realization of the dynamics for time $t$ involves the following: Starting with a density operator $\rho(0)$, a unitary evolution for a random time is followed by an instantaneous projective measurement according to a given projection or transition operator $T$. The result is subject to unitary evolution for another random time, followed by another instantaneous projective measurement. Continuing in this way over the time interval $[0, t]$, a realization of the evolution may involve $p \geq 0$ number of instantaneous projective measurements occurring at random time instances $t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_p$, with the times $\tau_p \equiv t_p - t_{p-1}; t_0 = 0$ between successive measurements being random variables that we choose to be sampled independently from a common distribution $p(\tau)$. A relevant and representative choice for $p(\tau)$ is an exponential distribution:

$$p(\tau) = \lambda e^{-\lambda \tau},$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is the inverse of the average time between two successive measurements. In Fig. 2, we show a schematic diagram of the aforementioned measurement protocol.

![FIG. 2. The figure shows according to the scheme detailed in Section III a typical evolution of a quantum system for time $t$ (shown by a blue dot on the time axis). Starting with a density operator $\rho(0)$, the evolution involves the following repetitive sequence of events: unitary evolution for time $\tau_{p'} \equiv t_{p'} - t_{p'-1}; t_0 = 0, p' = 1, 2, \ldots, p$ followed by instantaneous projective measurement (denoted by red arrows). The evolution ends with unitary evolution for time duration $t - t_p$. The averaged density operator (averaged over different realizations of the measurement dynamics detailed above) at time $t$ reads](image)

$$\overline{\rho}(t) = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \int_0^t \! dp \int_0^{t_1} \! dp_1 \cdots \int_0^{t_{p-1}} \! dp_{p-1} \int_0^{t_p} \! dt \int_0^{t_2} \! dt_1 \cdots \int_0^{t_3} \! dt_3 \int_0^{t_1} \! dt_1 \times \left(F(t - t_p)e^{-i\mathcal{L}(t - t_p)}T \rho(t_p - t_{p-1})e^{-i\mathcal{L}(t_p - t_{p-1})}T \cdots T \rho(t_2 - t_1)e^{-i\mathcal{L}(t_2 - t_1)}T \rho(t_1)e^{-i\mathcal{L}t_1} \rho(0) \right)$$

where $U(t)$ is a superoperator in the sense that it acts on one operator, namely $\rho(0)$, to yield another operator given by the left hand side. Appendix A provides a reminder on superoperators. In Eq. (20), the quantity $F(t)$ is the probability for no measurement to occur during time $t$. Equation (20) is easy to interpret (refer Fig. 2). Starting at time $t_0 = 0$ with the density operator $\rho(0)$, a realization of the dynamics involving the time sequence $\{0, t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_p\}$ and observation at time $t > t_p$ would comprise unitary evolution (i.e., following Eq. (10)) for time $t_1 = t_1 - t_0$, the probability of which is $p(\tau_1)$, followed by a projection, again unitary evolution for $t_2 = t_2 - t_1$, followed by a projection, and so on, until the last measurement in the sequence performed at time $t_p$, and then unitary evolution until the time $t$ of observation, that is, for duration $t - t_p$. No measurement should happen during this duration $t - t_p$, the probability of which is provided by the factor $F(t)$. Integrating over all possible values of $t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_p$ and summing over all possible values of $p$ yield the averaged density operator in Eq. (20).

In order to proceed, let us now recall the result for Laplace transform of a series of convolutions. The convolution between two functions $g_1(t)$ and $g_2(t)$ over an interval $[0, t]$ is defined as $g_1 * g_2 \equiv \int_0^t \! dt \, g_1(t - \tau)g_2(t - \tau)$. We then have $\mathcal{L}(g_1 * g_2) = \mathcal{L}(g_1)\mathcal{L}(g_2)$, with $\mathcal{L}$ denoting the Laplace transform operator. Generalizing the result to any number of convolutions, and applying it to Eq. (20), we get

$$\overline{\mathcal{L}}(\rho)(t) = \mathcal{L}(\rho(0)); \quad \mathcal{L}(F(t)e^{-i\mathcal{L}t}) \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \left[T \mathcal{L}(p(t)e^{-i\mathcal{L}t})\right]^p \quad \frac{\mathcal{L}(F(t)e^{-i\mathcal{L}t})}{1 - T \mathcal{L}(p(t)e^{-i\mathcal{L}t})}$$

where in the last step we have used the operator identity

$$(A - B)^{-1} = A^{-1} + A^{-1}B(A - B)^{-1}$$

with $A = 1$ and $B = T \mathcal{L}(p(t)e^{-i\mathcal{L}t})$. 

