

Non-Hermitian quantum walks and non-Markovianity: the coin-position interaction

Himanshu Badhani*

*The Institute of Mathematical Sciences, C. I. T. Campus, Taramani, Chennai 600113, India and
Homi Bhabha National Institute, Training School Complex, Anushakti Nagar, Mumbai 400094, India*

Subhashish Banerjee

Indian Institute of Technology Jodhpur, Jodhpur-342011, India

C. M. Chandrashekar†

*The Institute of Mathematical Sciences, C. I. T. Campus, Taramani, Chennai 600113, India
Homi Bhabha National Institute, Training School Complex, Anushakti Nagar, Mumbai 400094, India and
Department of Instrumentation & Applied Physics, Indian Institute of Science, Bengaluru 560012, India*

Discrete quantum walks are operations on the states comprised of an external position space and an internal coin space. The interactions between the two spaces governed by quantum walk operation greatly influence the properties of the states and have important consequences for the quantum algorithms and quantum simulation protocols for which they are used extensively. In this work, we study the effect of \mathcal{PT} symmetric non-Hermitian walk operation on the interactions between the coin and the position spaces of the state. Such an evolution mimics a quantum walk which is interacting with an external environment. To understand this interaction, we study the non-Markovianity of the reduced dynamics and also the entanglement between the two spaces. The non-Hermitian evolution is studied from the two perspectives: the normalised state method, and the metric formalism which relies on a redefinition of the Hilbert space. We argue that metric formalism provides a more consistent measurement of the non-Markovianity under the non-Hermitian dynamics compared to the case under the normalised state method. It can also provide a better indicator of the breakdown of \mathcal{PT} symmetry across the exceptional point. We also show that the non-unitary walks preserve the purity of the state under the metric formulation, due to which one can study entanglement under non-Hermiticity using entanglement entropy. We also find the indications that the coin-position entanglement is more robust in the asymmetric quantum walks.

I. INTRODUCTION

The operator formalism of quantum mechanics dictates that corresponding to every physical measurement of a closed system, there is an associated operator (called an observable) whose eigenvalues are the only possible results of the measurement. For this reason the observables must have only real eigenvalues. The time evolution of the system is generated by the Hamiltonian whose eigenvalues correspond to the energy of the state. If the Hamiltonian is Hermitian, the eigenvalues are guaranteed to be real and the evolution is unitary. However, in 1998 it was shown that there exist a class of non-Hermitian operators that also have real eigenvalues [1, 2]. These operators are invariant under the Parity-Time reversal or the \mathcal{PT} operation, i.e., under the consecutive action of time reversal ($t \rightarrow -t$) and spatial reflection ($x \rightarrow -x$). The evolution under \mathcal{PT} symmetric non-Hermitian evolution is non-unitary indicating that it models the evolution of an open quantum system [3, 4]. This has lead to a significant interest in the \mathcal{PT} symmetric dynamics in recent years [5–11], including the introduction of the so called pseudo-Hermiticity [12] which proposes an equivalence between the unitary and \mathcal{PT} symmetric non-unitary dynamics with a redefinition of the inner product.

Quantum walks, a unitary evolution and quantum analogue of the classical random walks hold a lot of promise for quantum algorithms and quantum simulations [13–16]. The \mathcal{PT} symmetric version of quantum walks were first defined in 2016 [21]. In this work we will try to characterise the interaction between the position and coin spaces of a one dimensional discrete time quantum walk under non-Hermitian (non-unitary) evolution. The reduced dynamics of a system, obtained by tracing over the ambient environment can be conveniently treated within the framework of Open Quantum Systems [3, 4]. It is generally non-Markovian [22–29] and one of the major mechanisms responsible for it is the information back-flow from the environment to the subsystem [30]. This is also seen in the dynamics of the internal coin state of the walk [31]. This non-Markovianity can play an important role in quantum algorithms and quantum communications [32] that utilize the properties of quantum walks. It thus becomes important to understand how the reduced dynamics, especially its non-Markovian characteristics, get effected due to the non-Hermiticity of the total quantum walk. We take a one parameter family of \mathcal{PT} symmetric walk operator and study the divisibility of the reduced dynamics and entanglement between the position and coin spaces.

Figure 1 shows a schematic representation of the scenario that we have studied in this work. With the introduction of the non-Hermiticity in the Hamiltonian we effectively increase the degrees of freedom of the environment with which our subsystem,

* himanshub@imsc.res.in

† chandru@imsc.res.in




FIG. 1: Pictorial representation of the dynamics of the reduced system ρ_S interacting with the environment ρ_E .

i.e. the coin space, is interacting. One therefore expects the information back-flow to the subsystem to decrease with the introduction of non-Hermiticity. The back-flow however depends on the dynamics of the system as a whole, including the subsystem interaction. In this study we will mainly investigate this question using the two primary methods of dealing with the non-Hermitian evolution. The coin space of the 1-dimensional quantum walk plays the role of the subsystem ρ_S , the position space is the immediate environment ρ_E and the whole system evolves under a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian. The information back-flow to the coin space will therefore depend on the walk parameters and the parameters controlling the non-hermitian part of the Hamiltonian.

We use two formalisms of non-Hermitian evolution: the normalised state method, where we normalise the state after a non-unitary evolution, and the metric formalism where we redefine the inner product to get a unit trace density matrix. We show the difference in the non-Markovianity measures with the two mechanisms. We also show that the metric formalism preserves the purity of the state for a quantum walk evolving under non-Hermitian \mathcal{PT} symmetric walk.

We introduce the \mathcal{PT} -symmetric quantum walk operator in section II. In section III we introduce the idea of a *metric* for non-Hermitian systems and contrast it with the more conventional treatment of non-unitary evolution which uses a redefinition of the normalised density matrix. In this section we also show how to evolve the coin of a quantum walk according to the metric formulation. In section IV we analyse the information flow in the reduced coin space in the above two formalisms. Finally, in section V we study the position - coin entanglement under non-Hermiticity. We conclude with a short discussion of our results in section VI.

II. THE \mathcal{PT} OPERATION

The non Hermitian dynamics can be used to model an open system which generally satisfies a Liovilian equation

$$\partial_t \rho_c(t) = \mathcal{L}_t \rho_c(t). \quad (1)$$

For a subsystem interacting weakly with the environment the system undergoes a Markovian evolution and the generator of the evolution take the following form [33, 34]

$$\partial_t \rho_c(t) = \mathcal{L}_t \rho_c(t) = -i[H, \rho_c(t)] + \sum_j A_j \rho_c(t) A_j^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{A_j A_j^\dagger, \rho_c(t)\}. \quad (2)$$

Where H is the effective (renormalized) Hamiltonian of the subsystem which we can assume to be Hermitian. Now, we redefine the Hamiltonian H as

$$H_e := H - i \sum_j A_j^\dagger A_j, \quad (3)$$

and the Lindblad equation can be recast into a form that is a sum of evolution under a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian H_e and an additional term,

$$\partial_t \rho_c(t) = \mathcal{L}_t \rho_c(t) = -i[H_e \rho_c(t) - \rho_c(t) H_e^\dagger] + \sum_j A_j \rho_c(t) A_j^\dagger. \quad (4)$$

In the above equation, $\sum_j A_j \rho_c(t) A_j^\dagger$, is the so called the “jump term”. Hence, apart from a jump term, a Lindbladian equation can be mapped to a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian. One particular kind of non-Hermitian Hamiltonians are the ones invariant under

the \mathcal{PT} transformation: $x \rightarrow -x$ and $i \rightarrow -i$ for which the energy eigenvalues are real,

$$\mathcal{PT}[f(x, p)] = f^*(-x, p) = f(x, p). \quad (5)$$

The \mathcal{PT} -symmetric Hamiltonian can therefore be used to study the non-unitary evolution of a system, which shows up in reduced dynamics of the systems that are interacting with the environment. Non-Hermitian terms in the Hamiltonian appear in form of non-Hermitian potentials that model the dissipative interactions with the environment. So for the dynamics to be \mathcal{PT} symmetric, the potential must satisfy

$$V^*(-x) = V(x). \quad (6)$$

A look at the continuity equation tells us the physical meaning of this constraint:

$$\partial_t \rho(x) = 2\Im[V(x)]\rho(x) - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}, \quad (7)$$

where $\Im[V(x)]$ is the imaginary part of the potential and \mathbf{j} is the probability current. Positive values of the first term on the RHS corresponds to a leak (or a sink) in probability current and negative value implies a source. Thus the \mathcal{PT} symmetry condition, which translates to $\Im[V(x)] = -\Im[V(-x)]$, implies equally strong sink and sources at the opposite sites. It is for this reason that the balanced gain and loss models in quantum optics have been simulated using \mathcal{PT} symmetric dynamics [20].

