

Accelerating relaxation in Markovian open quantum systems through quantum reset processes

Ruicheng Bao and Zhonghuai Hou*

Department of Chemical Physics & Hefei National Laboratory for Physical Sciences at Microscales, iChEM, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China

(Dated: December 22, 2022)

The divergent timescales of slow relaxation processes are obstacles to the study of stationary state properties and the functionalization of some systems like steady state heat engines, both in classical and quantum systems. Thus the shortening of the relaxation time scale would be desirable in many cases. Here we claim that using quantum reset, a common and important operation in quantum computation, the relaxation dynamics of general Markovian open quantum systems with arbitrary initial states is able to be accelerated significantly through a simple protocol. This faster relaxation induced by the reset protocol is reminiscent of the quantum Mpemba effect. The reset protocol we proposed is applied to a two-state quantum systems to illustrate our theory, which may characterize a single qubit or a spin. Furthermore, our new strategy to accelerate relaxations may also be applied to closed quantum systems or even some non-Markovian open quantum systems.

PACS numbers:

Introduction.—Relaxation processes, typically conducting to stationary states, are ubiquitous in both quantum and classical systems and are crucial research topics in non-equilibrium statistical physics. Intriguingly, relaxation processes are varied and nontrivial even within the framework of Markovian dynamics [1], such as non-monotonic relaxations known as the Mpemba effect [2–7], slow relaxations in glassy systems [8], and the anomalously far from equilibrium relaxation in the Ising anti-ferromagnetic chain system [9]. However, in many cases faster paces to stationary states are preferred, when the stationary states are desired for further study or use [10]. For instance, (periodic) steady states could serve as the functional states of some classical or quantum heat engines, in which they can output power [11–13]. In addition, fast relaxation is beneficial for control of quantum systems, quantum computing and the preparations of quantum states [14].

Stochastic reset, a dynamical protocol to stop a stochastic process randomly and start it anew, is of wide interest in the past decade [7, 15–27]. It was found that reset can benefit dynamical processes in classical systems, such as reducing the mean first passage time of diffusion processes [15] and accelerating the relaxation processes [7]. Recently, there are also a surge of works in quantum reset processes, including studies of the reset’s effect on closed quantum dynamics [24, 27, 28] and studies on the change of stationary state properties or thermodynamics of open quantum systems due to reset [29, 30]. However, the effect of reset on the relaxation dynamics of open quantum systems remains to be explored. Quantum reset is an important and common operation for the quantum state preparation, which is a key step in quantum computation [31]. For instance, at the beginning of

a quantum computation process, initialization of qubits to the computational state $|00\dots0\rangle$ is realized by the reset operation. Therefore it’s natural to ask whether this crucial operation in quantum system could serve as an approach to benefit quantum dynamics as it does in classical systems.

Here in this letter, we connect the quantum reset protocol with the acceleration of relaxations to stationarity in open quantum systems described by the Markovian Lindblad master equations. We show that quantum reset is able to drive systems with arbitrary initial states to accelerated approaches where they can reach stationary states significantly faster. The acceleration is realized by a simple reset protocol adding reset to the system for a given time and closing the reset after that, which would be further discussed later.

Spectral analysis of the Markovian open quantum dynamics.—We are considering open quantum systems in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} of dimension d , whose dynamics in the interaction picture are described by the Lindblad-Gorini-Kossakowski-Sudarshan (LGKS) master equation

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \mathcal{L}(\rho), \quad (1)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}(\rho) \equiv -i[H, \rho] + \sum_i \left[J_i \rho J_i^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{ J_i^\dagger J_i, \rho \} \right] \quad (2)$$

is the Lindbladian. It preserves the trace and Hermiticity $\{\text{Tr}[\mathcal{L}(X)] = 0, (\mathcal{L}(X))^\dagger = \mathcal{L}(X^\dagger), \forall X\}$, which assures the completely positive dynamics of the density operator ρ . Here H is the Hamiltonian of the system and the jump operators J_i describe the dissipation effect due to environment, mediating the system-bath interaction. For closed quantum systems, the jump operators turn to be zero. The evolution of the system can also be described in terms of the eigenvalues and eigenmatrices of