\[\boxed{}\]
For the case of exponential distribution of time gaps between two successive measurements, Eq. (19), we have $p(t) = \lambda \exp(-\lambda t)$ and $F(t) = \lambda \int_0^t \exp(-\lambda \tau) = \exp(-\lambda t)$. Then, using the result
\begin{equation}
\mathcal{L}(r^ne^{-at}u(t)) = \int_0^\infty dr e^{-(s+a)r}n! = \frac{n!}{(s+a)^{n+1}},
\end{equation}
where $n \in \{0, 1, \ldots, \infty\}$ and $u(t)$ is the unit-step function, one may obtain from Eq. (23) that
\begin{equation}
\tilde{U}(s) = [(s + \lambda)\mathbb{I} + i\mathcal{L} - T\lambda]^{-1}.
\end{equation}
Using the operator identity (24), we may expand $\tilde{U}(s)$ in Eq. (26) in an infinite series as
\begin{equation}
\tilde{U}(s) = \tilde{U}_0(s) + \lambda \tilde{U}_0(s)T\tilde{U}_0(s) + \lambda^2 \tilde{U}_0(s)T\tilde{U}_0(s)T\tilde{U}_0(s) + \ldots,
\end{equation}
where we have
\begin{equation}
\tilde{U}_0(s) \equiv [(s + \lambda)\mathbb{I} + i\mathcal{L}]^{-1}.
\end{equation}
Armed with the above background, we now specialize to the TBC. In our case, we have
\begin{equation}
\rho(0) = |n_0\rangle\langle n_0|,
\end{equation}
while the projection operator $T$ projects the instantaneous density operator into the form $|\mathcal{N}\rangle\langle \mathcal{N}|$.

The matrix elements of the superoperator $\tilde{U}_0(s)$ defined in Eq. (28) may be obtained by referring to Appendix A, and by using Eqs. (25) and (7) as
\begin{equation}
\langle mn|\tilde{U}_0(s)|mn'\rangle' = \langle mn|\int_0^\infty dr e^{-(s + \lambda)|m|} e^{-i\mathcal{L}r}|mn'\rangle' = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk' e^{i(m-m')k - i(n-n')k'} \frac{1}{s + \lambda + i\Gamma k},
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\sum_m \langle mn|\tilde{U}_0(s)|mn\rangle = \frac{1}{s + \lambda},
\end{equation}
which may be shown by using $\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(im(k - k')) = 2\pi \delta(k - k')$.

We want the form of $T$ to be such that subsequent to every projective measurement, the density operator becomes $\rho_+(t) = T\rho_+(t) = |\mathcal{N}\rangle\langle \mathcal{N}|$, with the trace of the operators satisfying $\text{Tr}[\rho_+(t)] = \text{Tr}[\rho_-(t)] = 1 \forall t$ and $\rho_-(t)$ denoting the density operator prior to the measurement. This is guaranteed with the form
\begin{equation}
\langle n_1n_1'|T|n_2n_2'\rangle = \delta_{n_1n_1'} \delta_{n_2n_2'} \delta_{n_1, \mathcal{N}}.
\end{equation}
Indeed, then, we have
\begin{equation}
\langle n|T|n'\rangle = \sum_{n_3n_4} \langle n n'|T|n_3n_4\rangle \langle n_3|\rho_-(t)|n_4\rangle = \delta_{nn'} \delta_{nn'} \sum_{n_3} \langle n_3|\rho_-(t)|n_3\rangle = \delta_{nn'} \delta_{n, \mathcal{N}},
\end{equation}
implying that $T|\rho_-(t)| = |\mathcal{N}\rangle\langle \mathcal{N}|$; here we have used the fact that $\text{Tr}[\rho_-(t)] = 1 \forall t$.

\section{Results for Averaged Site Occupancy Probability}

We now calculate the probability $\overline{P}_m(t)$ for the particle to be on site $m$ at time $t$ evolving according to our scheme of measurements at random times. The overline denotes as in Eq. (20) an average over different realizations of the measurement protocol. By definition, we have
\begin{equation}
\overline{P}_m(t) = \langle m|\overline{\rho}(t)|m\rangle.
\end{equation}
Denoting $\overline{P}_m(t)$ in the Laplace domain by $\overline{P}_m(s)$, one obtains from Eqs. (22) and (27) that
\begin{equation}
\overline{P}_m(s) = \langle m|\tilde{U}_0(s|\rho(0) + \lambda \tilde{U}_0(s)T\tilde{U}_0(s)|\rho(0) + \ldots |m\rangle
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\equiv \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \overline{P}^{(p)}_m(s),
\end{equation}
where $\overline{P}^{(p)}_m(s); p \in [0, \infty)$ is the $p$-th term of the infinite series. From Eq. (35), we get
\begin{equation}
\overline{P}^{(0)}_m(s) = \langle m|\tilde{U}_0(s)\rho(0)|m\rangle
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
= \sum_{n,n'} \langle mn|\tilde{U}_0(s)|nn'\rangle \langle n|\rho(0)|n'\rangle
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
= \langle mn|\tilde{U}_0(s)|n_0n_0\rangle
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk' e^{i(m-n_0)(k-k')} \frac{1}{s + \lambda + i\Gamma k'},
\end{equation}
where we have used Eqs. (29) and (30). The quantity $\overline{P}^{(0)}_m(t)$ may be read off from Eq. (36) to be
\begin{equation}
\overline{P}^{(0)}_m(t) = \frac{e^{-\lambda t}}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk' e^{i(m-n_0)(k-k')} e^{-i\Gamma k' t},
\end{equation}
where we have used Eq. (13).
Similarly, from Eq. (35), we get