A. The \mathcal{PT} symmetric walk operator

Quantum walks were introduced as quantum analogues of the classical random walks. Just as random walks play an important role in simulating dynamics in various classical systems and computational tasks, quantum walks are playing a similar role in quantum realm. For a given Hamiltonian H , the simulation task is defined by the construction of a walk operator W such that $W \approx e^{-iH}$ [35]. Therefore, for non-Hermitian Hamiltonian, the walk operator is non-unitary. Quantum walks can be a discrete time process (discrete time quantum walk or DTQW): $|\psi(t+1)\rangle - |\psi(t)\rangle \propto |\psi(t)\rangle$ or a continuous time process where time difference is replaced by a time derivative: $\partial_t |\psi\rangle \propto |\psi(t)\rangle$.

In this work we will focus on one dimensional discrete-time walks where a state ρ is evolved on a one dimensional lattice. Just like a random walk, we have analogues of random coin flip and conditional shift operations. For this we add internal degrees of freedom to the state that work as a coin space. We will restrict the coin space to be two dimensional. Quantum walk is then implemented as follows: the internal space is rotated using a unitary coin operator $C(\theta)$ parametrised by the angle of rotation θ . The new external state is then conditioned on the state of the internal state. This is achieved using a conditional shift operator. We will focus on the quantum walks where the coin and shift operators are not site or time dependent (homogeneous walks). We specifically use the following operators:

$$S = \sum_x |x+1\rangle\langle x| \otimes |\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow| + |x-1\rangle\langle x| \otimes |\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|$$

$$\bar{C}(\theta) = I_N \otimes \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & i \sin \theta \\ i \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} = I_N \otimes C(\theta) \quad (8)$$

Inspired from the balanced gain-loss models in optics, a \mathcal{PT} symmetric non-Hermitian version of a quantum walk was introduced by using a non-unitary operator in the walk [21]. The gain and loss in the amplitudes of the $|\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\rangle$ is executed by the following operators

$$\mathcal{G}_2 = \mathcal{G}_1^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} e^\gamma & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-\gamma} \end{pmatrix} \quad (9)$$

where $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ parametrises the degree of non-Hermiticity. The \mathcal{PT} symmetric quantum walk is then given by the following general walk operator:

$$W_{nh} = S \bar{\mathcal{G}}_2 \bar{C}(\theta_2) S \bar{\mathcal{G}}_1 \bar{C}(\theta_1), \quad (10)$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{G}} = I_N \otimes \mathcal{G}$. For the Hamiltonian that commutes with \mathcal{PT} operation, the operation $W = e^{-iH}$ must satisfy:

$$(\mathcal{PT})W(\mathcal{PT})^{-1} = W^{-1}. \quad (11)$$

If H is Hermitian and the dynamics is homogeneous (no site dependent operations), then in the coin space this translates to $\mathcal{PT}C(\mathcal{PT})^{-1} = C^* = C^{-1}$, a property that the above walk operator satisfies.

B. Walks in the Fourier space

We are interested in the dynamics of the reduced coin space. For certain types of walks the reduced dynamics has a simple form in the Fourier space. Let the position state have the following representation in the Fourier space

$$|x\rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-ikx} |k\rangle dx. \quad (12)$$

The shift operator in equation (8) therefore becomes diagonal in momentum basis:

$$S = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |k\rangle\langle k| \otimes \begin{pmatrix} e^{ik} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-ik} \end{pmatrix} dk. \quad (13)$$

This makes the walk in the Fourier space also diagonal

$$W = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |k\rangle\langle k| \otimes S(k)C(\theta)dk. \quad (14)$$

The discrete version of this walk operator in the Fourier space can be calculated by evaluating sum of the integrand at δ intervals from $-\pi$ to π and then normalizing by $N = 2\pi/\delta$

$$W \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{-\pi, k=k+\delta}^{\pi-\delta} |k\rangle\langle k| \otimes W_c(k), \quad (15)$$

where $W_c(k) = S(k)C(\theta)$ is the evolution operator of the reduced state in the Fourier space. Given an initial state starting at the origin $x = 0$ and coin state $\rho_c(t = 0)$, its momentum space representation can be given by: $\sum_k |k\rangle\langle k| \otimes \rho_c(t = 0)$. A t -time evolution of the reduced state in the Fourier space is therefore given by:

$$\rho_c(k, t) = W_c(k)^t \rho_c(t = 0) (W_c(k)^\dagger)^t. \quad (16)$$

The walk operation in the coin space is

$$W_c(k) = S(k)\mathcal{G}^{-1}C(\theta_2)S(k)\mathcal{G}C(\theta_1). \quad (17)$$

The reduced dynamics is obtained by tracing over the momentum space

$$\rho_c(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} W_c(k)^t \rho_c(t = 0) (W_c(k)^\dagger)^t dk. \quad (18)$$

C. Exceptional points

Non-Hermitian systems have the very peculiar characteristic of an exceptional point or the point of \mathcal{PT} phase transition. It is defined by the set of parameters for which the eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian become degenerate. Beyond this point, the eigenvalues shift from being completely real to being imaginary. Such an exceptional point cannot exist in Hermitian systems even if they have degenerate eigenvalues, since they do not allow complex eigenvalues. Eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian can be witnessed through the eigenvalues of the walk operator via the relation $W \approx e^{-iH}$. The eigenvalues of the operator $W(k, t)$ in the Fourier space can be given as [21],

$$\lambda_{\pm} = (a \pm \sqrt{a^2 - 1}), \quad (19)$$

where $a = \cos(2k) \cos(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) - \cosh(2\gamma) \sin(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2)$.

The quasi energies of the corresponding Hamiltonian will be given by $\epsilon_{\pm} = i \ln(\lambda_{\pm})$. We can solve this equation by a simple substitution: $a = \cos(x)$ with which the walk operator's eigenvalues become $\lambda_{\pm} = \cos(x) \pm i \sin(x)$. Hence, $\epsilon_{\pm} = \mp \cos^{-1}(a)$. The eigenvalues become degenerate at $\epsilon = 0$ or $a = 1$.

For $a > 1$, $\cos^{-1}(a)$ is purely imaginary, so the quasi-energy goes from being completely real to being completely imaginary.

From the above equation (19) it is clear that for $a > 1$, θ_1 and θ_2 must be of the opposite sign as the first term is always smaller than 1. So the second term must be positive. Further, for a given γ , θ_1 and θ_2 the minima of ϵ in the real regime occurs for $k = n\pi$. This gives us the following relation for the phase transition:

$$\gamma_{PT} = \frac{1}{2} \cosh^{-1} \left[\frac{\cos(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2) - 1}{\sin(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2)} \right], \quad (20)$$

where, $\theta_1 \in [0, \pi), \theta_2 \in (-\pi, 0]$.