*E-mail: hzhjlj@ustc.edu.cn

\mathcal{L} since it acts linearly on the density matrix. We denote the eigenvalues of \mathcal{L} by λ_k and order them such that $0 \geq \text{Re}(\lambda_k) \geq \text{Re}(\lambda_{k+1})$. Assuming that the generator \mathcal{L} is able to be diagonalized, the right eigenmatrices R_k and left eigenmatrices L_k can be found by

$$\mathcal{L}(R_k) = \lambda_k R_k,$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}^\dagger(L_k) = \lambda_k^* L_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, d^2$$

respectively. They are normalized as

$$\text{Tr}(L_k^\dagger R_h) = \delta_{kh}. \quad (3)$$

Note that the dual operator \mathcal{L}^\dagger implementing the evolution of observables is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}^\dagger(O) = i[H, O] + \sum_i \left[J_i O J_i^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{J_i^\dagger J_i, O\} \right]. \quad (4)$$

Then, given an initial state ρ_0 , the system state at time t can be expressed as

$$\rho(t) = e^{t\mathcal{L}}[\rho_0] = \rho_{ss} + \sum_{k=2}^{d^2} e^{\lambda_k t} \text{Tr}(L_k^\dagger \rho_0) R_k, \quad (5)$$

in which the unique stationary state of the open quantum system ρ_{ss} is given by

$$\rho_{ss} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \rho(t) = R_1, \quad (6)$$

if assuming the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1 = 0$ is non-degenerate. We further assume that the second eigenvalue λ_2 is real and unique [10], so that there is a spectral gap, then for long time one has

$$\|\rho(t) - \rho_{ss}\| \sim \exp(\lambda_2 t).$$

In this case, for the system with a general initial state, the timescale for relaxation is determined by

$$\tau = \frac{1}{|\lambda_2|}, \quad (7)$$

when the slowest decaying mode $e^{t\lambda_2} R_2$ is excited.

Reset protocol to accelerate relaxation processes.—To prevent the slowest decaying mode of the quantum systems with general initial states from being excited, we introduce a quantum reset dynamics. We let initial states evolve under this quantum reset dynamics for a given time t_s , during which reset of the system to a given reset state $|\delta\rangle$ occurs randomly at times distributed exponentially with constant rate r . After t_s , the reset is closed and the system follows the reset-free dynamics according to the original Lindbladian. Next, we would like to show that this quantum reset process can eliminate the overlaps of the initial state with the slowest dynamical mode by appropriately setting the reset time t_s , i.e.,

$$\text{Tr}[L_2^\dagger \rho^r(t_s)] = 0 \quad (8)$$

is realized. Here

$$\rho^r(t_s) = e^{t_s \mathcal{L}_r} \rho_0$$

and \mathcal{L}_r is the generalized Lindblad operator with reset, as we will see below. The quantum reset dynamics can be simply constructed by adding jump operators

$$J_i^r = \sqrt{r} |\delta\rangle \langle \phi_i| \quad (9)$$

to the Lindbladian (2). Here $|\phi_i\rangle$ form an auxiliary complete orthonormal basis. This modification gives rise to the generalized Lindblad operator as

$$\mathcal{L}_r(\rho) = \mathcal{L}(\rho) + r \text{Tr}(\rho) |\delta\rangle \langle \delta| - r \rho. \quad (10)$$

The eigenvalue equations of this new operator are [29]

$$\mathcal{L}_r(R_i) = (\lambda_i - r) R_i, \quad i \in \{2, \dots, d^2\}, \quad (11)$$

That is, the eigenmatrices are unchanged and the eigenvalues are all shifted down by a value r compared to the original Lindbladian. Then, acting the time-evolution operator generated by this generalized Lindblad operator on the eigenvalue-expanded form of the initial state

$$\rho_0 = \rho_{ss} + \sum_{k=2}^{d^2} \text{Tr}(L_k^\dagger \rho_0) R_k \quad (12)$$

results in

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^r(t) &= e^{t\mathcal{L}_r} \rho_0 \\ &= e^{t\mathcal{L}_r} \rho_{ss} + \sum_{k=2}^{d^2} \text{Tr}(L_k^\dagger \rho_0) e^{(\lambda_k - r)t} R_k. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

