

# Thermodynamics of quantum Brownian motion with internal degrees of freedom : the role of entanglement in the strong-coupling quantum regime

Christian Hoerhammer and Helmut Buttner  
Theoretische Physik I, Universität Bayreuth, D-95440, Germany  
(Dated: March 23, 2022)

We study the influence of entanglement on the relation between the statistical entropy of an open quantum system and the heat exchanged with a low temperature environment. A model of quantum Brownian motion of the Caldeira-Leggett type (for which a violation of the Clausius inequality has been stated by Th.M. Nieuwenhuizen and A.E. Allahverdyan [Phys. Rev. E 66, 036102 (2002)]) is reexamined and the results of the cited work are put into perspective. In order to address the problem from an information theoretical viewpoint a model of two coupled Brownian oscillators is formulated that can also be viewed as a continuum version of a two-qubit system. The influence of an additional internal coupling parameter on heat and entropy changes is described and the findings are compared to the case of a single Brownian particle.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Open systems are subject to dissipation of energy and fluctuations in their degrees of freedom. Within the theory of quantum dissipative systems [1, 2] the starting point in describing noise and damping is the Hamiltonian  $H_{\text{tot}} = H_S + H_E + H_{SE}$  where the Hamiltonian of the total system  $H_{\text{tot}}$  is expressed as a sum of the Hamiltonian of the subsystem of interest  $H_S$ , a Hamiltonian  $H_E$  modeling the environmental degrees of freedom and an interaction term  $H_{SE}$ . For quantum objects this coupling to the environment leads in addition to the phenomena of decoherence and entanglement. In the low temperature respectively strong coupling regime these entanglement effects become important. Under the unitary evolution of the density operator  $\rho_{\text{tot}}(t) = U(t;0)\rho_{\text{tot}}(0)U^\dagger(t;0)$  with  $U(t;0) = \exp[-\frac{i}{\hbar}H_{\text{tot}}t]$  an initial product state of subsystem  $S$  and bath  $E$  evolves into a correlated state with  $\rho_{\text{tot}}(t) \notin \rho_S(t) \otimes \rho_E(t)$  for  $t > 0$ . For zero temperature the closed, total system is in its ground state and therefore the von Neumann entropy  $S(\rho_{\text{tot}}(t))$  stays zero for all times. But for  $t > 0$  the pure state of the whole system is an entangled state of subsystem and bath with  $S(\rho_{\text{tot}}(t)) = S(\rho_S(t)) + S(\rho_E(t))$ . The subsystem therefore is in a mixed state with  $S(\rho_S(t)) > 0$  even for zero bath temperature.

In most applications, especially in quantum optics [3, 4], the coupling between system and bath can be assumed to be weak which allows neglecting entanglement effects (Born-Markov-Approximation) and applying the formalism of Markovian quantum master equations. In this case the statistical thermodynamics of the open subsystem are governed by the quantum Gibbs distribution. In the strong-coupling quantum regime, the stationary state of the subsystem  $\rho_S(t)$  is still Gaussian but non-Gibbsian due to the entanglement with the bath. If the total Hamiltonian is harmonic, a Gaussian initial state

of the subsystem remains Gaussian for all times. Its density matrix  $\rho_S(t)$  is completely characterized by the first and second moments of the relevant operators. The Heisenberg equation of motion for these operators is the quantum Langevin equation [5, 6]. The characterizing moments are determined by the stationary values of the quantum Langevin equation and can be calculated alternatively by applying the quantum fluctuation-dissipation theorem. The statistical entropy associated with that stationary quantum state is the von Neumann entropy. The system's exchange of heat with the environment (which is defined as the change in energy due to redistributions in phase space) is related to the thermodynamic entropy by the Clausius inequality. This thermodynamic entropy can only be identified with the statistical entropy when  $\rho_S$  takes the form of the canonical density matrix. This is just the case for negligible interaction between subsystem and environment.

From an information-theoretical point of view above considerations become important. The Landauer principle [7, 8] which is based on the Clausius inequality states that "many-to-one" operations like erasure of information require the dissipation of energy. Deleting one bit of information is accompanied by a released amount of heat of at least  $kT \ln 2$ . This erasure is connected with a reduction of entropy, and thus cannot be realized in a closed system. Therefore the information-carrying system has to be coupled to its environment. To avoid a rapid destruction of the necessary quantum coherence the quantum subsystem should be placed in a low temperature environment. Thus the coupling might be relatively strong compared to thermal energy. Since the Landauer principle is dealing with information processing and erasure, the relevant entropy is the statistical entropy of the system. Statistical entropy and heat are defined separately. Thus, the relation between both the quantities can be examined.

The purpose of our paper is to study deviations from the Clausius inequality and Landauer bound respectively in the strong coupling quantum regime. An analytic treatment of this issue is given within the framework of the Caldeira-Leggett model of quantum Brownian motion.

Electronic address: christian.hoerhammer@uni-bayreuth.de

In the first part of this paper we want to discuss quite controversial recent work [9, 10, 11, 12] and put some of those results into perspective. Therefore the quantum Langevin equation of a harmonically bound quantum particle which is based on the Caldeira-Leggett model is presented. The stationary moments which are obtained from this equation characterize the reduced density matrix which is used to define thermodynamic quantities. Then, changes in heat and in statistical entropy for adiabatic parameter variations are compared and the applicability of the Clausius inequality in the strong coupling/ low temperature quantum regime is discussed. In the second main part we will focus on a model of Brownian motion of two coupled oscillators, which can be understood as a continuum version of a two-qubit system [13]. With regard to recent work done on continuous variable computing [14, 15] the impact on quantum information theory is studied. It will become clear that additional internal degrees of freedom can lead to different results as in the case of quantum motion of a single Brownian particle.