FIG. 2: Contour plot of γ_{PT} with respect to θ_1 and θ_2 . We have restricted $\pi - \epsilon > \theta_1 > 0$ and $-\pi + \epsilon < \theta_2 < 0$. The γ_{PT} diverges around the parameter values of $\pm\pi$.

In figure 2 we show the contour plot of the \mathcal{PT} transition point, or the exceptional point, γ_{PT} as a function of the two coin parameters θ_1 and θ_2 .

III. METRIC FORMULATION OF NON-HERMITIAN QUANTUM MECHANICS

Time evolution of a system is governed by the Hamiltonian of the system. In quantum mechanics, the Schrödinger equation gives us the governing dynamics of a quantum state ψ in terms of a Hamiltonian operator,

$$i\partial_t|\psi\rangle = H|\psi\rangle. \quad (21)$$

The corresponding equation of motion for the density matrix is given by

$$i\partial_t\rho = H\rho - \rho H^\dagger \quad (22)$$

which reduces to the von-Neumann equation for the case of Hermitian Hamiltonians: $i\partial_t\rho = [H, \rho]$. A density matrix ρ can be interpreted as a mixture of pure states: $\rho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ where the state $|\psi_i\rangle$ is prepared with probability p_i . This means that a valid density matrix must have trace $\text{tr}(\rho) = \sum_i p_i = 1$. It is clear that the trace of a state under unitary transformation remains unchanged: $\text{tr}(U\rho U^\dagger) = \text{tr}(\rho)$. A Hermitian evolution is always unitary, as can be seen by integrating the equation (21): $|\psi(t)\rangle = U|\psi\rangle = e^{-iHt}|\psi\rangle$, assuming the Hamiltonian is time independent: $U^\dagger = e^{-iHt^\dagger} = e^{iH^\dagger t} = e^{iHt} = U^{-1}$. For non-Hermitian Hamiltonians, the evolution operator is not unitary and therefore the trace of the density matrix ρ is time dependent. One way to get a trace 1 density matrix is to redefine it as

$$\rho \rightarrow \rho_N = \rho / \text{tr}(\rho). \quad (23)$$

We call it the trace normalisation method. This redefined density matrix satisfies the equation of motion

$$\begin{aligned} i\partial_t\rho_N &= H\rho_N - \rho_N H^\dagger - \rho_N \frac{\partial_t \text{tr}(\rho)}{\text{tr}(\rho)} \\ &= H\rho_N - \rho_N H^\dagger - i\rho_N \text{tr}\{\rho_N, H^\dagger - H\}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Such a density matrix has been shown to disobey the no-signalling theorem [36, 37]

A. Metric formalism

Another approach towards non-Hermitian systems [12] involves the reconstruction of the Hilbert space endowed with a *generalised* inner product:

$$\langle \psi | \phi \rangle_\eta := \langle \psi | \eta | \phi \rangle, \quad (25)$$

where η is a linear, invertible and Hermitian operator which satisfies the following relation:

$$\eta H = H^\dagger \eta. \quad (26)$$

A Hamiltonian H for which one can find such an operator η is called a pseudo-Hermitian operator. From equation (11) it becomes clear that a \mathcal{PT} symmetric Hamiltonian is pseudo-Hermitian.

This approach was generalised to non-pseudo Hermitian Hamiltonians with the so called metric formalism [17–19]. In this approach we redefine the Hilbert space with a similar generalisation of the inner product. Let the state evolved under a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian be denoted by $|\psi(t)\rangle = |\psi(t)\rangle\rangle$. The dual state in the Hilbert space is given by $\langle\langle\psi(t)| = \langle\psi(t)|G(t)$ where $\langle\psi|$ is the conjugate transpose of $|\psi\rangle$ and $G(t)$ is an invertible, Hermitian operator called the metric which satisfies the following equation of motion

$$\partial_t G(t) = i(G(t)H(t) - H(t)^\dagger G(t)). \quad (27)$$

In this modified Hilbert space, the density matrix is defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\rho}(t) &= \sum_i p_i |\psi_i(t)\rangle\rangle \langle\langle\psi_i(t)| \\ &= \sum_i p_i |\psi_i(t)\rangle\rangle \langle\psi_i(t)| G(t) = \rho(t) G(t). \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

The density matrix thus obtained can be shown to be positive semi-definite under the redefined inner product, as was shown in [19]. Let $[O]_{|\phi\rangle}$ denote the expectation value of the observable O for the state $|\phi\rangle$. In the metric formalism, this expectation value is redefined as $[O]_{|\phi\rangle} = \langle\langle\phi|O|\phi\rangle\rangle$. One can now establish the positive semi-definiteness of the generalised density matrix

$$_{|\phi\rangle} \equiv \langle\langle\phi|\bar{\rho}G|\phi\rangle\rangle = \sum_i p_i \langle\phi|G|\psi_i(t)\rangle\rangle \langle\psi_i(t)|G|\phi\rangle \geq 0. \quad (29)$$

Furthermore, the requirement that the density matrix should be a Hermitian matrix, the dagger operation (conjugate-transpose) of an operator O is replaced by a generalized dagger operation given by

$$O^\# = G^{-1} O G. \quad (30)$$

With this redefinition, the generalised density matrix $\bar{\rho}$ can be shown to be a Hermitian. Therefore the density matrix under the metric formalism is a valid density matrix. It can be easily shown that this density matrix follows the von-Neumann equation even for the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian:

$$i\hbar \partial_t \bar{\rho}(t) = [H, \bar{\rho}]. \quad (31)$$

Hamiltonians that allow a time independent metric are the pseudo-Hermitian Hamiltonian.

Claim: The metric can be constructed using the eigenvectors $|n(t)\rangle$ of the Hamiltonian $H(t)$ ([38] and [19]), which for a diagonalisable Hamiltonian forms a complete set of basis for the Hilbert space.

$$G(t) = \left(\sum |n(t)\rangle\rangle \langle n(t)| \right)^{-1}, \quad (32)$$

where $|n(t)\rangle\rangle = e^{-i\epsilon_n t} |n(0)\rangle\rangle$ for the eigenvalues $|n(0)\rangle\rangle$ of the Hamiltonian with eigenvalue ϵ_n .

Proof. From the definition, $G(t) = (\sum_n |n(t)\rangle\rangle \langle n(t)|)^{-1} = (\sum_n e^{2i\Im(\epsilon_n)t} |n(0)\rangle\rangle \langle n(0)|)^{-1}$. Therefore we have $HG^{-1} = \sum_n \epsilon_n |n(t)\rangle\rangle \langle n(t)|$

and $G^{-1}H^\dagger = \sum_n \epsilon_n^* |n(t)\rangle\langle n(t)|$. Using this we can prove that metric in equation (32) satisfies equation (27):

$$\begin{aligned}
RHS &= i[G(t)H - H^\dagger G(t)] \\
&= iG(t)[HG(t)^{-1} - G(t)^{-1}H^\dagger]G(t) \\
&= iG(t) \sum_n (\epsilon_n - \epsilon_n^*) |n(t)\rangle\langle n(t)| G(t) \\
&= G(t) \sum_n -2\Im(\epsilon_n) e^{2\Im(\epsilon_n)t} |n(0)\rangle\langle n(0)| G(t) \\
&= -G(t) \partial_t G^{-1}(t) G(t) \\
&= \partial_t G(t) = LHS.
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

□

We note that the metric G is not uniquely defined as it depends on the choice of complete set of basis. Therefore, one can always choose the metric such that the trace of the density matrix is always 1: $G(t) \rightarrow G(t)/(tr(\rho))$.