\[
\tilde{P}_m^{(1)}(s) = \lambda \sum_{n_1, n_2, n_0} \langle mm | \bar{U}_0(s) | n_1 n_2 \rangle \langle n_1 n_2 | T | n_3 n_4 \rangle \\
\times \langle n_3 n_4 | \bar{U}_0(s) | n_5 n_6 \rangle | \rho(0) \rangle | n_6 \rangle \\
= \lambda \sum_{n_1, n_2} \langle mm | \bar{U}_0(s) | n_1 n_2 \rangle | n_2 n_0 \rangle \\
= \frac{\lambda}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk_1 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk_2 \, e^{i(m-n')(k_1-k_2)} \\
\times \frac{1}{(s+\lambda)(s+\lambda+i\Gamma_{k_1 k_2})},
\]

(38)

where in obtaining the last step, we have used Eqs. (30) and (31). Using the fact that the Laplace transform of a convolution of two functions is given by the product of their individual Laplace transforms, we may write

\[
\tilde{P}_m^{(1)}(s) = \lambda \mathcal{L}\left( \int_0^t dt' e^{-\lambda (t-t')} \right) \\
\times \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk_1 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk_2 \, e^{i(m-n')(k_1-k_2)} \\
\times \frac{1}{(s+\lambda)(s+\lambda+i\Gamma_{k_1 k_2})}.
\]

(39)

where we have used Eq. (13). We thus arrive at the result

\[
\tilde{P}_m^{(1)}(t) = \lambda e^{-\lambda t} \int_0^t dt' J_{m-n'}^2(\Delta t').
\]

(40)

Proceeding in a similar manner, we get

\[
\tilde{P}_m^{(2)}(s) = \frac{\lambda^2}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk_1 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk_2 \, e^{i(m-n')(k_1-k_2)} \\
\times \frac{1}{(s+\lambda)^2(s+\lambda+i\Gamma_{k_1 k_2})}.
\]

(41)

Using the result on Laplace transform of a convolution and Eq. (13), the last equation may be written as

\[
\tilde{P}_m^{(2)}(s) = \lambda^2 \mathcal{L}\left( e^{-\lambda t} \int_0^t dt' (t-t') J_{m-n'}^2(\Delta t') \right)
\]

(42)

yielding

\[
\tilde{P}_m^{(2)}(t) = \lambda^2 e^{-\lambda t} \int_0^t dt' (t-t') J_{m-n'}^2(\Delta t').
\]

(43)

The general expression may thus be written as

\[
\tilde{P}_m^{(p)}(t) = \lambda^p e^{-\lambda t} \int_0^t dt' (t-t')^{p-1} \frac{1}{(p-1)!} J_{m-n'}^2(\Delta t'); \quad p \in [1, \infty),
\]

(44)

so that inverting Eq. (35) back to the time domain and using the above equation, one gets [37]

\[
\tilde{P}_m(t) = e^{-\lambda t} J_{m-n_0}^2(\Delta t) + \lambda \int_0^t dt' e^{-\lambda t'} J_{m-n'}^2(\Delta t').
\]

(45)

Equation (45) is the key result of the paper, yielding the averaged probability at time \( t \) to be on site \( m \) for a quantum particle starting at site \( n_0 \) and evolving under Hamiltonian (1) subject to repeated projective measurements at random times. This result may be contrasted with Eq. (14) that holds in the absence of measurements.

Summing over \( m \) on both sides of Eq. (45), and using the results \( J_{m}(x) = (-1)^m J_m(x) \) and \( 1 = J_0^2(x) + 2 \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} J_m^2(x) \), we get \( \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{P}_m(t) = \exp(-\lambda t) + \lambda \int_0^t dt' \exp(-\lambda t') = 1 \), as desired.

The result (45) has a simple physical interpretation. The first term on the right hand side arises from those realizations of evolution for time \( t \) that did not involve a single measurement (the probability for which is \( \exp(-\lambda t) \)) [38], so that the corresponding contribution to \( \tilde{P}_m(t) \) would be given by the product of the probability of no measurement for time \( t \) with the probability to be on site \( m \) at time \( t \) in the absence of any measurement and while starting from site \( n_0 \) at time \( t = 0 \). The latter quantity is obtained from our analysis in II as equal to \( \int_{m-n_0}^\infty (\Delta t) \), see Eq. (14). In order to understand the second term on the right hand side, let us appreciate that every time there is a measurement, the system collapses to the state \( |\bar{n} \rangle \) and its evolution starts afresh from site \( \bar{n} \). Consequently, at time \( t \), what should matter is when has been the last measurement, and the corresponding contribution to \( \tilde{P}_m(t) \) would be given by the product of the probability at time \( t \) of the last measurement to occur in the interval \( [t', t'-\Delta t'] \), with \( t' \in [0, t] \), with the probability in the absence of any measurement for the particle to be on site \( m \) owing to evolution for time duration \( t-t' \) while starting from site \( \bar{n} \). The former probability is given by \( \lambda dt' \exp(-\lambda (t-t')) \) [38]. We thus get the contribution as equal to \( \lambda \int_0^t dt' \exp(-\lambda (t-t')) J_m^2(\Delta t (t-t')) \), to which effecting a change of integration variable directly yields the second term on the right hand side of Eq. (45).