## II. CALDEIRA-LEGGETT MODEL OF QUANTUM BROWNIAN MOTION

Brownian motion is a prominent example of an open quantum system [16]. The standard model of quantum Brownian motion, often referred to as the Caldeira-Leggett model [17, 18], is a system-plus-reservoir model. The whole system is governed by the Hamiltonian

$$H_{\text{tot}} = \frac{p^2}{2m} + V(q) + \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{p_i^2}{2m_i} + \frac{m_i \omega_i^2}{2} x_i^2 \right) + \sum_{i=1}^N g_i x_i q + \frac{c_i^2}{2m_i \omega_i^2} q^2 \quad (1)$$

where  $q$  and  $p$  are the Heisenberg operators for coordinate and momentum of the Brownian particle moving in the harmonic potential  $V(q) = \frac{1}{2} m \omega_0^2 q^2$ . The particle is coupled to a bath of  $N$  harmonic oscillators with variables  $x_i$  and  $p_i$  and uniformly spaced modes  $\omega_i = i$ . The interaction is bilinear in coordinates of system  $q$  and bath  $x_i$ . For the coupling-parameters  $c_i$  the so-called Drude-Üllersma spectrum [19] with large cutoff frequency and coupling constant is chosen:  $c_i = \frac{2}{\omega_i} \frac{m_i \omega_i^2}{\omega_i^2 + 1} = \frac{2}{\omega_i^2 + 1}$ . The bath is characterized by its spectral density  $J(\omega)$ , which takes the form of the Drude spectrum  $J(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega^2 + 1}$  in the thermodynamic limit (sending  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ ,  $N \rightarrow 1$  and keeping  $p = N = \text{const.}$ ). The potential renormalization term  $\frac{c_i^2}{2m_i \omega_i^2} q^2$  ensures that  $V(q)$  remains the bare potential. Neglecting this self-interaction term, the positive definiteness of the total Hamiltonian  $H_{\text{tot}}$  would just be guaranteed for  $m_i \omega_i^2 = 1$  and  $\{ \}$  since  $\omega_i$  is large  $\{ \}$  would restrict the applicability of the model to weak-coupling approximations ( $\omega_i \rightarrow 0$ ).

### A. Quantum Langevin equation

From the Hamiltonian (1) the Heisenberg equations of motion for the operators  $q$  and  $p$  and the bath variables  $x_i, p_i$  are received. By eliminating the bath degrees of freedom the quantum Langevin equation [5, 6] of a particle moving in the potential  $V(q)$  can be derived:

$$m \ddot{q}(t) + \frac{dV(q)}{dq} + \int_0^t dt' \gamma(t-t') \dot{q}(t') = \dot{q}(t) - q(0) - \dot{q}(t): \quad (2)$$

The stochastic character of this integro-differential equation with the friction kernel  $\gamma(t) = \sum_j \omega_j^2 e^{-\omega_j t}$  comes into play by considering the initial distribution of the bath variables which determines the noise term  $\dot{q}(t)$ :

$$\dot{q}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N c_i x_i(0) \cos \omega_i t + \frac{p_i(0)}{m_i \omega_i} \sin \omega_i t : \quad (3)$$

Assuming an uncorrelated initial state with the reservoir being in canonical equilibrium at temperature  $T = \frac{1}{\beta}$ ,  $\exp(-\beta H_E)$ ,  $\dot{q}(t)$  is a stationary Gaussian operator noise with  $\langle \dot{q}(t) \rangle = 0$  and the correlation function [3]:

$$K(t-t') = \frac{1}{2} \langle \dot{q}(t) \dot{q}(t') + \dot{q}(t') \dot{q}(t) \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{c_i^2}{2m_i \omega_i^2} \coth\left(\frac{1}{2} \beta \omega_i\right) \cos \omega_i(t-t') \quad (4)$$

In the case of initial correlations of particle and bath the correlation function contains additional terms which affect the dynamics on the timescale  $t \sim 1$ . To fully characterize the reduced dynamics it is thus important to specify the initial preparation.

### B. Stationary state

The relaxation dynamics of the moments  $\langle q^2(t) \rangle$  and  $\langle p^2(t) \rangle$  described by eq. (2), end up in a stationary state for  $t \rightarrow 1$ . The stationary correlations can be calculated alternatively by applying the quantum fluctuation-dissipation theorem [20], which establishes a connection between the quantum mechanical dynamical susceptibility  $\chi''(\omega) = \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_0^1 dt \langle \dot{q}(t) \dot{q}(0) \rangle e^{i\omega t} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\omega^2 + 1} \sim \frac{1}{\omega^2}$  and the equilibrium fluctuations  $\langle q^2 \rangle$  and  $\langle p^2 \rangle$ :

$$\langle q^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{c_i^2}{\omega_i^2} \coth\left(\frac{1}{2} \beta \omega_i\right) \sim \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\omega_i^2} \quad (5)$$

$$\langle p^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{c_i^2 m_i^2 \omega_i^2}{\omega_i^2 + 1} \coth\left(\frac{1}{2} \beta \omega_i\right) \sim \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\omega_i^2} \quad (6)$$

If the dissipative part of the susceptibility  $\chi''(\omega)$  of the non-Markovian damped oscillator with three characteristic frequencies  $\omega_1, \omega_2$  and  $\omega_3$  (poles in the complex plane)

is inserted, an analytic expression for eq. (5) and (6) is derived [1]:

$$\hbar\omega^2 i = \frac{\sim}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{X^3}{(i+1)^2} \frac{(\frac{i}{2})^{\frac{i}{2}}}{(i+1)^2} T; \quad (7)$$

$$\hbar\omega^2 i = m^2 \omega_0^2 \hbar\omega^2 i + \frac{\sim}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{X^3}{(i+1)^2} \frac{(\frac{i}{2})^{\frac{i}{2}}}{(i+1)^2}; \quad (8)$$

where  $\psi(x)$  is the Digamma function and  $\omega_0 = \omega_3$ ,  $\omega_4 = \omega_1$ . The stationary state of the Brownian particle is fully characterized by the variances (7) and (8) which determine the stationary density matrix  $\rho_s$  of the subsystem [1, 21]:

$$\rho_s(q; q^0) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\hbar\omega^2 i}} \exp \left[ -\frac{(q + q^0)^2}{8\hbar\omega^2 i} - \frac{(q - q^0)^2}{2\omega^2 = \hbar\omega^2 i} \right]; \quad (9)$$