Trace calculation in metric formalism: Given an operator O acting on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} equipped with an inner product and an orthonormal basis $\{|i\rangle\}$, the trace can be given by

$$tr(O) = \sum_i \langle i|O|i\rangle. \tag{34}$$

In the matrix representation of O with respect to the orthonormal basis, the trace is the sum of the diagonal elements of the matrix. This quantity, however, is independent of the basis in which O is represented. For the non-Hermitian case, the operator may have the matrix representation given by

$$O = \bar{O}_{ij} |i\rangle\langle j|. \tag{35}$$

Hence the trace will be given by $tr(\bar{O}) = \sum_i \bar{O}_{ii}$. If the basis is orthonormal, i.e., $\langle\langle k|j\rangle\rangle = \delta_{jk}$, the trace can be given by $tr(O) = \langle\langle k|O|k\rangle\rangle$. This also implies that the trace is metric independent. This is because, given any set of complete basis $\{|k\rangle\}$ and the metric $G_{\{|k\rangle\}}$ defined w.r.t. this basis, we have $\langle i|G_{\{|k\rangle\}}|j\rangle = \delta_{i,j}$. With this definition, it is clear that even for operators defined with respect to different metrics of different operators, the trace operation is distributive over matrix summation

$$tr(A + B) = tr(A) + tr(B). \tag{36}$$

B. Metric formalism for the quantum walk

In the case of a discrete time quantum walk, if we start with a pure state $|\psi\rangle$, then the state at time t is given by $|\psi(t)\rangle = W^t|\psi(t=0)\rangle$. Evolution of the state ρ therefore will be given by,

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\rho}(t) &= \sum p_i |\psi_i(t)\rangle\langle\langle\psi_i(t)| \\
&= \sum p_i |\psi_i(t)\rangle\langle\langle\psi_i(t)| G(t) \\
&= \sum p_i W^t |\psi_i(0)\rangle\langle\langle\psi_i(0)| W^{\dagger t} G(t) \\
&= W^t \rho_0 W^{\dagger t} G(t).
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

For the walk operator in the momentum space, given by equation (15), the eigenvectors are given by $\{|k\rangle|\phi_i(k)\rangle\}$, $i = \{1, 2\}$ where $|\phi_i(k)\rangle$ are the eigenvectors of the operator $W_c(k)$. If the eigenvalues of the corresponding Hamiltonian $H = -i \ln(W_c(k))$ are given by $\epsilon_i(k)$, these eigenvectors will therefore evolve with time as $|\phi_i(k, t)\rangle = e^{-i\epsilon_i(k)t} |\phi_i(k)\rangle$.

$$\begin{aligned}
G(t) &= \left(\sum_{k,i} |k\rangle|\phi_i(k, t)\rangle\langle\langle k|\langle\phi_i(k, t)| \right)^{-1} \\
&= \sum_k |k\rangle\langle k| \otimes \left(\sum_i |\phi_i(k, t)\rangle\langle\phi_i(k, t)| \right)^{-1} \\
&\equiv \sum_{k,i} |k\rangle\langle k| \otimes G_c(k, t).
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Therefore the metric operator itself is block-diagonalized in the momentum space for the isotropic walk operator with the momentum dependent metric in the coin space given by:

$$G_c(k, t) = \left(\sum_{i=1,2} e^{2\Im(\epsilon_i(k))t} |\phi_i(k)\rangle \langle \phi_i(k)| \right)^{-1}. \quad (39)$$

where $\Im(\epsilon_i(k))$ are the imaginary part of the eigenvalues. The reduced state under the metric formalism will therefore be given by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\rho}_c(t) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} W_c(k)^t \rho_c(t=0) (W_c(k)^\dagger)^t G_c(k, t) dk \\ &\sim \frac{1}{N} \sum_{-\pi, k=k+\delta}^{\pi-\delta} W_c(k)^t \rho_c(t=0) (W_c(k)^\dagger)^t G_c(k, t) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{-\pi, k=k+\delta}^{\pi-\delta} \bar{\rho}_k(t). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

From equation (36), it is clear that $\text{tr}(\bar{\rho}_c)$ is time independent. Now, we redefine $\bar{\rho}_c \rightarrow \bar{\rho}_c / \text{tr}(\bar{\rho}_c)$ to normalize the density matrix. Note that, as opposed to the normalisation done without the metric, here we are normalising with a constant number which .

Partial trace in the metric formalism:

Partial trace is a CPTP map $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ where $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_X)$ denotes the set of linear operators on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_X . The partial trace we have performed here is certainly a trace preserving operation under the metric formalism. However, establishing the complete positivity of this operation requires more nuanced discussion. Usually, the sum of positive semi-definite matrices is a positive semi-definite matrix. This is due to the fact that the inner product for them is defined under the same metric, $G = I$ and the resulting sum is also a density matrix in the same metric space. However, when we sum up two density matrices with two different metrics, the resulting quantity in most cases does not belong to any Hilbert space with a given metric. For instance, in equation (40) each momentum component $\bar{\rho}_k$ is positive semi-definite under a different metric $G_c(k)$ but we are not guaranteed to find a Hermitian matrix G_c for all $\bar{\rho}_c$ such that $\langle \phi | G_c \bar{\rho}_c | \phi \rangle \geq 0 \forall |\phi\rangle$. Furthermore, to demand the existence of such a metric is equivalent to demanding that the dynamics of the reduced system can be described by an effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian through equation (31). This can be the case when the metric of the whole system is in a product form $G = G_A \otimes G_B$ and we look at the dynamics of system A or system B . This assumes that the dynamics of the system is separable with Hamiltonian of the form $H_{AB} = H_A \otimes I_B + I_A \otimes H_B$. This is a very stringent demand on the reduced dynamics because we have seen that even for the systems weakly interacting with the bath, the effective dynamics as given by the Lindbladian equation (4) is only approximately of the form (22). Therefore, to establish the positivity of the reduced state $\bar{\rho}(t)$ given by equation (40) if we redefine the expectation value of an operator $\text{tr}_X(O)$ as

$$[\text{tr}_X(O)]_{|\phi\rangle} \equiv \langle \phi | \text{tr}_X(GO) | \phi \rangle. \quad (41)$$

where the operator O lives in a Hilbert space with metric G and the partial trace is performed over a space X . With this definition, the expectation values of the density matrix $\bar{\rho}_c(t) = \text{tr}_P(\rho(t)G)$ is given by the following

$$[\text{tr}_X(\rho G)]_{|\phi\rangle} \equiv \langle \phi | \text{tr}_X(G \rho G) | \phi \rangle. \quad (42)$$

Note that this is a generalisation of the expression given in equation (29). With this definition, partial trace operation becomes a completely-positive operation and it also proves the distributive property of the trace operation in equation (36). The explicit form of the expectation value is given as follows

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi\rangle &= \langle \phi | \sum_k \frac{1}{N} G_c(k, t) \bar{\rho}_k(t) | \phi \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_k \langle \phi | G_c(k, t) \bar{\rho}_k(t) | \phi \rangle \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Construction of the metric requires calculating the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors of the walk operator. A walk operator constructed for n step walk will therefore give a different metric then the metric for a m step walk. Furthermore, calculating the eigenvectors and eigenvalues is a task which gets computationally harder with increasing matrix dimensions. For a two state




FIG. 3: Trace of the coin state as a function of time, evolved under a walk operator with coin parameters $\theta_1 = \pi/4$ and $\theta_2 = -\pi/7$ and the exceptional point is given by $e^{\gamma_{PT}} = 1.34714..$ Dotted lines correspond to the usual evolution of equation (18) and solid lines correspond to the state with metric correction given by equation (40). Inset corresponds to γ values below the exceptional point. As expected, the state with metric redefinition has time invariant trace.

walk that we have defined here, a 50 step walk will be represented by a 200×200 matrix. Therefore, the method of calculating the reduced state through Fourier transforms is more computationally accurate and correspond to a infinite walk operator in position space.