Now, using the result \( \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} m J_m^2(x) = n_0 \) (see the paragraph following Eq. (17)), one obtains from Eq. (45) the average displacement of the particle from the initial position \( n_0 \) as

\[
\bar{x}(t) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} (m-n_0) \tilde{P}_m(t) = \langle \bar{n} \rangle - n_0 \left[ 1 - e^{-\lambda t} \right],
\]

(46)

which in the limit \( \lambda \to 0 \) reproduces as expected the result (16). Next, by using the result \( \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} m^2 J_m^2(x) = x^2/2 \) (see Eqs. (17) and (18)), the MSD of the particle about the initial location \( n_0 \) is obtained from Eq. (45) as

\[
\mathbb{S}(t) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} (m-n_0)^2 \tilde{P}_m(t) \\
= \frac{\Delta^2}{\lambda^2} \left[ 1 - e^{-\lambda t}(1 + \lambda t) \right] + \langle \bar{n} \rangle - n_0 \left[ 1 - e^{-\lambda t} \right],
\]

(47)

which in the limit \( \lambda \to 0 \) reproduces correctly the result (18). Figure 3 shows the behavior of averaged site occupation probability \( \tilde{P}_m(t) \) as a function of \( t \) for three different values of \( m \). In the figure, the dashed line in black depicts the analytical result given in Eq. (45), while the continuous line in red is
FIG. 3. The figures show for the tight-binding model (3) the dependence of the averaged site occupation probability $P_m(t)$ on $t$ for three values of $m$, namely, $m = 5$ (first panel), 10 (second panel), and 15 (third panel). The initial location of the particle is $n_0 = 1$, while the location of the detector is $N = 10$; also, we have $\Delta = 1$, and $\lambda = 0.5$. In the plots, the dashed line in black depicts the analytical result given in Eq. (45), while the continuous line in red is obtained from numerical implementation of the dynamics and involving averaging over 4000 realizations and a periodic lattice of $N = 30$ sites; see Appendix B for details on numerical implementation. The dash-dotted line in grey shows the long-time value of $P_m(t)$ given in Eq. (53). The plots show, up to fluctuations due to use of a finite lattice in numerics, a very good agreement between the theoretical and the numerical result.

obtained from numerical implementation of the measurement dynamics averaged over 4000 realizations. Appendix B provides details on the numerical implementation procedure. One may observe a good agreement between numerics and analytical results, the fluctuations in the numerical results about the analytical ones being due to the fact that while our theory is for an infinite chain, the numerics involves for obvious reason a finite lattice.

A. Limit $(\lambda/\Delta) \to 0$

In the limit $(\lambda/\Delta) \to 0$, we may expand the exponentials in Eq. (45) and get to leading order in $\lambda$ that

$$
P_m(t) = 1 - \lambda^{-1} \left[ J_0^2(n_0(D\lambda)) + \int_0^t \lambda^{-1} \left[ J_0^2(n_0(D\lambda')) + \int_0^{\lambda^{-1}} \lambda^{-1} \right] d\lambda' \right].$$

Equation (48) is checked in Fig. 4. In the figure, the continuous lines are obtained by using Eq. (45), while the points are obtained by using Eq. (48). We find that Eq. (48) indeed represents the leading behavior of Eq. (45) in the limit $(\lambda/\Delta) \to 0$.

B. Limit $(\lambda/\Delta) \to \infty$ and the Zeno limit

In order to check the Zeno limit, one needs to place the detector at the initial position $n_0$, and the site of interest $m$ is also the same. Therefore, in this case, we have $m = n_0 = N$. Then, in the limit $(\lambda/\Delta) \to \infty$, one may use Eq. (45) and the fact that the zeroth order Bessel function of the first kind has the expansion $J_0(x) = 1 - (x^2/4)$ for small $x$ [39, Eq. 10.2.2], to write that

$$
P_{n_0}(t) \approx 1 - \frac{\Delta^2}{2\lambda^2} + e^{-\lambda t} \left[ J_0^2(D\lambda) - 1 + \frac{\Delta^2 / 2}{2} \right].$$

As $\lambda \to \infty$, one obtains the Zeno result $P_{n_0}(t) \to 1$. Equation (49) is checked in Fig. 5. In the figure, the continuous lines are obtained by using Eq. (45), while the points are obtained by using Eq. (49). One may observe from the plot that Eq. (49) indeed depicts the leading-order behavior of Eq. (45) in the limit $(\lambda/\Delta) \to \infty$.