This reduced density matrix is different from the canonical equilibrium density matrix  $\rho_{th} = \exp(-\beta H_s)$  for any finite coupling  $\gamma$ . The statistical entropy of the quantum state  $\rho_s$  { the von Neumann entropy  $S(\rho_s)$  } is [9, 22]:

$$S(\rho_s) = -\text{Tr}[\rho_s \ln \rho_s] = -\sum_n p_n \ln p_n = \left( v + \frac{1}{2} \right) \ln \left( v + \frac{1}{2} \right) - \left( v - \frac{1}{2} \right) \ln \left( v - \frac{1}{2} \right); \quad (10)$$

with Boltzmann constant set to  $k_B = 1$  and the subsystems phase space volume  $v$  defined by

$$v = \frac{1}{\sim} \frac{1}{\hbar\omega^2 i \hbar\omega^2 i}; \quad (11)$$

as well as the eigenvalues of  $\rho_s(q; q^0)$ ,

$$p_n = 1/(v+1/2) [(v-1/2) = (v+1/2)]^n; \quad (12)$$

which are obtained as solution of the problem  $\frac{d}{dx} \rho_s(q; q^0) f_n(q^0) = p_n f_n(q)$ , where the eigenfunctions  $f_n$  are given by  $f_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{c}} H_n(\alpha x) e^{-c^2 x^2/2}$  with Hermite polynomials  $H_n$  and  $c = [\hbar\omega^2 i = (\sim^2 \hbar\omega^2 i)]^{1/4}$ .

The von Neumann entropy of the subsystem is increased with raising the coupling  $\gamma$  at a given temperature (Fig. 1). Even at  $T \rightarrow 0$  the subsystem's entropy is larger than zero. This effect is due to the correlations between subsystem and bath which prevent the subsystem from reaching a pure state for  $T \rightarrow 0$ . The probabilities to find the subsystem in an excited state depend on the coupling to the environment [23]. In the weak coupling limit, where  $\rho_s = \rho_{th}$ , expression (10) gives the entropy

$$S(\omega_0; T) = \frac{\sim \omega_0}{e^{\sim \omega_0} - 1} \ln \left( 1 + e^{\sim \omega_0} \right) \quad (13)$$

of a harmonic oscillator in canonical equilibrium.

It is important to remark here, that the entropy (10) deviates from the difference of the total entropy  $S(\rho_{tot})$




FIG. 1: Temperature dependence of the entropy expressions  $S(\rho_s)$  and  $S_p$  for different values of the system-bath couplings (in units of  $m\omega_0^2$ ). Dark lines from bottom to top:  $S(\rho_s) = 0$ ;  $S(\rho_s) = 1$ ;  $S(\rho_s) = 5$ . Grey lines:  $S_p$ ;  $\gamma = 1$  (dashed) and  $S_p$ ;  $\gamma = 5$ . Other parameters:  $\omega_0 = 1$ ,  $m = 1$ ,  $\sim = 10$ ,  $\omega = 1$ .

and the entropy of the bath in absence of the particle  $S(\rho_E) = 0$  which is given by [24]

$$S_p = \frac{1}{\omega_0} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} S(\omega_n; T) \ln \left( \frac{d \ln \sim(\omega_n)}{d \omega_n} \right) d \omega_n; \quad (14)$$

In the same way the thermodynamic potentials  $F_p$  and  $U_p$  can be derived which are related by  $S_p = (U_p - F_p)/T$ . One can see from Fig. 1 that  $S_p$  vanishes at  $T \rightarrow 0$  whereas  $S(\rho_s)$  does not. Proceeding in this way, the entropy  $S_p$  also contains the part of entropy that is associated with the quantum mechanical correlations or particle and bath. Since this conditional entropy is negative for entangled systems, the statistical entropy of the Brownian oscillator alone is underestimated by  $S_p$ . Thus, in our further treatment we will concentrate on the entropy  $S(\rho_s)$ .

### C. Thermodynamics of adiabatic changes

Nieuwenhuizen and Allahverdyan [11] examined the validity of the Clausius inequality respectively the Landauer bound in the strong coupling quantum regime. They found a violation of these principles at very low temperatures due to the existing correlations between subsystem and bath. With respect to quantum information theory they concluded that quantum mechanical information carrier therefore could be more efficient than their classical counterparts. A controversial subject in this context is the appropriate choice of heat and entropy expressions. Our purpose in this section is to clarify this issue and to put the findings of Nieuwenhuizen and Allahverdyan into perspective.

The internal energy of the Brownian oscillator can be defined as the mean energy in the stationary state [9]:

$$U_s = \text{Tr}[\rho_s H_s] = \hbar \omega_s i = \frac{1}{2m} \hbar\omega^2 i + \frac{1}{2} m \omega_0^2 \hbar\omega^2 i; \quad (15)$$

This expression differs from the equivalent to (14) defined internal energy  $U_p$ . The difference  $U_p - U_s$  can be interpreted as the interaction energy  $U_{int}$  (see HSE i!) which is related to the free energy  $F_p$  by

$$U_{int} = U_p - U_s = \frac{\partial F_p}{\partial \beta} \quad (16)$$

Choosing the parameter values  $m; \beta_0$  and  $\gamma$  as in Fig. 1 the ratio  $\beta_0 = U_{int}/U_p$  at zero bath temperature is given by  $(\beta_0 = m \beta_0^2) = 0.03$  and  $(\beta_0 = 5m \beta_0^2) = 0.10$ . For  $kT = \beta_0$  the ratios are  $(\beta_0 = m \beta_0^2) = 0.01$  and  $(\beta_0 = 5m \beta_0^2) = 0.05$  respectively.