Figure 3 shows the trace of the reduced state constructed with and without the metric. The metric method of equation (40) gives us a time independent trace and therefore, by changing the metric by a constant factor we can define a trace one density matrix. Below the exceptional point (the inset), the trace of the density matrices without metric correction oscillates around its asymptotic values, a trademark for the \mathcal{PT} symmetric evolution. Above the exceptional point (which in the corresponding figure is $e^{\gamma_{PT}} = 1.347$ for the chosen evolution parameters), the trace increases exponentially with time.

IV. NON-MARKOVIANITY OF THE COIN DYNAMICS AND THE INFORMATION FLOW

A Markovian process is a memoryless process where the future state of the system is independent of the evolution history of the system and depends only on the current state. Therefore, the Markovian evolutions are generally the easiest and best understood of the open system dynamics. Quantum Markovian processes between two times t_0 to t , represented by a CPTP map \mathcal{E}_{t,t_0} , can be broken down into composition of intermediate CPTP maps:

$$\mathcal{E}_{t,t_0} = \mathcal{E}_{t,t_1} \circ \mathcal{E}_{t_1,t_0}. \quad (44)$$

This is the so called divisibility property of the Markovian maps. If the intermediate map \mathcal{E}_{t,t_1} is a positive map for all times, the process is called a P-divisible process. If it is a completely positive map, the process is called a CP-divisible process. A CP-divisible process is therefore also a P-divisible process.

While the Markovian processes are relatively well understood, most processes in nature do show some degree of dependence on the history of the evolution (the memory effects). It is only under certain approximations viz. weak system-environment interactions and separation of time scales that we can ignore the memory effects and approximate the evolution to be Markovian. In our system of interest, the two dimensional coin space interacts with the position space through a quantum walk shift operator. This internal dynamics is known to be P-indivisible [31]:

$$\rho_c(t) = \mathcal{E}_t(\rho_c) = Tr_p(W^t \rho_p \otimes \rho_c W^{\dagger t}). \quad (45)$$

In this section we analyse the dependence of non-Markovianity in the coin dynamics on the non-Hermiticity of the walk operation. As discussed, the study will compare the results from two methods of constructing the reduced state: the metric formalism ($\bar{\rho}$) and the state normalisation (ρ_N).

A. BLP measure

: The first measure is derived from the principle of contractivity of the trace distance under positive trace preserving maps [39]. Trace distance between two states ρ_1 and ρ_2 is half of the trace norm of $\rho_1 - \rho_2$, i.e.,

$$D(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1 / 2. \quad (46)$$

Trace norm of an operator X is defined as $\|X\|_1 = \text{tr}(\sqrt{X^\dagger X})$. Under a trace preserving positive linear quantum map Λ the trace distance between two states is monotonically decreasing,

$$D(\Lambda(\rho_1), \Lambda(\rho_2)) \leq D(\rho_1, \rho_2). \quad (47)$$

In other words, the states should become less and less distinguishable under the action of a positive trace preserving *linear* map. This loss of distinguishability can be attributed to the loss of information of the system to the environment. The violation of the inequality in equation (47) implies that the dynamical map is not positive trace preserving map and that the information is flowing from the environment back to the systems (information back-flow). This is a characterizing property of the non-Markovian dynamics.

However, this line of reasoning fails when the evolution is non-linear. For instance, the map in equation (23) is clearly a positive and trace preserving map, but the trace distance between any two states under this evolution is non-monotonic. Violation of monotonicity is therefore not a signature of non P-divisibility under such an evolution and therefore does not characterise the non-Markovianity in the usual sense, see e.g. [40, 41]. Nevertheless, the decrease or increase in distinguishability is a reliable indicator of the flow of information from the system or back to the system respectively. We will therefore use the trace distance to measure information flow in the normalised state method. Since the map (23) preserves Hermiticity, the trace distance between two state $\rho_N(t)$ and $\sigma_N(t)$ is simply the sum of the absolute values of the operator $\Delta = \rho_N(t) - \sigma_N(t)$.

In the metric picture, where the state evolution is governed according to equation (28), the trace distance between the states $\bar{\rho}$ and $\bar{\sigma}$ given by $\text{tr}(\bar{\Delta}^\dagger \bar{\Delta}(t))/2$, where $\bar{\Delta} = \bar{\rho} - \bar{\sigma}$, is still non-monotonic in time even though the trace of the states is time independent. This is because $\bar{\rho}$ is not equal to its conjugate transpose. However, with the generalised dagger operation defined in equation (30), the density matrix is Hermitian. One can, therefore, redefine the trace norm in the metric picture to give a *generalised* trace norm as

$$\|X\|_1 = \text{tr}(\sqrt{X^\# X}). \quad (48)$$

This definition enables us to treat the density matrix under non-Hermitian evolution as a valid *Hermitian* matrix ($i.e. \bar{\rho}^\# = \bar{\rho}$) and the trace norm of $\bar{\Delta} = \bar{\rho}(t) - \bar{\sigma}(t)$ is simply the sum of the absolute values of the absolute eigenvalues of $\bar{\Delta}$. Trace distance under each of the above discussed evolutions are plotted in fig. 4 where the quantum operation is the \mathcal{PT} symmetric quantum walk operation. We see that with the redefined trace norm through the generalised dagger operation, the trace distance under the metric formalism is constant whereas the trace distance under the normalised state method oscillates.

If we plot trace distance as a function of time, the positive slope in the plot will indicate the flow of information from the environment to the system [39]. Let the slope be given by $\eta(t, \rho_1, \rho_2) = \frac{d}{dt} D(\rho_1(t), \rho_2(t))$. Then, one can quantify the amount of information flow from the environment to the system by the area under the positive slope for any given set of initial states. This gives us the so called the BLP measure: $N(\Lambda) = \max_{\rho_1, \rho_2} \int_{\eta > 0} \eta(t, \rho_1, \rho_2) dt$, where the maximum is taken over the set of all possible pairs of states ρ_1 and ρ_2 to characterize the non-Markovianity of the channel Λ independent of the states. In this work we will not do the maximisation over the set of states, but will restrict ourselves with a fixed pair of initial states. This gives us a measure that depends on the initial states : $N(t, \rho, \sigma)$.

Let $D(\Lambda(\rho), \Lambda(\sigma)) - D(\rho, \sigma) = \Delta$, where $\Lambda(\rho)$ is the discrete map given either under the state normalisation formalism or the metric formalism. The BLP measure for this discrete dynamics can be given by:

$$N(t, \rho, \sigma) = \begin{cases} N(t-1, \rho, \sigma) + \Delta, & \text{if } \Delta > 0 \\ N(t-1, \rho, \sigma), & \text{if } \Delta \leq 0 \end{cases} \quad (49)$$

where $N(0, \rho, \sigma) = 0$.