Equation (49) represents the leading behavior of Eq. (45) in the limit $(\lambda/\Delta) \to 0$. From Eq. (48), it is evident that as $\lambda$ decreases, $P_m$ approaches in our case the value of $J_0^2(D\lambda)$. That $J_0(x)$ is a non-monotonic function of $x$ explains in the limit $\lambda \to 0$ the non-monotonic behavior of the plots with respect to variation of $\Delta$. The same is evident from Eq. (49).
has the Zeno result that \( P_{m_0}(t) = 1 \). With the variance \( \text{Var}(H) \) equal to \( \lambda^2/2 \), as may be straightforwardly calculated by using the representation (3), we finally have \( P_{m_0}(t) \approx 1 - t \pi \lambda^2/2 \). In our case, wherein \( \tau \) is a random variable with the average value \( \langle \tau \rangle = 1/\lambda \), we may regard \( 1/\lambda \) to be playing the role of the fixed time interval \( \tau \) between measurements in the usual Zeno effect. The result (49) that holds in the limit \( \lambda \to \infty \) at a fixed \( \Delta \) may then be regarded as characterizing stochastic Zeno effect, namely, Zeno effect with classical stochasticity introduced through random \( \tau \). Equation (49) suggests that in contrast to the usual Zeno effect, which as mentioned above displays a correction to the Zeno result that is linear in observation time \( t \), we have an exponentially-suppressed correction term in our case.

![Figure 5](image-url)  
**FIG. 5.** The figure shows for the tight-binding model (3) and in the limit \( \lambda/\Delta \to \infty \) the dependence on \( \lambda \) of the averaged site occupation probability \( P_{m_0} \), with the position of the detector coinciding with the initial position of the particle: \( \mathcal{N} = n_0 \). Here, we have taken \( t = 1 \) and three different values of \( \Delta \). The continuous lines are obtained by using Eq. (45), while the points are obtained by using Eq. (49). It is seen from the plot that Eq. (49) indeed depicts the leading-order behavior of Eq. (45) in the limit \( \lambda/\Delta \to \infty \). The figure implies that with an increase in \( \lambda \), the particle is more likely to be found in the neighborhood of the initial site \( n_0 \). The dashed line in grey is a guide to the eye.

\[
\mathcal{P}_{\text{st}} = \frac{\Gamma\left(\left|m-\mathcal{N}\right|+1/2\right)}{\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma\left(\left|m-\mathcal{N}\right|+1\right)} \frac{1}{2+\lambda^2/\mathcal{N}^2} 2F_1\left(\frac{m-\mathcal{N}}{2}, \frac{3}{4}; \frac{m-\mathcal{N}}{2}+\frac{1}{4}; \frac{4}{(2+\lambda^2/\mathcal{N}^2)^2}\right).
\]

In Fig. 3, the stationary values \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{st}} \) for the three given values of \( m \) are shown by the dash-dotted lines in grey. We see, up to fluctuations due to use of a finite lattice in numerics, a very good agreement between numerics and analytical results.

In the stationary state, the mean displacement and the MSD of the particle about the initial location \( n_0 \), denoted by \( \mathcal{S}_{\text{st}} \) and \( \mathcal{S}_{\text{st}} \), respectively, are obtained from Eqs. (46) and (47) by

\[
\mathcal{S}_{\text{st}} = \frac{\lambda^2}{\alpha^2} + (\mathcal{N} - n_0)^2.
\]

V. STATIONARY SITE OCCUPATION PROBABILITY

It is evident from Fig. 3 that the quantity \( \mathcal{P}_{m}(t) \) relaxes to a stationary value at long times. In order to obtain the latter value analytically, we consider Eq. (45) in the limit \( t \to \infty \). In this limit, the first term on the right hand side drops out; using the fact that \( J_{m}^2(x) = J_{-m}^2(x) = J_{m}^2(x) \) and the integral identity [41]

\[
\int_0^\infty dx e^{-\alpha x} J_\nu(x) J_\nu(\gamma x) = \frac{1}{\pi \sqrt{\nu \beta}} Q_{\nu - 1/2} \left( \frac{\alpha^2 + \beta^2 + \gamma^2}{2 \beta \gamma} \right)
\]

with the conditions \( \text{Re}(\alpha + i\beta + i\gamma) > 0, \gamma > 0, \text{Re}(\nu) > -1/2 \), where \( Q_{\nu}(x) \) being the Legendre function of the second kind, we obtain from Eq. (45) that the stationary-state distribution is given by

\[
\mathcal{P}_{\text{st}} \equiv \lim_{t \to \infty} \mathcal{P}_{m}(t) = \frac{\lambda}{\pi \Delta} Q_{|m-\mathcal{N}|-1/2} \left( 1 + \frac{\lambda^2}{2 \Delta^2} \right).
\]

The function \( Q_{\nu}(x) \) may be constructed from the associated Legendre function of the second kind \( Q_{\nu}^m(x) \) with \( \mu = 0 \). Then, using the relation [39, Eqs. 14.3.3 and 14.3.7]

\[
Q_{\nu}^m(x) = e^{i\mu \pi} \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2^{\nu+1} \nu^{\nu+\mu+1}} \frac{\Gamma(\nu + \mu + 1)}{\Gamma(\nu + 3/2)} \times 2F_1\left(\frac{\nu + \mu}{2} + 1, \frac{\nu + \mu}{2} + 1; \nu + 3/2, x^2\right);
\]

\[
\mu + \nu \neq -1, -2, -3, \ldots,
\]

where \( \Gamma(z) \) and \( 2F_1(a,b;c;z) \) are the Gamma function and the Gauss’ hypergeometric function, respectively, Eq. (51) may be rewritten as

\[
\mathcal{P}_{\text{st}} = \mathcal{P}_{\text{st}}^m = \mathcal{S}_{\text{st}} = \frac{\lambda^2}{\alpha^2} + (\mathcal{N} - n_0)^2.
\]
such measurements reaches at long times a stationary state in which the particle has time-independent values for the probability to be on different sites. Concomitantly, the MSD of the particle about its initial position attain time-independent values. These aspects imply localization of the quantum particle on the lattice through introduction of classical stochasticity, a phenomenon that we refer to as Stochastic Localization. This effect offers a stark contrast when viewed against the results in the absence of any measurement, as discussed in Section II. In this case, the site occupation probability continues to change forever as a function of time see Eq. (14), and in particular, the MSD about the initial position changes quadratically in time, Eq. (18).