The total differential  $dU_s$  of the internal energy  $U_s$ ,

$$dU_s = \text{Tr}[dH_s] + \text{Tr}[H_s d\beta] = W + Q \quad (17)$$

can be divided into two parts [25]. The first term results from the change of the parameters  $m$  and  $\beta_0$  in the Hamiltonian, so it is a mechanical, non-statistical object and will be referred to as work  $W$ :

$$W = m \beta_0^2 \frac{d\beta_0}{d\beta} + \frac{\beta_0^2}{2} \frac{d^2 \beta_0}{d\beta^2} \frac{d\beta}{d\beta} \quad (18)$$

The second term  $\text{Tr}[H_s d\beta]$  represents the variation of  $U_s$  due to the statistical redistribution of the phase space, which will be associated with the change in heat  $Q$ :

$$Q = \beta_0 Q + m Q \quad \text{with} \quad \beta_0 Q = \frac{1}{2} m \beta_0^2 \frac{\partial \langle h^2 \rangle}{\partial \beta_0} + \frac{1}{2m} \frac{\partial \langle p^2 \rangle}{\partial \beta_0} \frac{d\beta_0}{d\beta} \quad (19)$$

$$m Q = \frac{1}{2} m \beta_0^2 \frac{\partial \langle h^2 \rangle}{\partial m} + \frac{1}{2m} \frac{\partial \langle p^2 \rangle}{\partial m} \frac{dm}{d\beta} \quad (20)$$

Now the validity of the Clausius inequality

$$Q \geq T dS \quad (21)$$

can be evaluated. The Second Law of thermodynamics in the formulation by Clausius states that in a quasi-static process, during which the system at all times passes through equilibrium states, one has  $dS_{th} = Q/T$ . The thermodynamic entropy  $S_{th}$  defined by the Clausius equality can only be identified with the statistical entropy  $S(s)$  at thermalequilibrium where  $s = s_{th}$  with  $s_{th} = Z^{-1} \exp(-\beta H_s)$  and  $Z = \text{Tr} \exp(-\beta H_s)$ , because

$$dS = \text{Tr}[d s_{th} \ln s_{th}] = \text{Tr}[d s_{th} \ln Z] + \text{Tr}[d s_{th} H_s] = \text{Tr}[d s_{th} H_s] = Q = dS_{th} \quad (22)$$

Concerning the Landauer principle, which is based on the Clausius inequality, but deals with information processing and erasure, the relevant entropy is the statistical entropy  $S(s)$ . Therefore we want to compare changes in the statistical entropy  $dS$  to changes in heat  $Q$  induced by adiabatic variation of the system's parameters. The total differential of the von Neumann entropy (10) is given by

$$dS = -\text{Tr}[d s \ln s] = -\ln \frac{v + \frac{1}{2}}{v - \frac{1}{2}} dv \quad (23)$$

Thus, the sign of the change in  $S(s)$  is determined by the sign of the change in  $v$ . Note here that the parameters  $m$  and  $\beta_0$  are chosen as independent quantities, so that we can examine  $Q_m$  and  $T dS_m$  separately.




FIG. 2: Changes in heat  $Q_m$  (positive) and entropy-term  $T dS_m$  (negative) versus bath temperature  $T$  for different values of the system-bath coupling (in units of  $m \beta_0^2$ ): 0.5 (dashed), 1 (grey), 5 (dark). The oscillator parameters are chosen to be  $\beta_0 = 1$  and  $m = 1$ . The cut-off frequency is set to  $\omega = 10$  and  $\gamma = 1$ .

Fig. 2 shows the temperature dependence of the changes in heat  $Q_m$  and of the term  $T dS_m$  for different coupling strength. While  $Q_m$  is always positive, which means that the Brownian particle absorbs heat during an adiabatic increase of mass, the change of entropy and therefore the product  $T dS_m$  remains negative. In the high-temperature limit one has  $Q_m \rightarrow 0$  as well as  $T dS_m \rightarrow 0$  and therefore the behavior of an uncoupled harmonic oscillator characterized by (13). The term  $T dS_m$  converges relatively slowly towards zero because of the increasing factor  $T$ . The smaller the coupling, the faster is the convergence of the two terms  $Q_m$  and  $T dS_m$ . If the temperature  $T$  goes to zero, then the product  $T dS_m$  does as well. The amount of heat  $Q_m$  exchanged with the bath stays positive even in this limit and equals  $\beta_0 U_{int}$ . Thus, the Brownian particle can extract heat from the bath even at  $T = 0$ , a fact that was already extensively discussed in ref. [9, 11].

Fig. 3 gives results of the cited work [11]. Nieuwenhuizen and Allahverdyan studied the influence of adiabatic changes in mass on the phase space volume  $v$  given by eq. (11). At  $T = 0$  one receives a monotonous decreasing function which should converge with increasing mass to the minimal value  $v_{min} = 1/2$  which results from the uncertainty relation. They found, that at moderate temperatures the phase space volume first decreases for low masses, then reaches a minimum and finally increases nearly linearly with the mass. The increasing phase space volume means a positive sign for the entropy change  $dS$ . Therefore the authors conclude that the different signs of  $Q$  and  $T dS$  would only occur




FIG. 3: Phase space volume  $v$  versus mass  $m$  for different  $T$ -values. From bottom to top:  $T = 0; 0.1; 0.2; 0.25$ . Oscillator potential  $V(q) = \frac{1}{2}a^2q^2$  with fixed spring constant  $a = 1$ . Other parameters:  $\gamma = 1$ ,  $\omega = 500$ ,  $\hbar = 1$ . (See also ref. [11].)

at very low temperatures due to quantum correlations between system and bath.