Let us now focus on the dynamics of the coin state. The map $\Lambda(\rho)$ is therefore given by the tracing out the position degrees of freedom from the walk state evolved under either of the above two formalisms. In figure 5 we show the evolution of the BLP measure $N(t, \rho, \sigma)$ for the reduced coin state under metric formalism for different values of non-Hermitian parameter γ . Here we have fixed the two initial coin states as $\rho = |\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow|$ and $\sigma = |\uparrow + \downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow + \downarrow|/2$. For the dynamics which we have chosen by fixing the coin parameters as $\theta_1 = \pi/4$ and $\theta_2 = \pi/7$ the exceptional point is at $e^\gamma = 1.347$. We see that as we approach the exceptional point from below, the rate of increase of the measure decreases, beyond which it suddenly rises. This dependence on the parameter γ and the behaviour near the exceptional point is more apparent in figure 6 which shows the BLP




FIG. 4: With initial states $\rho(t=0) = |\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|$ and $\sigma(t=0) = |\uparrow + \downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow + \downarrow|/2 \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|$, the figure shows the trace distance between the two states under the discussed definitions of the trace distance. We have defined $\Delta \equiv \rho - \sigma$ and $\bar{\Delta} \equiv \bar{\rho} - \bar{\sigma}$. The states evolved under the normalised state method are denoted by ρ and σ , the ones evolved under the metric formalism are denoted by $\bar{\rho}$ and $\bar{\sigma}$. The non-Hermitian parameter is set to $e^\gamma = 1.2$ and the coin parameters are $\theta_1 = \pi/4$ and $\theta_2 = -\pi/7$ which correspond to the exceptional point $e^\gamma = 1.34713\dots$. We see that the trace distance is non-contractive under the non-Hermitian, albeit positive trace preserving, map. In fact, above the exceptional point, the trace distance can be found to be exponentially increasing. However, under the metric formalism and with the generalised dagger operation, the trace distance between the two states is constant. Therefore, while studying the metric formalism, we will use the redefined trace norm based on the generalised dagger operation.

measure after 50 steps of the walk as a function of e^γ for the same initial states ρ and σ , and the same coin parameters as before. We also see that the information back-flow does not monotonically decrease with increasing non-Hermiticity. This indicates that increasing non-Hermiticity does not necessarily lead to a loss of information into a larger environment. In fact, somewhat counter-intuitively, the information back-flow can increase with an increasing strength of non-Hermiticity interaction. Figure 6 also compares the BLP measure for the normalised state and the metric formalism. Below the exceptional points the two methods give approximately the same measure values. Close to the exceptional point both the methods show a sudden dip in the measures indicating that under both the evolutions, the information flow is only from the sub-system to the environment at the exceptional point and there is no information back-flow. However, with the metric formalism, the dip is sharp with an exponential increase beyond this point, indicative of a first order phase transition. The normalised state method on the other hand does not necessarily indicate such a phase transition. Figure 7 shows the variation of this measure with respect to time as well as γ for both the metric and normalised state method.

B. RHP measure

This measure is derived from the fact that the local CPTP maps do not increase entanglement between two systems. If we define Markovianity through CP-divisibility, entanglement between the system and the environment under the local Markovian dynamics should be a monotonically decreasing function of time. Choi matrix of such a map would have a trace norm 1. For non-CP maps, the trace norm would be > 1 . Based on this the RHP measure of the dynamical map Λ is given by:

$$\mathcal{I}_{RHP} = \int g(t) dt, \quad (50)$$

$$\text{where } g(t) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|1 \otimes \Lambda(t + \epsilon, t)|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi| - 1\|}{\epsilon}$$

and $|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|$ is the maximally entangled state.

Finding the intermediate map:

The map that takes a coin state (initially separable from the position space) from time $t = 0$ to t in the metric formalism is given




FIG. 5: BLP measure for the non-Hermitian dynamics of $\bar{\rho}_c(t=0) = |\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow|$ and $\bar{\sigma}_c(t=0) = (|\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle)(\langle\uparrow| + \langle\downarrow|)/2$ for various $g = e^\gamma$ values.




FIG. 6: BLP measure after 50 steps as a function of e^γ . The solid lines correspond to the evolution with metric formalism and the dotted lines correspond to the evolution with normalised state method. The exceptional points corresponding to the three sets of coin parameters are marked on the x axis. The metric method clearly shows a better indication of the breakdown of the \mathcal{PT} symmetry.

by

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(t, 0)(\rho_c(t)) &= \text{Tr}_p(W^t \rho_p \otimes \rho_c W^{\dagger t} G(t)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} W_c(k)^t \rho_c(t=0) (W_c(k)^\dagger)^t G(k, t) dk. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

In the normalised state method the map will be defined without the metric. Unfortunately, this map does not have a nice analytical form in terms of the maps $\Lambda_k(t, t+1)$. We therefore derive it using vectorisation.

Corresponding to the map $\Lambda(t, 0)$ we construct a matrix $L(t, 0)$ such that

$$L(t, 0) = \{v_{11}, v_{12}, v_{21}, v_{22}\}, \quad (52)$$

where $v_{ij} = \text{vec}[\Lambda(t, 0)|i\rangle\langle j|]$. The composition of channels in equation (44) translates to the multiplication of the corresponding matrix representations

$$L(t+1, 0) = L(t+1, t)L(t, 0). \quad (53)$$

This gives us the matrix representation of the intermediate map: $L(t+1, t) = L(t+1, 0)L(t, 0)^{-1}$. The Choi matrix of the intermediate map constructed using the following operation

$$C_\Lambda(t) = \text{devec}[U_{2 \leftrightarrow 3}(L(t+1, t) \otimes I_4)U_{2 \leftrightarrow 3} \text{vec}(|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|)]. \quad (54)$$




FIG. 7: Contour plot of the BLP measure with respect to time steps and the non Hermiticity parameter. Top: using the normalised state method. Bottom: using the metric formalism. For $\theta_1 = \pi/4, \theta_2 = -\pi/6$, $e^{\gamma_{PT}} = 1.243..$ and for $\theta_1 = \pi/4, \theta_2 = -\pi/7$, $e^{\gamma_{PT}} = 1.347..$ For the normalised state method, the measure does not blow up after the exceptional point, therefore we can show the plot beyond this point. For the metric formalism the measure diverges beyond this point and therefore we show the plot till the exceptional point.






FIG. 8: Trace of the Choi matrix C_Λ for maps under metric formalism and (inset) normalised state method. The coin parameters are $\theta_1 = \pi/4$ and $\theta_2 = -\pi/7$ with exceptional point given by $e^{\gamma_{PT}} = 1.34714..$ The metric formalism makes the non-unitary map also trace preserving and therefore gives us the valid Choi matrix for a trace preserving map.

where $devec[]$ is the construction of the 4×4 matrix from the 16×1 vector and $U_{2 \leftrightarrow 3}$ is the swap operator between the second and third subsystems


$$U_{2 \leftrightarrow 3} = I_2 \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes I_2. \quad (55)$$



(a)



(b)



(c)

FIG. 9: The RHP measure as calculated using metric formalism for different coin parameters. The coin parameters $\{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$ and the corresponding exceptional point for the parameters are given in the figure titles. RHP value is lowest for all calculated time beyond the exceptional point.

The matrix $C_\Lambda(t)$ is exactly the Choi matrix of the intermediate map and hence the function $g(t)$ from the equation (50) can be given in the following form for the discrete quantum walk evolution

$$g(t) = \|C_\Lambda(t)\|_1 - 1. \quad (56)$$

The Choi matrix of a trace preserving map Λ satisfies $\text{tr}_{out}[C_\Lambda] = I_{in}$ where tr_{out} corresponds to the partial trace of the final Hilbert space and I_{in} is the identity operator in the initial Hilbert space. We note that this condition is satisfied only under the metric formalism. Figure 8 shows the trace of the Choi matrix as derived using the metric formalism and figure 8[inset] shows the trace of the Choi matrix derived using the state normalisation method. We see that the metric formalism gives the Choi matrices with trace 2 even in the \mathcal{PT} broken region. This is not the case for the normalised state method and therefore the metric formalism can be argued to be a better method of studying non-Hermitian evolution.