A. Limit ($\lambda/\Delta \to 0$)

In order to evaluate the stationary-state distribution $P_{st}^m$ in the limit ($\lambda/\Delta \to 0$), we first note that [39, Sec. 14.2(ii)] $Q_\nu(x) = \Gamma(v+1)Q_\nu(x)$, where $Q_\nu(x)$ is the Olver’s associated Legendre function of order zero. In the limit $x \to 1^+$, one may write [39, Eqs. 14.8.9 and 5.2.2]

$$Q_\nu(x) = -\frac{\ln(x-1)}{2\Gamma(v+1)} + \ln \frac{2\gamma - 2\Gamma'(v+1)/\Gamma(v+1)}{2\Gamma(v+1)} + \mathcal{O}(x-1);$$

$$\nu \neq -1, -2, -3, \ldots,$$

where we have $\Gamma'(x) \equiv d\Gamma(x)/dx$, and $\gamma$ is the Euler-Mascheroni constant, defined as $\gamma \equiv \lim_{n \to \infty} (\sum_{k=1}^{n} 1/k - \ln(n))$. In our case, since we have $\lambda > 0$ and $\Delta > 0$, the limit ($\lambda/\Delta \to 0$) reduces to the limit $\lambda/\Delta \to 0$. Then, from Eqs. (51) and (56), we obtain

$$\lim_{(\lambda/\Delta) \to 0} P_{st}^m = \frac{1}{\pi} \lim_{x \to 0^+} \ln Q_{m-N} - \mathcal{O}(x-1) \equiv 0.$$ 

We thus see that in the limit ($\lambda/\Delta \to 0$), the stationary site occupation probability satisfies $P_{st}^m \to 0 \forall m$. However, since the probability is normalized, what happens in this case is that the particle spreads out over larger number of lattice sites of the infinite chain as ($\lambda/\Delta \to 0$). In Fig. 6, we have plotted $P_{st}^m$ as a function of $m$ for different values of $\lambda$ while keeping $\Delta$ fixed. It is evident from the figure that with a decrease in $\lambda$, the quantity $P_{st}^m$ gets distributed over more lattice sites centered at the detector site $N$. What this suggests is that eventually in the limit ($\lambda/\Delta \to 0$), the particle spreads over the whole infinite lattice chain, yielding $P_{st}^m \to 0$ at a fixed $m$ but nevertheless satisfying $\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} P_{st}^m = 1$. Consistently, the MSD of the particle diverges in this limit, as may be seen from Eq. (55).

B. Limit ($\lambda/\Delta \to \infty$)

From the definition of the Gauss’ hypergeometric function [39, Eq. 15.2.1] $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x^n \Gamma(a+n)\Gamma(b+n)/\Gamma(c+n) = \Gamma(c)/(\Gamma(a)\Gamma(b)\Gamma(c))$, it is seen that $\lim_{x \to \infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x^n \Gamma(a+n)\Gamma(b+n)/\Gamma(c+n) = x!$. Using this result, we obtain from Eq. (53) that

$$\lim_{(\lambda/\Delta) \to \infty} P_{st}^m = x_{m,N}.$$ 

In the limit ($\lambda/\Delta \to \infty$), we get from Eqs. (54) and (55) the results $\Pi_{st}^m = (N-n_0)$ and $\delta_{st} = (N-n_0)^2$, which are consistent with Eq. (58). From Fig. 6, it is seen that with the increase of $\lambda$ at a fixed $\Delta$, the distribution $P_{st}^m$ becomes more peaked around $m = N$, suggesting that in the limit ($\lambda/\Delta \to \infty$), we would have $P_{st}^m = \delta_{m,N}$, thereby validating Eq. (58).

VI. CONCLUSIONS

What happens when a generic quantum system evolving unitarily in time is subject to repeated projective measurements at random times? In this work, we addressed this question, which is both of theoretical and practical relevance, within the ambit of a paradigmatic quantum system, the so-called tight-binding chain (TBC). The TBC plays a paradigmatic role in understanding the physical properties of a solid in the quantum domain. The model involves motion of a quantum particle, e.g., an electron, which for most times is localized on sites of a lattice, but which owing to spontaneous quantum fluctuations performs occasional tunnelling to nearest-neighbour sites. Here, we deduced both theoretical and numerical results in support of the emergence of a re-

![Graph](image-url)
markable dynamical effect that we dub Stochastic Localization, whereby repeated measurements at random times lead to the particle initially located on one site to have at long-times time-independent values for its probability to be found on different sites of the lattice. Thus, the particle gets completely localized and does not spread out to farther sites as time passes by, a situation that is observed in the absence of any measurement.