In contrast to that, Fig. 4 shows the mass dependence of the phase space volume using the moments defined by eq. (7) and (8). One can clearly see that even for moderate temperatures the phase space volume does not increase, but reaches a temperature-dependent limit value. This value is given by the phase space volume of an uncoupled harmonic oscillator in canonical equilibrium:  $v_{th} = \frac{1}{2} \coth \frac{\hbar \omega}{2T}$ . Both, sending  $m \rightarrow 1$  or coupling  $\rightarrow 0$ , finally leads to the standard case of the quantum Gibbs distribution.

The differences between our findings and the results in [11] which become obvious in the figures 3 and 4 can be explained as follows: in the paper by Nieuwenhuizen and Allahverdyan [11] the harmonic potential  $V(q) = \frac{1}{2}m\omega_0^2q^2$  is expressed by  $\frac{1}{2}a^2q^2$  with spring constant  $a$ . Varying  $m$  and keeping  $a$  fixed leads to the results of Fig. 3. But since the limit  $m \rightarrow 1$  and  $\omega_0 \rightarrow 0$  should lead to the same result of  $v = 1/2$  at  $T=0$ , this choice of the potential is inconsistent. In Fig. 3 the phase space volume at  $T = 0$  does not reach the value  $v = 1/2$  even for high masses (instead  $v \rightarrow 0.6$  for the given parameter values). In order to receive the correct expressions for  $\langle hq^2 \rangle$ ,  $\langle hp^2 \rangle$  and  $U$  in the weak coupling or high temperature limit one has to set  $a = m\omega_0$ , which has also been done in the cited work [11] in different contexts.

Choosing the potential  $V(q) = \frac{1}{2}m\omega_0^2q^2$ , which is then affected by the variation of the mass, shows that the anomaly of different signs is an even stronger effect than found in [11]. This indicates that not only quantum correlations at low temperatures might play a role but also classical correlations between the damped oscillator and its environment at moderate temperatures.




FIG. 4: Phase space volume  $v$  versus oscillator mass  $m$  for different temperature values. From bottom to top:  $T = 0; 0.25; 0.5; 1$ . Oscillator potential  $V(q) = \frac{1}{2}m\omega_0^2q^2$  with frequency  $\omega_0 = 1$ . Other parameters:  $\gamma = 1$ ,  $\omega = 500$ ,  $\hbar = 1$ .

### III. QUANTUM BROWNIAN MOTION OF TWO COUPLED HARMONIC OSCILLATORS

In order to study the influence of additional parameters on the results stated above we introduce a model of quantum Brownian motion of two coupled oscillators which can be viewed as a continuum version of a two qubit system. In contrast to former work concerning the relaxation dynamics of two coupled oscillators [13, 26] we focus on the stationary state. The Hamiltonian  $H_{S^0}$  of the open quantum system  $S^0$  now reads

$$H_{S^0} = H_A + H_B + H_{AB}; \quad (24)$$

where  $H_A$  and  $H_B$  are the Hamiltonians of the two harmonic oscillators A and B with masses  $m_a, m_b$  and frequencies  $\omega_a$  and  $\omega_b$ .  $H_{AB}$  describes the interaction between them. Before deriving a quantum Langevin equation it is necessary to discuss different couplings between the oscillators as well as between the system  $H_{S^0}$  and the bath  $H_E$  and to choose an appropriate model.

#### A. Coupling between the two oscillators

In the framework of quantum optics the coupling between oscillators is often chosen to  $H_{AB} = D \hat{q}_a \hat{q}_b$  with coupling parameter  $D$ . In this case one problem is the constraint  $D \propto \sqrt{m_a m_b} \omega_a \omega_b$  as a condition for real eigenfrequencies of the system which restricts the range of allowed parameter variations. In our further treatment we will concentrate on the interaction Hamiltonian

$$H_{AB} = \frac{1}{2}D (\hat{q}_a - \hat{q}_b)^2; \quad (25)$$

This Hamiltonian is clearly inspired by its mechanical analogy { a restoring force proportional to the relative distance of the two oscillators { and leads to real eigenfrequencies of the system  $H_{S^0}$  for all values of the coupling parameter  $D$ .




FIG. 5: Oscillators separately coupled to the bath: eigenfrequencies of eq. (28) for a finite model with  $N + 2 = 10$  oscillators versus the system-bath coupling strength (in units of  $m$ ). The critical value  $\gamma_{\text{crit}}$  is given by eq. (29). Parameters:  $\omega_a = 2$ ,  $\omega_b = 5$ ,  $m_a = m_b = 1$ ,  $D = 2$  and  $\gamma = 1$ ,  $N = 8$ .

## B. Coupling between system and bath

In order to study the case of strong system-bath-coupling, the positive definiteness of the Hamiltonian has to be guaranteed in the range of relevant  $\gamma$ -values. Therefore we will discuss different couplings between system and bath in the following section.