To get the detailed form of the first term, note that the stationary state under reset dynamics has been determined by Garrahan as

$$\rho_{ss}^r = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \rho^r(t) = \rho_{ss} + \sum_{k=2}^{d^2} \frac{r \langle \delta | L_k^\dagger | \delta \rangle}{r - \lambda_k} R_k, \quad (14)$$

and the stationary state has the property that

$$e^{t\mathcal{L}_r} \rho_{ss}^r = \rho_{ss}^r. \quad (15)$$

Thus, acting $e^{t\mathcal{L}_r}$ on both sides of the Eq.(14) and combining Eq.(15) bring about

$$\begin{aligned} e^{t\mathcal{L}_r} \rho_{ss} &+ \sum_{k=2}^{d^2} \frac{r \langle \delta | L_k^\dagger | \delta \rangle}{r - \lambda_k} e^{(\lambda_k - r)t} R_k \\ &= \rho_{ss} + \sum_{k=2}^{d^2} \frac{r \langle \delta | L_k^\dagger | \delta \rangle}{r - \lambda_k} R_k. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Combining these equations one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^r(t) &= e^{t\mathcal{L}_r} \rho_{ss} + \sum_{k=2}^{d^2} \text{Tr}(L_k^\dagger \rho_0) e^{(\lambda_k - r)t} R_k \\ &= \rho_{ss} + \sum_k a_k(t) e^{\lambda_k t} R_k, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

with the time-dependent expansion coefficients $a_k(t)$ being defined as

$$a_k(t) \equiv \left[\text{Tr}(L_k^\dagger \rho_0) - \frac{r \langle \delta | L_k^\dagger | \delta \rangle}{r - \lambda_k} \right] e^{-rt} + \frac{r \langle \delta | L_k^\dagger | \delta \rangle}{r - \lambda_k} e^{-\lambda_k t}. \quad (18)$$

To fulfill the condition $\text{Tr}[L_2^\dagger \rho^r(t_s)] = 0$, one let

$$a_2(t_s) = 0. \quad (19)$$

Then one can obtain the resetting time t_s through the equation

$$\left[\text{Tr}(L_2^\dagger \rho_0) - \frac{r \langle \delta | L_2^\dagger | \delta \rangle}{r - \lambda_2} \right] e^{-rt_s} + \frac{r \langle \delta | L_2^\dagger | \delta \rangle}{r - \lambda_2} e^{-\lambda_2 t_s} = 0, \quad (20)$$

whose solution is simply given by

$$t_s(r) = \frac{1}{r - \lambda_2} \ln \left[1 - \frac{\text{Tr}(L_2^\dagger \rho_0)(r - \lambda_2)}{r \langle \delta | L_2^\dagger | \delta \rangle} \right]. \quad (21)$$

For an arbitrary initial state ρ_0 which may be a mixed state, one can appropriately choose the reset state $|\delta\rangle$ so that $t_s(r) \geq 0$, leading to an exponentially fast pace to stationarity. The whole dynamics of this open quantum system is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^r(t) = & \rho_{ss} + \sum_k a_k(t) e^{\lambda_k t} \Theta(t_s - t) R_k \\ & + \sum_k a_k(t_s) e^{\lambda_k t} \Theta(t - t_s) R_k. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Application to a two-level quantum system.—To illustrate our theory, we take a two-level quantum system as an example, which may represent a single qubit or a spin. For brevity, we set the ground state energy $E_0 = 0$ and the excited state energy $E_1 = E$, then the total Hamiltonian may be

$$H = E|1\rangle\langle 1| + \Omega(|0\rangle\langle 1| + |1\rangle\langle 0|), \quad (23)$$

where Ω is the frequency of intrinsic transition between state $|1\rangle$ and state $|0\rangle$. The Lindblad jump operators describing the dissipation effect due to coupling to the environment are given by

$$J_0 = |1\rangle\langle 0| = \sigma_+, \quad (24)$$

$$J_1 = |0\rangle\langle 1| = \sigma_-, \quad (25)$$

then the original Lindblad master equation governing the dynamics of the reduced density matrix $\rho(t)$ of the system reads