We define the RHP measure of the coin state under the metric formalism, using equation (56), as follows:

$$\mathcal{I}_{RHP}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^t g(k). \quad (57)$$

Figure 9 shows the above RHP measure as a function of time, calculated using the metric formalism. Here too we do not see a clear monotonicity with respect to non-Hermiticity parameter γ . The sudden jumps in the RHP measures can be attributed to the non-invertibility of the intermediate map $L(t+1, t)$. The dependency of the jumps on the time and non-Hermiticity parameter γ is not very clear. A further probe on the intricate dependence of the walk with the two coin parameters and bounds on the dynamics due to interference [43] could give some insight into the dependency of jumps on the time and non-Hermitian parameter. However, RHP measure is lowest beyond the exceptional point for all given coin parameters, a behaviour completely opposite to the BLP measure of non-Markovianity.

V. COIN-POSITION ENTANGLEMENT

The purity of a state ρ , as measured by the scalar quantity $\text{tr}(\rho^2)$, is preserved under a unitary transformation $\rho \rightarrow U\rho U^\dagger$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(\rho^2) &\rightarrow \text{tr}(U\rho U^\dagger U\rho U^\dagger) \\ &= \text{tr}(\rho^2). \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Under the evolution with metric formalism the operator $U = e^{-iH}$ is not a unitary operator but the purity of the state is still conserved.

Claim: Below the exceptional point, the purity of a quantum state is conserved under the non-Hermitian evolution of the states with metric formalism.

Proof. To see this we note that the state transformation is given by $\rho \rightarrow U\rho U^\dagger G = U\bar{\rho}G^{-1}U^\dagger G$, where $\bar{\rho} = \rho.G$ is the metric corrected state. Let us denote $G^{-1}U^\dagger G \equiv U^\#$ as the generalised dagger operation. Unitary operations under metric formalism are generally defined by the property: $U^\#U = 1$. Hence the purity is transformed as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(\bar{\rho}^2) &\rightarrow \text{tr}(U\bar{\rho}U^\#U\bar{\rho}U^\#) \\ &= \text{tr}(\bar{\rho}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

The walk operators that simulate a Hamiltonian via $W = e^{-iH}$ satisfy this property below the exceptional point because we have $G^{-1}H^\dagger G = H$, so $G^{-1}e^{iH^\dagger}G = e^{iH} = W^{-1}$. \square

Hence if we start with a pure state the state remains a pure state. This means that the entanglement between the position and coin space can be evaluated using entanglement entropy if we start with a pure state. Entanglement entropy between two systems is given by the von-Neumann entropy of the reduced density matrix. For the diagonalisable reduced system, it has a simple form in terms of the eigenvalues of the density matrix. We define the entanglement entropy as

$$EE(t) = - \sum_i |\lambda_i(t)| \ln |\lambda_i(t)|, \quad (60)$$

where $|\lambda_i(t)|$ are absolute values of the eigenvalues of the coin state $\bar{\rho}_c(t)$. Figure 10 shows the entanglement entropy between the coin and position space for different coin parameters and two different initial state $|\psi_0\rangle$ which correspond to symmetric $|\uparrow + \downarrow\rangle/\sqrt{2}$ and asymmetric $|\uparrow\rangle$ distribution in the position space. We notice that for symmetric walks, the entanglement drops




FIG. 10: Entanglement entropy between the position and coin as a function of time. Solid lines correspond to Hermitian evolution and the dotted lines show the EE for non-Hermitian evolutions under metric formalism. 10a corresponds to the walk with coin parameters $\theta_1 = \pi/3$ and $\theta_2 = -\pi/6$ and 10b corresponds to $\theta_1 = \pi/4$ and $\theta_2 = -\pi/7$.

with non-Hermiticity. Similar observation cannot be made for asymmetric walks and entanglement seem to converge to the similar values for Hermitian and non-Hermitian cases in the asymptotic limit. We therefore conjecture that the asymptotic (large time limit) entanglement between the coin and the position space decreases with increasing non-Hermiticity for symmetric quantum walks while remains the same for the asymmetric quantum walk. The behaviour of the entanglement beyond the exceptional point would require measures like negativity which make use of the knowledge of both of the subsystems. With the large size of position space, such a calculation would be computationally more demanding and we leave this for future work.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have looked at a model of \mathcal{PT} symmetric non-Hermitian quantum walk and focused on the interaction between the coin and position spaces. Coin-position interaction is an important factor in a lot of quantum walk based search algorithms and simulations, and this interaction is inevitably affected by the noise from the environment. It therefore becomes important to see the implications of non-unitary effects due to environment-walk interactions on the coin-position interaction. Furthermore, quantum walks also provides a simple toy model to understand the change in dynamics between two subsystems when one or both of them interact with an external environment.

We contrast the two typically used methods of describing the dynamics in non-Hermitian regimes: normalised state method and the metric formalism. We analyse the effect of non-Hermiticity, within and beyond the \mathcal{PT} symmetry regime, on the information flow between the reduced coin state and the its environment and on the coin-position entanglement under these two methods.

The metric formalism gives us a positive density matrix with trace one (with a redefined *generalised* partial trace operation), and the intermediate maps are also well defined under this formalism. We have also seen that the trace distance is constant under metric formalism for a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian. Since the metric formalism requires the knowledge of eigenvectors and eigenvalues, we have restricted ourselves to the homogeneous quantum walk operations, with which the dynamics takes a block-diagonal form in the Fourier space.

With a redefined trace norm for the metric formalism, we see that for both the methods, the BLP measure attains the minimum value at the exceptional point. However, it does not monotonically decrease with increasing non-Hermiticity for all coin parameters. The difference between the BLP measure obtained using the two methods is stark only beyond the exceptional point where the normalised state method gives us a typically decreasing value with non-Markovianity while the metric formalism gives rapidly increasing value due to the imaginary eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian. The BLP measure of the coin dynamics studied under the metric formalism gives a clear indication of the \mathcal{PT} symmetry breaking in the walk dynamics which is not the case for the BLP measure under normalisation method. We have also elaborated the method to calculate the RHP measure that indicates the CP-indivisibility of the intermediate map. We show that the intermediate map is well defined through its Choi representation only in the case of metric formalism. The RHP measure under metric formalism shows no clear phase transition across the exceptional point, unlike the BLP measure. Understanding the underlying dynamics that results in this contrasting behaviour of RHP and BLP measures is something that requires further work. Finally, we have studied the entanglement between the position and coin space using metric formalism. We have shown that the metric formalism preserves the purity of the state and therefore for initially pure states entanglement entropy is a correct measure of entanglement. We note that for symmetric walks, the entanglement decreases with non-Hermiticity and for non-symmetric case, the asymptotic value of the entanglement entropy remains the same. These may positively impact the algorithms and simulations where this entanglement plays a role. Further, analytical work to establish the claims we have made regarding the asymptotic values of entanglement for symmetric and asymmetric quantum walks will be very useful and we leave these for future work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

HB would like to thank V Ranjith and Dr. Sibasish Ghosh for stimulating conversations on the metric formalism and Dr. S R Hassan for comments on this work. CMC and SB acknowledge the support from Interdisciplinary Cyber Physical Systems (ICPS) programme of the Department of Science and Technology, India, Grants No.: DST/ICPS/QuST/Theme-1/2019/1 and DST/ICPS/QuST/Theme-1/2019/6, respectively.