### 1. Oscillators separately coupled to the bath

If each oscillator is coupled separately to the bath according to the coupling in (1) then we receive the following interaction Hamiltonian  $H_{S^0B}$ :

$$H_{S^0B} = \sum_{i=1}^N q x_i (q_a + q_b) + \frac{c_i^2}{2m_i \omega_i^2} (q_a^2 + q_b^2) \quad (26)$$

The equation for the eigenvalues of the total system

$$H_{\text{tot}} = H_A + H_B + H_{AB} + H_E + H_{S^0B} \quad (27)$$

reads:

$$\omega_a^2 + \frac{D}{m_a} = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{c_i^2}{m_a m_i (\omega_i^2 - \omega_a^2)} \frac{1}{\omega_i^2} + \frac{\frac{1}{m_a m_b} D}{\omega_b^2 + \frac{D}{m_b} + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{c_i^2}{m_b m_i (\omega_i^2 - \omega_b^2)} \frac{1}{\omega_i^2}} \quad (28)$$

Fig. 5 shows the influence of the system-bath-coupling strength on the eigenfrequencies of a finite system consisting of the two oscillators coupled to an environment of eight oscillators. The lowest eigenvalue  $\omega_1$  decreases with increasing coupling strength and becomes imaginary at a critical value

$$\gamma_{\text{crit}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{c_i^2}{m_a m_i (\omega_i^2 - \omega_a^2)} \frac{1}{\omega_i^2} (\omega_a^2 + D) (\omega_b^2 + D)}{2 \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{c_i^2}{m_a m_i (\omega_i^2 - \omega_a^2)} \frac{1}{\omega_i^2}} \quad (29)$$




FIG. 6: Bath-coupling to the center of mass: eigenfrequencies of eq. (31) for a finite model with  $N + 2 = 10$  oscillators versus the system-bath coupling strength (in units of  $m$ ). Parameters:  $\omega_a = 2$ ,  $\omega_b = 5$ ,  $m_a = m_b = 1$ ,  $D = 2$  and  $\gamma = 1$ ,  $N = 8$ .

which means exponentially increasing amplitudes and therefore instability of the whole system. In the thermodynamic limit this critical value becomes very small, so that this model is only suitable in the weak coupling case.

### 2. Bath-coupling to the center of mass

A more adequate model is the bath-coupling attached to the center of mass  $R$  of the system  $H_{S^0}$ . The system-bath interaction could then be described by the Hamiltonian:

$$H_{S^0B} = \sum_{i=1}^N q x_i R + \frac{c_i^2}{2m_i \omega_i^2} R^2 \quad (30)$$

This coupling leads to the following eigenvalue equation of the total system  $H_{\text{tot}}$ :

$$\frac{1}{M} (m_a \omega_a^2 + m_b \omega_b^2) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{c_i^2}{M m_i (\omega_i^2 - \omega^2)} \frac{1}{\omega_i^2} + \frac{(\omega_a^2 - \omega_b^2)^2}{m_b \omega_a^2 + m_a \omega_b^2 + \frac{M}{D}} \frac{1}{M \omega^2} \quad (31)$$

In Fig. 6 one can recognize that the lowest eigenvalue is only slightly reduced by increasing the coupling strength and remains real for all  $\gamma$ -values.

Since this interaction term assures the positive definiteness of the total Hamiltonian we will use this system-bath coupling in the further examination. Additionally this coupling allows us to transform the system easily to normal coordinates which simplifies the analysis in the case of identical oscillators.

### C . Langevin equation of two coupled Brownian oscillators

By transforming the Hamiltonian  $H_S$  onto coordinates for the center of mass  $R = 1/2(m_a q_a + m_b q_b)$  and the relative coordinate  $x = (q_a - q_b)$  (with total mass  $M$  and reduced mass  $\mu$ ) and eliminating the bath variables, the following system of coupled equations for the Heisenberg operators  $x$  and  $R$  can be written down:

$$\ddot{x} = -\omega_x^2 x(t) - (\omega_a^2 - \omega_b^2)R(t) \quad (32)$$

$$\ddot{R} = -\omega_R^2 R(t) - \frac{1}{M} \int_0^t \gamma(t-t') R(t') dt' + \xi(t) \quad (33)$$

with the frequencies

$$\omega_x^2 = \frac{1}{M} (m_b \omega_a^2 + m_a \omega_b^2 + \frac{M}{D}) \quad (34)$$

$$\omega_R^2 = \frac{1}{M} (m_a \omega_a^2 + m_b \omega_b^2) \quad (35)$$

and damping term  $\gamma(t)$  and noise term  $\xi(t)$  as defined in section IIA. Solving eq. (32) as an inhomogeneous differential equation and inserting the solution into (33) gives a Langevin equation for the center of mass  $R$  with new damping term  $\tilde{\gamma}(t)$  and new noise term  $\tilde{\xi}(t)$ :

$$M \ddot{R} + \frac{dV(R)}{dR} + \int_0^t \tilde{\gamma}(t-t') R(t') dt' = \tilde{\xi}(t) \quad R(0) = \tilde{\xi}(0) \quad (36)$$

which describes the motion of  $R$  in the effective potential  $V(R) = 1/2 M \tilde{\omega}_R^2 R^2$  with frequency

$$\tilde{\omega}_R^2 = \omega_R^2 - \frac{(\omega_a^2 - \omega_b^2)^2}{M \omega_x^2} \quad (37)$$

influenced by the damping

$$\tilde{\gamma}(t-t') = \gamma(t-t') + \frac{(\omega_a^2 - \omega_b^2)^2}{2 \omega_x^2} \cos \omega_x(t-t') \quad (38)$$

and the stochastic force

$$\tilde{\xi}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N c_i x_i(0) \cos(\omega_i t) + \frac{p_i(0)}{m_i \omega_i} \sin(\omega_i t) + (\omega_b^2 - \omega_a^2) x(0) \cos(\omega_x t) + \frac{p_x(0)}{M \omega_x} \sin(\omega_x t) \quad (39)$$

In the case of identical oscillators the equations (32) and (33) are decoupled. The relative coordinate performs a harmonic oscillation and for  $R$  the Langevin equation of a Brownian particle with mass  $M$  and oscillator frequency  $\omega_R$  is received,

$$M \ddot{R} + M \omega_R^2 R + \int_0^t \gamma(t-t') R(t') dt' = \xi(t) \quad R(0) = \xi(0) \quad (40)$$

which is equivalent to quantum Langevin equation (2) in the first part of this paper.