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\rho(t)}{dt} = & -i[H, \rho] + \Gamma_0 \left(J_0 \rho J_1 - \frac{1}{2} \{J_0 J_1, \rho\} \right) \\ & + \Gamma_1 \left(J_1 \rho J_0 - \frac{1}{2} \{J_1 J_0, \rho\} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where $\Gamma_{0,1}$ are the transition rates from state $|0\rangle$ to state $|1\rangle$ or converse. Assuming the transition rates obey the detailed balance condition $\Gamma_0 e^{-\beta_{\text{env}} E_0} = \Gamma_1 e^{-\beta_{\text{env}} E_1}$, i.e.,

$$\Gamma_0 = \Gamma_1 e^{-\beta_{\text{env}} E},$$

then this two-level system with any initial condition ρ_0 would evolve into a unique equilibrium stationary state ρ_{eq} depending on the environment temperature $T = 1/\beta_{\text{env}}$, given by

$$\hat{\rho}_{\text{eq}} = \frac{e^{-\beta_{\text{env}} H}}{\text{Tr}(e^{-\beta_{\text{env}} H})}. \quad (27)$$

To study the relaxation dynamics, we consider a general initial state as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\rho}_0 = & \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{1+e^{-\beta_0 E}} & k e^{i\phi} \\ k e^{-i\phi} & \frac{e^{-\beta_0 E}}{1+e^{-\beta_0 E}} \end{pmatrix}, \\ 0 \leq k \leq & \frac{\sqrt{e^{\beta_0 E}}}{e^{\beta_0 E} + 1}, \quad 0 \leq \phi \leq 2\pi, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where the off-diagonal terms $k e^{\pm i\phi}$ quantify the amount of coherence in the initial state. Firstly, let's consider the simple case when there is no intrinsic transitions ($\Omega = 0$). In this case, the two-state system will finally converge to a unique Gibbs state $\hat{\rho}_{\text{eq}}$ whose off-diagonal terms vanish. Thus the corresponding relaxation process can be regarded as a decoherence process. All the eigenmatrices and eigenvalues of the Lindbladian can be computed exactly, which we list in the Appendix B. We choose the ground state $|0\rangle\langle 0|$ as the reset state, which may be more friendly for experimental realizations. Then using Eq. (22), the whole dynamics of this simple system under our reset protocol can be obtained. To quantify the distance between the state $\rho(t)$ and the final stationary state ρ_{ss} , we utilize a common choice of the distance measure in quantum systems, the trace distance

$$D[\rho(t)|\rho_{ss}] := \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}|\rho(t) - \rho_{ss}|, \quad (29)$$

where $|A| := \sqrt{A^\dagger A}$. Equipped with this distance measure, we fix all dynamical parameters and plot the trace distances between $\rho(t)$ and ρ_{eq} of this two-state system as the function of time t with different resetting rate r , as shown in Figure 1 (a). In the presence of reset protocol, the system is initialized at $\beta_0 = 2.0$, $k = 0.32$ and $\phi = 1$. The system without reset is initially at $\beta_0 = 3.0$, $k = 0.21$ and $\phi = 1$. The environment is set to be at a lower temperature $\beta_{\text{env}} = 4.0$, thus the system without reset is initially closer to the target stationary state, compared to the system imposed on the reset protocol. Remarkably, relaxation processes with reset protocol are significantly faster than the free relaxation process without reset, even resulting in the emergence of an anomalous relaxation phenomenon which is similar to Mpemba effect. That is, the systems which are initially farther from the stationary state reach the stationarity sooner.




FIG. 1: Relaxation dynamics of the two-state system. (a) Distances between $\rho(t)$ and ρ_{eq} as the function of time t with different resetting rate r . (b) The critical time t_s as a function of the resetting rate r . The parameters are chosen as $\beta_0 = 2.0$, $k = 0.32$ and $\phi = 1$ with reset protocol and $\beta_0 = 3.0$, $k = 0.21$ and $\phi = 1$ without reset.

We also plot the critical time t_s to close the reset as a function of the resetting r in Figure 1 (b), where t_s is shown to be a decreasing function of r with other parameter fixed. This implies that the reset protocol with larger resetting rate r leads to faster relaxation of open quantum systems.

Note that when there are intrinsic transitions ($\Omega \neq 0$), our reset protocol can still take effects. In Figure 1 (c) we show the effect of our reset protocol on relaxation dynamics when $\Omega = 2$, where the relaxation processes of open quantum systems are still accelerated.