While our analysis is developed here for the case of the tight-binding chain, our general technique to study the dynamics a la the stochastic Liouville equation approach would apply to any quantum system. It would thus be of great interest to extend our analysis to other quantum systems, and in particular, to the case of the tight-binding chain in presence of a time-varying external field, wherein an intricate interplay of the frequency of variation of the field with the average time between successive measurements is expected to lead to interesting dynamical effects.

A further direction of great interest is to consider the probability distribution of the random time gap between successive measurements to be given by a power-law or a Lévy distribution, instead of the exponential distribution considered in this work. While all moments of an exponential distribution are finite, not so is the case with a power-law distribution for which in specific range of values of the power or the exponent, the mean and the variance of the distribution are infinite. This latter fact is expected to have important bearings on the emergence of Stochastic Localization of the particle. Investigations in these directions are under way and will be reported elsewhere.
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Appendix A: Liouville operators and the notion of a superoperator

Following Ref. [20], the Liouville operator $\mathcal{L}$ associated with an ordinary operator such as the Hamiltonian $H$ and when operating on an ordinary operator $A$ gives rise to the commutator of $H$ with $A$:

$$\mathcal{L} A = [H, A].$$

Thus, a Liouville operator operating on an ordinary operator gives another ordinary operator, just as a wave function operated on by an operator yields another wave function, and in this sense, a Liouville operator is a superoperator. Hence, all the rules of linear algebra are valid in the operations with superoperators. Accordingly, we denote the ‘states’ of a Liouville operator by round kets:

$$\mathcal{L} |nm\rangle = \mathcal{L} |n\rangle \langle m| = H |n\rangle \langle m| - |n\rangle \langle m| H,$$

(A2)

where the complete set of states are in our case the Wannier states, namely, the set $\{ |n\rangle \}$. The superoperator then lives in a product Hilbert space, the dimension of which is the square of the space of the associated operator. We see that the matrix elements of the superoperator are labelled by four indices, just as those of an ordinary operator are labelled by two indices. One has the closure property for the two-indexed states as $\sum_{m,n} |mn\rangle \langle mn| = I$. Consistent with Eq. (A1) then, we have

$$\langle n| \mathcal{L} A |m\rangle = \sum_{m', n'} (nm|n'm') \langle n'|A|m', \rangle,$$

(A3)

wherein

$$\langle nm| \mathcal{L} |n'm'\rangle = \langle n|H|n'\rangle \delta_{nn'} - \langle n'|H|m\rangle \delta_{mn'}.$$  

(A4)

Finally, the Heisenberg time-evolution of an operator may be defined as

$$A(t) = e^{i\mathcal{L} t} A(0) = e^{iHt} A(0) e^{-iHt},$$

(A5)

while that of the density operator is given by

$$\rho(t) = e^{-i\mathcal{L} t} \rho(0) = e^{iHt} \rho(0) e^{-iHt}.$$  

(A6)

The rule (A4) applies to any superoperator, and applying it to the density operator $\rho(t)$ given in Eq. (A6), we get

$$\langle m| \rho(t) |n\rangle = \sum_{m', n'} (m|e^{-i\mathcal{L} t} |m'n') \langle m'|\rho(0)|n'\rangle$$

$$= \sum_{m', n'} \langle m|e^{-iHt} |m'\rangle \langle m'|\rho(0)|n'\rangle \langle n'| e^{iHt} |n\rangle.$$  

(A7)

Comparing the first and the second equality in Eq. (A7) yields the matrix elements of the superoperator $\exp(-i\mathcal{L} t)$ as

$$\langle mn| e^{-i\mathcal{L} t} |m'n'\rangle = \langle m| e^{-iHt} |m'\rangle \langle n'| e^{iHt} |n\rangle.$$  

(A8)

Appendix B: Numerical implementation of the measurement protocol for the TBC Hamiltonian

Let us first show how starting from a one-dimensional periodic chain of $N$ sites, the model (3) arises in the limit $N \to \infty$. We start with the Hamiltonian

$$H = -\frac{\Delta}{2} (K + K^\dagger); \quad K = \sum_{n=-N/2}^{N/2-1} |n\rangle \langle n+1|,$$

(B1)

with

$$|q\rangle = \sum_{n=-N/2}^{N/2-1} e^{-i2\pi q n/N} |n\rangle, \quad |n\rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{q=-N/2}^{N/2-1} e^{i2\pi q n/N} |q\rangle.$$  

(B2)
In writing the above equations, we have considered \( N \) to be even. For odd \( N \), one has \( n, q \in \{-(N-1)/2, (N-1)/2\} \).