### D . Stationary state

In order to calculate the stationary correlations for the general case we again apply the quantum fluctuation-dissipation theorem.

From eq. (36) one obtains the dynamical susceptibility  $\tilde{\chi}_R^{(0)}(\omega) = [M \tilde{\omega}_R^2 - M \omega^2 - i \tilde{\gamma}(\omega)]^{-1}$  and can express the variance of the center of mass by

$$\langle R^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \tilde{\chi}_R^{(0)}(\omega) \coth\left(\frac{1}{2} \beta \hbar \omega\right) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{\omega^2}{\omega^2 - \omega_R^2 + i \tilde{\gamma}(\omega)} \coth\left(\frac{1}{2} \beta \hbar \omega\right) \quad (41)$$

where

$$\tilde{\gamma}(\omega) = M \omega_R^2 - M \omega^2 - \frac{(\omega_a^2 - \omega_b^2)^2}{\omega_x^2} \quad (42)$$

Fig. 7 shows the temperature dependence of the variance (41) in comparison to the limiting cases:

$$\langle R^2 \rangle_{th} = \frac{1}{2M \tilde{\omega}_R} \coth\left(\frac{1}{2} \beta \hbar \tilde{\omega}_R\right) \sim \tilde{\omega}_R^{-1} \quad \text{for } \beta \hbar \tilde{\omega}_R \gg 1 \quad (43)$$

$$\langle R^2 \rangle_{cl} = \frac{kT}{M \tilde{\omega}_R^2} \quad \text{for } T \gg m \tilde{\omega}_R^2 \quad (44)$$




FIG. 7: Temperature dependence of  $\langle R^2 \rangle$  (41) for parameter values  $\omega_a = 2, \omega_b = 3, m_a = m_b = 1, D = M \omega_R^2, \gamma = 10$  and  $\tilde{\gamma} = 5M \omega_R^2$ , (dark line). For increasing temperature  $\langle R^2 \rangle$  converges to the limiting cases  $\langle R^2 \rangle_{th}$  (grey line) and  $\langle R^2 \rangle_{cl}$  (dashed line) as given by eq. (43) and (44).

In the same way we can specify the variance of the center of mass momentum  $P_R$ :

$$\langle P_R^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} M^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \tilde{\chi}_R^{(0)}(\omega) \omega^2 \coth\left(\frac{1}{2} \beta \hbar \omega\right) = \frac{1}{2} M^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{\omega^3}{\omega^2 - \omega_R^2 + i \tilde{\gamma}(\omega)} \coth\left(\frac{1}{2} \beta \hbar \omega\right) \quad (45)$$

as well as the variance of the relative coordinate  $x$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x^2 \rangle &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \langle n | x^2 | n \rangle \sim \coth\left(\frac{1}{2} \beta \hbar \omega_x\right) = \quad (46) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \langle n | \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{m_a} + \frac{1}{m_b} \right) \right) x^2 | n \rangle \sim \coth\left(\frac{1}{2} \beta \hbar \omega_x\right) \end{aligned}$$

and the corresponding momentum  $p_x$

$$\langle p_x^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \langle n | p_x^2 | n \rangle \sim \frac{1}{2} \coth\left(\frac{1}{2} \beta \hbar \omega_x\right) \quad (47)$$

The stationary correlation  $\langle x_R^2 \rangle$  is obtained by transforming on normal coordinates  $y = x + R$ ,  $z = x - R$ . Because of  $\langle yz \rangle = 0$  in the stationary state one receives

$$\langle x_R^2 \rangle = \frac{\langle x^2 \rangle + \langle R^2 \rangle}{1 + \#} \quad (48)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{where } \# &= \frac{(\frac{1}{m_a} + \frac{1}{m_b})}{M^2 (\frac{1}{m_b} + \frac{1}{m_a} + M = D)} \\ \# &= \frac{M (\frac{1}{m_a} + \frac{1}{m_b})}{M^2 + (\frac{1}{m_a} + \frac{1}{m_b})} \quad (49) \end{aligned}$$

and  $\omega_x$  are the normal frequency of system (24) with  $H_{AB}$  given by (25):

$$\omega_x^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{m_a} + \frac{1}{m_b} + \frac{D}{M} \right) \quad (50)$$

Further correlations, such as  $\langle x_R p_R \rangle$ ;  $\langle x p_x \rangle$ ;  $\langle x p_x \rangle$ ; ... are zero in the stationary state.

#### E. Thermodynamic of adiabatic changes

The stationary Gaussian state of the subsystem is completely characterized by the correlations (41), (45)–(48). The internal energy again is defined as the stationary mean value of the system's Hamiltonian (24):

$$\begin{aligned} U_{S^0} &= \frac{1}{2M} \langle p_R^2 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle p_x^2 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle x^2 \rangle + \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} M \langle R^2 \rangle + \left( \frac{1}{m_a} + \frac{1}{m_b} \right) \langle x_R^2 \rangle \quad (51) \end{aligned}$$

In case of identical oscillators ( $m_{a,b} = M=2$ ,  $\omega_{a,b} = \omega$ ) the internal energy  $U_{S^0}$  turns into

$$U_{S^0} = \frac{1}{2M} \langle p_R^2 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} M \langle R^2 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \coth\left(\frac{1}{2} \beta \hbar \omega\right); \quad (52)$$

where  $\langle p_R^2 \rangle$  and  $\langle R^2 \rangle$  are given by the moments defined in equations (7) and (8) with oscillator parameters  $M$  and  $\omega$ . We can apply the weak coupling limit to the

(free) oscillation of the relative coordinate so that the values  $\langle x^2 \rangle$  and  $\langle p_x^2 \rangle$  are determined by the quantum Gibbs distribution of an uncoupled oscillator with mass and frequency  $\omega_x = \sqrt{\omega^2 + D} = \omega$ . The motion of  $R$  is described by eq. (40) and leads to the stationary variances given by (7) and (8).