The choice of reset state in our protocol is also of interest. To accelerate quantum relaxation through our protocol, the reset state should be chosen to guarantee that the relation $t_s(r) \geq 0$ holds. For this two-state system,

the expression of t_s is given by

$$t_s = \frac{\ln \left[1 + \frac{\Gamma_1 k_{tot}}{r} \left(\frac{1}{\Gamma_0 + \Gamma_1 e^{(\beta_0 - \beta_{env})E}} - \frac{1}{\Gamma_0 + \Gamma_1} \right) \right]}{k_{tot}}, \quad (30)$$

where the total transition rate $k_{tot} = r + \Gamma_0 + \Gamma_1$. One can readily find that when the initial temperature $\beta_0 < \beta_{env}$, i.e., the relaxation process corresponds to “cooling the system”, the ground state $|0\rangle\langle 0|$ can always act as an efficacious reset state whatever the resetting rate r is. In contrast, when $\beta_0 > \beta_{env}$, reset of the system to the ground state wouldn’t accelerate its relaxation, and one should have to choose the excited state $|1\rangle\langle 1|$ as the reset state.

Concluding remarks.—In conclusion, we propose a new paradigm to accelerate relaxations in open quantum systems through quantum reset processes for general initial states. The reset protocol claimed here is quite convenient to implement, one should just close the reset after a given time t_s , which can be tuned by the resetting rate r . Note that our reset protocol could also be applied to closed quantum system (see Appendix B for details), or even be applicable to some non-Markovian open quantum systems and non-Hermitian open quantum systems, once their dynamics can be described by some linear dynamical equations. There are still some limitations of our reset protocol, for example, when the spectral gap of the dynamical generator is small, this protocol may not accelerate the relaxation process significantly.

An interesting but challenging open problem is to generalize of our work to the case where the slowest decaying modes of the dynamical generator form a complex conjugate pair [32]

$$\rho(t) = \rho_{ss} + e^{\lambda_2 t} \text{Tr}(L_2^\dagger \rho_0) R_2 + e^{\lambda_2^* t} \text{Tr}(L_2 \rho_0) R_2^\dagger + \dots, \quad (31)$$

where our reset protocol cannot eliminate two slowest modes simultaneously to realize acceleration.

This work is supported by MOST(2018YFA0208702).

Appendix

Appendix A: Spectral analysis of the two-state model

The Eq. (26) can be rewritten as a matrix equation for the vector $\vec{\rho}(t) = [\rho_{00}(t), \rho_{01}(t), \rho_{10}(t), \rho_{11}(t)]^T$:

$$\frac{d\vec{\rho}(t)}{dt} = L\vec{\rho}(t), \quad (A1)$$

where L is a 4×4 Liouvillian matrix in the Fock-Liouvillian space, taking the form as

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} -\Gamma_0 & -i\Omega & i\Omega & \Gamma_1 \\ -i\Omega & -iE - \frac{\Gamma_0 + \Gamma_1}{2} & 0 & i\Omega \\ i\Omega & 0 & iE - \frac{\Gamma_0 + \Gamma_1}{2} & -i\Omega \\ \Gamma_0 & i\Omega & -i\Omega & -\Gamma_1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (A2)$$

In the simple case $\Omega = 0$, the right eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the matrix L are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_1 &= 0, \quad \vec{R}_1 = (\Gamma_1, 0, 0, \Gamma_0)^T \\ \lambda_2 &= -\Gamma_0 - \Gamma_1, \quad \vec{R}_2 = (-1, 0, 0, 1)^T \\ \lambda_3 &= \frac{1}{2}(-2i - \Gamma_0 - \Gamma_1), \quad \vec{R}_3 = (0, 1, 0, 0)^T \\ \lambda_4 &= \frac{1}{2}(2i - \Gamma_0 - \Gamma_1), \quad \vec{R}_4 = (0, 0, 1, 0)^T\end{aligned}\tag{A3}$$

Likewise, the left eigenvalues and eigenvectors are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_1^* &= 0, \quad \vec{R}_1 = (1, 0, 0, 1)^T \\ \lambda_2^* &= -\Gamma_0 - \Gamma_1, \quad \vec{R}_2 = (-\Gamma_0, 0, 0, \Gamma_1)^T \\ \lambda_3^* &= \frac{1}{2}(2i - \Gamma_0 - \Gamma_1), \quad \vec{R}_3 = (0, 1, 0, 0)^T \\ \lambda_4^* &= \frac{1}{2}(-2i - \Gamma_0 - \Gamma_1), \quad \vec{R}_4 = (0, 0, 1, 0)^T.\end{aligned}\tag{A4}$$