-
- [1] Carl M. Bender and Stefan Boettcher, Real Spectra in Non-Hermitian Hamiltonians Having P T Symmetry Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 5243 (1998).
 - [2] Carl M Bender \mathcal{PT} -symmetric quantum theory, J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. 631, 012002, 2015
 - [3] Heinz-Peter Breuer and Francesco Petruccione. The theory of open quantum systems. Oxford University Press, 2002.
 - [4] Subhashish Banerjee. Open quantum systems. Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd., 2018.
 - [5] C M Bender, D C Brody and H F Jones, Phys. Rev. D 70, 025001 (2004).
 - [6] I Rotter, A non-Hermitian Hamilton operator and the physics of open quantum systems, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 42, 153001 (2009).
 - [7] J Heinrichs, Eigenvalues in the non-Hermitian Anderson model, Phys. Rev. B 63, 165108 (2001).
 - [8] L Zhang, G S Agarwal, W P Schleich and M O Scully, Hidden \mathcal{PT} symmetry and quantization of a coupled-oscillator model of quantum amplification by superradiant emission of radiation, Phys. Rev. A 96 013827 (2017).
 - [9] J Naikoo, K Thapliyal, S Banerjee and A Pathak, Quantum Zeno effect and nonclassicality in a PT symmetric system of coupled cavities, Phys. Rev. A 99, 023820 (2019).
 - [10] J Naikoo, S Banerjee and A Pathak, Interplay between nonclassicality and PT symmetry in an effective two level system with open system effects, Phys. Rev. A 100, 023836 (2019).
 - [11] Javid Naikoo, Swati Kumari, S Banerjee and A. K. Pan, PT symmetric evolution, coherence and violation of Leggett-Garg inequalities, J. Phys. A: Mathematical and Theoretical 54, 275303 (2021).
 - [12] Ali Mostafazadeh, Pseudo-Hermiticity and generalized PT- and CPT-symmetries. Journal of Mathematical Physics 44, 974 (2003).
 - [13] C. M. Chandrashekar, R. Srikanth and S. Banerjee, Symmetries and noise in quantum walk, Phys. Rev. A 76, 022316 (2007).
 - [14] S. Banerjee, R. Srikanth, C. M. Chandrashekar and Pranaw Rungta, Symmetry-noise interplay in quantum walk on an n-cycle, Phys. Rev. A 78, 052316 (2008).
 - [15] C. M. Chandrashekar, S. Banerjee and R. Srikanth, Relationship Between Quantum Walk and Relativistic Quantum Mechanics, Phys. Rev. A 81, 062340 (2010).
 - [16] C. M. Chandrashekar and S. Banerjee, Parrondo's game using a discrete-time quantum walk, Phys. Lett. A 375, 1553 (2011).
 - [17] Carl M Bender, Making sense of non-Hermitian Hamiltonians. Reports on Progress in Physics 70(6), 2007

- [18] Ali Mostafazadeh, Pseudo-Hermitian Representation of Quantum Mechanics. *International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics* 7(7), 1191-1306, 2010
- [19] Chia-Yi Ju, Adam Miranowicz, Guang-Yin Chen, and Franco Nori, Non-Hermitian Hamiltonians and no-go theorems in quantum information. *Phys. Rev. A* 100, 062118, 2019
- [20] A. Regensburger, C. Bersch, M-A. Miri, G. Onishchukov, D. N. Christodoulides, and U. Peschel, Parity-time synthetic photonic lattices, *Nature (London)* 488, 167 (2012).
- [21] Ken Mochizuki, Dakeyong Kim, and Hideaki Obuse, Explicit definition of \mathcal{PT} symmetry for nonunitary quantum walks with gain and loss. *Phys. Rev. A* 93, 062116, 2016.
- [22] Angel Rivas, Susana F Huelga, and Martin B Plenio, Quantum non-Markovianity: characterization, quantification and detection, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* 77(9):094001, (2014).
- [23] I de Vega and D. Alonso, Dynamics of non-Markovian open quantum systems, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 89:015001, (2017).
- [24] L Li, M. J. W. Hall, and H. M. Wiseman, Concepts of quantum non-Markovianity: A hierarchy, *Physics Reports*, 759:1–51, (2018).
- [25] U. Shrikant, R. Srikanth, and S. Banerjee, Temporal self-similarity of quantum dynamical maps as a concept of memorylessness, *Nature Scientific Reports*: 10, 15049 (2020).
- [26] U. Shrikant, R. Srikanth, and S. Banerjee, Non-Markovian dephasing and depolarizing channels, *Phys. Rev. A* 98, 032328 (2018).
- [27] P. Kumar, S. Banerjee, R. Srikanth, V. Jagadish, F. Petruccione, Non-Markovian evolution: a quantum walk perspective, *Open Systems and Information Dynamics (OSID)* 25, 1850014 (2018).
- [28] N. Kumar, S. Banerjee and C. M. Chandrashekar, Enhanced non-Markovian behavior in quantum walks with Markovian disorder, *Scientific Reports* 8, 8801 (2018).
- [29] K. G Paulson, E. Panwar, S. Banerjee, and R. Srikanth, Hierarchy of quantum correlations under non-Markovian dynamics, *Quantum Information Processing* 20, 141 (2021).
- [30] H-P Breuer, E-M Laine, J Piilo, and B Vacchini, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 88(2):021002, (2016).
- [31] J. Naikoo, S. Banerjee, C. M. Chandrashekar, Non-Markovian channel from the reduced dynamics of a coin in a quantum walk. *Phys. Rev. A* 102(6), 062209, 2020.
- [32] U. Shrikant, R. Srikanth, and S. Banerjee, Ping-pong quantum key distribution with trusted noise: non-Markovian advantage, *Quantum Information Processing* 19, 366 (2020).
- [33] V. Gorini, A. Kossakowski and E. C. G. Sudarshan, *J. Math. Phys.* 17, 821 (1976)
- [34] G. Lindblad, On the Generators of Quantum Dynamical Semigroups, *Commun. math. Phys.* 48, 119—130 (1976)
- [35] A. M. Childs, On the Relationship Between Continuous- and Discrete-Time Quantum Walk. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 294, 581–603, (2010)
- [36] Yi-Chan Lee, Min-Hsiu Hsieh, Steven T. Flammia, and Ray-Kuang Lee, Local \mathcal{PT} Symmetry Violates the No-Signaling Principle. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 112, 130404, (2014)
- [37] Dorje C Brody Consistency of PT-symmetric quantum mechanics *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* 49, 10, 10LT03, 2016
- [38] Ali Mostafazadeh, Pseudo-Hermiticity versus PT-symmetry. II. A complete characterization of non-Hermitian Hamiltonians with a real spectrum. *J. Math. Phys.* 43(5), 2814, (2002)
- [39] Elsi-Mari Laine, Jyrki Piilo, Heinz-Peter Breuer, Measure for the Non-Markovianity of Quantum Processes. *Phys. Rev. A* 81(6), 062115 (2010).
- [40] Kohei Kawabata, Yuto Ashida, Masahito Ueda. Information Retrieval and Criticality in Parity-Time-Symmetric Systems *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 119(19), p. 190401 (2017).
- [41] H. Rangani Jahromi, R. Lo Franco. Searching for exceptional points and inspecting non-contractivity of trace distance in (anti-) \mathcal{PT} -symmetric systems *Quantum Information Processing* volume 21, Article number: 155 (2022)
- [42] Jean-Pierre Antoine, Camillo Trapani Some remarks on quasi-Hermitian operators *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 55, 1, 013503 (2014).
- [43] N. P. Kumar, R. Balu, R. Laflamme, C. M. Chandrashekar Bounds on the dynamics of periodic quantum walks and emergence of gapless and gapped Dirac equation *Phys. Rev. A* 97, 012116 (2018).