Now, in Eq. (B2), effecting the change of variable \( q \to k \equiv 2\pi q/N \), so that \( \Delta k = 2\pi/N \to 0 \) as \( N \to \infty \), we get in the limit \( N \to \infty \) that

\[
|k\rangle = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-i kn} |n\rangle,
\]

\[
|n\rangle = \frac{1}{N} \left\{ \sum_{k=-\pi}^{\pi} \Delta k \ e^{i kn} |k\rangle \right\}_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk \ e^{i kn} |k\rangle.
\]

Redefining the Fourier transforms as

\[
|k\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-i kn} |n\rangle,
\]

\[
|n\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk \ e^{i kn} |k\rangle,
\]

we see that Eq. (B1) in the limit \( N \to \infty \) and together with Eq. (B4) are equivalent to the model defined in Section II.

We therefore expect numerical evolution using the TBC for a large-enough value of \( N \) to generate results that would match with theoretical results obtained in the main text in the limit \( N \to \infty \).

In our numerical implementation of the measurement protocol, we employ a one-dimensional periodic lattice of finite number of sites equal to \( N \). The density operator (and any other ordinary operator, e.g., the Hamiltonian \( H \)) is then given by an \( N \times N \) matrix, while the transition operator \( T \) (and any other superoperator) is represented by a matrix of dimension \( N^2 \times N^2 \). A particular realization of the measurement protocol over a total duration \( t \) involves sampling first the time gaps \( \tau \) between successive measurements. Here, we sample the interval \( \tau \)’s independently from the exponential distribution (19) using standard techniques, and record their sum after each draw until the sum exceeds the value of \( t \).

For example, let us assume that after \( \Omega \)-th draw, we have \( \sum_{p=1}^{\Omega} \tau_p < t \), and the very next draw yields such a \( \tau_{\Omega+1} \) that one gets \( \sum_{p=1}^{\Omega+1} \tau_p > t \). At this point, as the total time of evolution of the system is given to be \( t \), we stop the iteration of sampling the \( \tau \)’s and set the value of the last interval as \( \tau_{\Omega+1} = t - \sum_{p=1}^{\Omega} \tau_p \). Following this procedure, for a single realization of the measurement protocol, we end up with the sequence \( \{ \tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_\Omega, \tau_{\Omega+1} = t - \sum_{p=1}^{\Omega} \tau_p \} \) of \( (\Omega + 1) \) elements. The first \( \Omega \) elements of the sequence are sampled from the exponential distribution, while the sum of all the elements yields \( t \). Note that the number \( \Omega \) varies from one realization to another. The dynamical evolution proceeds as follows: We start with the initial density operator \( \rho(0) \), which has only its \((n_0, n_0)\)-th element nonzero and in fact equal to unity, with \( n_0 \) being the initial location of the particle. We evolve \( \rho(0) \) unitarily in time for time \( \tau_1 \) to obtain the evolved density operator as \( \rho(1) = \exp(-iH\tau_1)\rho(0)\exp(iH\tau_1) \), and then operate on it by the transition operator \( T \) constructed according to the prescription (32). The result is evolved unitarily for time \( \tau_2 \), then operated on by \( T \), and so on. The final step of evolution comprises unitary evolution for time \( \tau_{\Omega+1} \), and the \((mm)\)-th element of the resulting matrix gives the probability for the given realization of the measurement protocol for the particle to be found on site \( m \) at time \( t \). The process is repeated for a large-enough number of dynamical realizations to finally obtain the averaged site occupation probability \( \overline{P}_m(t) \) as reported in the main text.

[18] M. J. Clauser and M. Blume, Stochastic theory of line shape:


[34] Note that on the right hand side of Eqs. (14) and (45), one would have $-\Delta$ in the argument of the Bessel function if one had taken the TBC Hamiltonian to be negative of what we have considered, namely, Eq. (1). Nevertheless, since $J_0(x) = J_0(-x)$, this would leave $P_m(t)$ and $\mathcal{P}_m(t)$ invariant.

[35] The exponential distribution (19) implies that in a small time $0 < \Delta t \ll 1$, the probability of a measurement to take place equals $\lambda \Delta t$, while the same for no measurement is $1 - \lambda \Delta t$.

To see this, let us ask for the probability for the next measurement to happen after a certain time $t$, in the interval $[t, t + dt]$.

Let us discretize time in equal steps of length $0 < \Delta t \ll 1$; we will in the end consider the limit $\Delta t \to 0$.

The number of such steps during time duration $t$ equals $n_0 = t/\Delta t$. Consequently, the probability that the next measurement takes place after time $t$, in the interval $[t + \Delta t, t + 2\Delta t]$, equals $\left(1 - \lambda \Delta t\right)\left(1 - \lambda \Delta t\right)\cdots\left(1 - \lambda \Delta t\right)\lambda \Delta t = (1 - \lambda \Delta t)^{n_0} \lambda \Delta t$.

In the limit $\Delta t \to 0$, the latter quantity equals $\exp(-\lambda t) \lambda dt$. Thus, the probability for no measurement to occur during a given time duration $t$ equals $\exp(-\lambda t)$, while the probability for the next measurement to occur after time $t$ is, in the interval $[t, t + dt]$, equals $\exp(-\lambda t) \lambda dt$. It then follows that at a given time instant $t$, the probability that the last measurement happened in the interval $[t - \tau - dt, t - \tau]$, with $\tau \in [0, t]$, equals $\exp(-\lambda \tau) \lambda dt$.