Then, by Eq.(21) in the main text, the expression for the critical time t_s is given by

$$t_s = \frac{\ln \left[1 + \frac{\Gamma_1(r + \Gamma_0 + \Gamma_1) \left(\frac{1}{\Gamma_0 + \Gamma_0 e^{\beta_0 E} - \Gamma_0 + \Gamma_1} \right)}{r} \right]}{r + \Gamma_0 + \Gamma_1},\tag{A5}$$

from which one can see that the critical time wouldn't be affected by the coherence terms of the initial state.

Appendix B: Application of the reset protocol to closed quantum systems

For a closed quantum system whose dynamics is described by the von-Neumann equation $\dot{\rho}(t) = -i[H, \rho(t)] \equiv L\rho(t)$, it's also convenient to reconsider the time evolution of the density matrix in the Fock-Liouville space [33] as

$$\frac{d\vec{\rho}(t)}{dt} = \hat{L}\vec{\rho}(t),\tag{B1}$$

with \hat{L} being the Liouville superoperator. The system is in a d dimensional Hilbert space, so that \hat{L} is a $d \times d$ matrix. After incorporating the effect of quantum reset, the modified dynamics of the density matrix $\vec{\rho}_r(t)$ with quantum reset is simply given by

$$\frac{d\vec{\rho}_r(t)}{dt} = \left(\hat{L} - r\hat{I} \right) \vec{\rho}_r(t) + r\vec{\Delta},\tag{B2}$$

where \hat{I} is the identity matrix and $\vec{\Delta}$ is a column vector with all but one of its entries being zeros. The only one elements being 1 corresponds to the pure resetting state $|\delta\rangle\langle\delta|$. The solution to Eq.(B2) is formally given by

$$\vec{\rho}_r(t) = e^{-rt} e^{\hat{L}t} \vec{\rho}_r(0) + \int_0^t r e^{-r\tau} e^{\hat{L}\tau} \vec{\Delta} d\tau,\tag{B3}$$

or in the original Hilbert space as [28]

$$\rho_r(t) = e^{-rt} e^{iHt} \rho_r(t) e^{-iHt} + \int_0^t r e^{-r\tau} e^{iH\tau} \Delta e^{-iH\tau} d\tau.\tag{B4}$$

Assuming that there is a unique stationary state $\vec{\rho}_{st}$, then the eigenvalues of \hat{L} satisfy $0 = \mu_1 > \text{Re}(\mu_2) \geq \text{Re}(\mu_3) \geq \dots \geq \text{Re}(\mu_{d^2})$, and the corresponding right eigenvectors are $r_1 = \vec{\rho}_{st}$, r_2, \dots, r_{d^2} . From completeness relation, the

initial state $\vec{\rho}_r(0)$ and the reset state $\vec{\Delta}$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{\rho}_r(0) &= \vec{\rho}_{st} + \sum_{k=2}^{d^2} a_k r_k \\ \vec{\Delta} &= \vec{\rho}_{st} + \sum_{k=2}^{d^2} d_k r_k.\end{aligned}\tag{B5}$$

Plugging the above formula into Eq.(B3) and using the relation $e^{\hat{L}t} r_k = e^{\mu_k t} r_k$ lead to

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{\rho}_r(t) &= \vec{\rho}_{st} + \sum_{k=2}^{d^2} \left[\frac{r d_k}{r - \mu_k} e^{-\mu_k t} + \left(a_k - \frac{r d_k}{r - \mu_k} e^{-rt} \right) \right] r_k e^{\mu_k t} \\ &\equiv \vec{\rho}_{st} + \sum_{k=2}^{d^2} a_k(t) e^{\mu_k t} r_k,\end{aligned}\tag{B6}$$

Setting the second modified coefficient $a_2(t_c) = 0$ gives rise to the expression of critical time

$$t_c = \frac{1}{r - \mu_2} \ln \left[1 - \frac{a_2(r - \mu_2)}{r d_2} \right],\tag{B7}$$

at which the reset is closed (we have assumed that μ_2 is real). Therefore, it has been demonstrated that our reset protocol can be imposed on closed quantum systems as well.

Furthermore, our reset protocol may even be applied to some non-Markovian or non-Hermitian open quantum systems, since the reduced dynamics of these systems could also be described by a linear differential equation [10, 34].

-
- [1] N. Shiraishi and K. Saito, Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 110603 (2019), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.123.110603>.
 - [2] Z. Lu and O. Raz, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **114**, 5083 (2017).
 - [3] I. Klich, O. Raz, O. Hirschberg, and M. Vucelja, Physical Review X **9**, 021060 (2019).
 - [4] A. Santos and A. Prados, Physics of Fluids **32**, 072010 (2020).
 - [5] A. Kumar and J. Bechhoefer, Nature **584**, 64 (2020).
 - [6] A. Gal and O. Raz, Physical review letters **124**, 060602 (2020).
 - [7] D. M. Busiello, D. Gupta, and A. Maritan, New Journal of Physics **23**, 103012 (2021), URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/ac2922>.
 - [8] C. Toninelli, G. Biroli, and D. S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 185504 (2004), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.92.185504>.
 - [9] G. Teza, R. Yaacoby, and O. Raz, arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11644 (2022).
 - [10] F. Carollo, A. Lasanta, and I. Lesanovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **127**, 060401 (2021), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.060401>.
 - [11] K. Brandner, M. Bauer, and U. Seifert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 170602 (2017), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.170602>.
 - [12] J. Um, K. E. Dorfman, and H. Park, Phys. Rev. Research **4**, L032034 (2022), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevResearch.4.L032034>.
 - [13] P. Pietzonka and U. Seifert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 190602 (2018), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.190602>.
 - [14] R. Dann, A. Tobalina, and R. Kosloff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 250402 (2019), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.250402>.
 - [15] M. R. Evans and S. N. Majumdar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 160601 (2011), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.160601>.
 - [16] S. Gupta, S. N. Majumdar, and G. Schehr, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 220601 (2014), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.220601>.
 - [17] E. Roldán, A. Lisica, D. Sánchez-Taltavull, and S. W. Grill, Phys. Rev. E **93**, 062411 (2016), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevE.93.062411>.
 - [18] S. Reuveni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 170601 (2016), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.170601>.
 - [19] S. Belan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 080601 (2018), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.080601>.

- [20] A. Chechkin and I. M. Sokolov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 050601 (2018), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.050601>.
- [21] A. Pal, I. Eliazar, and S. Reuveni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 020602 (2019), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.020602>.
- [22] S. Gupta and A. M. Jayannavar, Frontiers in Physics **10**, 789097 (2022).
- [23] B. De Bruyne, J. Randon-Furling, and S. Redner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **125**, 050602 (2020), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.050602>.
- [24] G. Peretto, F. Carollo, M. Magoni, and I. Lesanovsky, Phys. Rev. B **104**, L180302 (2021), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.104.L180302>.
- [25] A. Miron and S. Reuveni, Phys. Rev. Research **3**, L012023 (2021), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevResearch.3.L012023>.
- [26] B. De Bruyne, S. N. Majumdar, and G. Schehr, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 200603 (2022), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.128.200603>.
- [27] E. B. Ruoyu Yin, arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01974 (2022).
- [28] B. Mukherjee, K. Sengupta, and S. N. Majumdar, Phys. Rev. B **98**, 104309 (2018), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.98.104309>.
- [29] D. C. Rose, H. Touchette, I. Lesanovsky, and J. P. Garrahan, Phys. Rev. E **98**, 022129 (2018), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevE.98.022129>.
- [30] G. Peretto, F. Carollo, and I. Lesanovsky, SciPost Phys. **13**, 079 (2022), URL <https://scipost.org/10.21468/SciPostPhys.13.4.079>.
- [31] L. Buffoni, S. Gherardini, E. Zambrini Cruzeiro, and Y. Omar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **129**, 150602 (2022), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.129.150602>.
- [32] S. Kochsiek, F. Carollo, and I. Lesanovsky, Phys. Rev. A **106**, 012207 (2022), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.106.012207>.
- [33] F. Schmolke and E. Lutz, arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.02456 (2022).
- [34] Q. Du, K. Cao, and S.-P. Kou, Phys. Rev. A **106**, 032206 (2022), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.106.032206>.