In this case of identical oscillators the von Neumann entropy  $S(S^0)$  of the system  $H_{S^0}$  can be expressed as sum of the entropy of the center of mass coordinate  $S_R$  and the entropy of the relative coordinate  $S_x$ :

$$S(S^0) = S_x + S_R; \quad (53)$$

where  $S_R$  and  $S_x$  are defined similar to equation (10) with the phase space volumes

$$v_x = \frac{1}{q} \int dx^2 \int dp_x^2 \quad \text{and} \quad (54)$$

$$v_R = \int dR^2 \int dp_R^2; \quad (55)$$

The exchange of heat  $Q$  and the change in entropy  $dS(S^0)$  are defined equivalent to eq. (17) and (23) by

$$Q = \text{Tr}[H_{S^0} dS^0] \quad \text{and} \quad (56)$$

$$dS = \text{Tr}[dS^0 \ln S^0]; \quad (57)$$

We now want to study deviations from the Clausius inequality in the case of identical oscillators. Regarding variation of the mass  $M$  the Clausius inequality reads:


$$Q_M \leq T dS_M; \quad (58)$$

With regard to an information theoretical viewpoint, we use again the statistical entropy instead of the thermodynamic entropy  $S_{th}$  for which the Clausius equality { by definition } is fulfilled for quasi static processes.


In the weak-coupling case of a single harmonic oscillator with mass  $M$ , entropy and heat are not affected by adiabatic variations of the mass:  $Q_M = T dS_M = 0$ . This is different in the case of two coupled oscillators weakly interacting with the bath, where the additional coupling parameter  $D$  leads to an increase of  $Q_M$  and  $T dS_M$  with rising temperature (narrow dashed curves in g. 8a and 8b). Nevertheless for  $\omega \neq 0$  the equality  $Q_M = T dS_M$  holds for all values of  $T$  and  $D$ . Furthermore, in this weak coupling approximation it is  $Q_M \geq 0$  and  $dS_M \geq 0$  for all  $T$  and  $D$ .

The impact of a non-zero system-bath-coupling can be studied from g. 8a: the exchanged amount of heat  $Q_M$  is increased at a given bath temperature  $T$ , whereas the term  $T dS_M$  is reduced. At low temperatures the product  $T dS_M$  becomes negative, so that changes in heat and entropy have different signs. This effect is the larger the stronger the system-bath-coupling is. At high temperatures  $kT \gg \hbar \omega$  both terms become equal.







(a) Coupling parameter  $D$  between the oscillators A and B is set to  $D = M \hbar^2$ .



(a)  $Q_M$  and  $TdS_M$  versus coupling  $D$  at bath temperature  $T = \hbar/k$ .



(b) Weak coupling between the oscillators A and B with parameter  $D = 0.01 M \hbar^2$ .



(b)  $Q_M$  and  $TdS_M$  versus coupling  $D$  at bath temperature  $T = 0.5 \hbar/k$ .

FIG. 8: Changes in heat  $Q_M$  and entropy-term  $TdS_M$  versus bath temperature  $T$  for two different values of the oscillator coupling  $D$ . The system-bath coupling is chosen as in g. 2. From top to bottom:  $Q_M; = 5$ ,  $Q_M; = 1$ ,  $Q_M; = 0.5$ ,  $TdS_M; = 0.5$ ,  $TdS_M; = 1$ ,  $TdS_M; = 5$ . The oscillator parameters are  $\hbar = \hbar_{a,b} = 1$  and  $M = 2m_{a,b} = 1$ . The cutoff-frequency is set to  $\omega = 10$  and  $\gamma = 1$ . (Compare to g. 2.)

If the coupling  $D$  between the two oscillators is reduced ( $D \rightarrow 0$ ), the system behaves like a single Brownian particle as could be supposed by comparing the figures 8b and 2.

For  $D \rightarrow 1$  the system again behaves like a single Brownian oscillator. This is shown by g. 9a and g. 9b which give the  $D$ -dependence of  $Q_M$  and  $TdS_M$  for different temperatures  $T$  and couplings  $\gamma$ . One can recognize that the values of  $Q_M$  for  $D \rightarrow 1$  and  $D \rightarrow 0$  are equal (as well as the values for  $TdS_M$ ) and correspond with the results for a single Brownian oscillator.

Furthermore, g. 9a shows that, depending on the

FIG. 9: Changes in heat  $Q_M$  (grey line) and entropy-term  $TdS_M$  (dark line) versus coupling parameter  $D$  at two different bath temperature  $T$  in comparison to the case of  $\gamma = 0$  where  $Q_M; = 0 = TdS_M; = 0$  (dashed line). Parameters are chosen as in g. 8.

chosen parameter values of oscillators ( $M, \hbar$ ) and bath ( $\gamma, T$ ), there may exist a range of  $D$ -values where the terms  $TdS_M$  and  $Q_M$  have equal signs. Fig. 9b makes clear that at lower temperatures such a region does not exist necessarily.

Summarizing the results of this section, we can state the following:

Compared to the case of a single Brownian particle, an open quantum system with internal degrees of freedom shows additional effects. In our introduced model the direction of heat and entropy flow due to mass variations depends on the coupling strength between both the oscillators. Already at moderate temperatures the flow of heat and entropy occurs in the same direction, whereas in the model of single Brownian motion this is reached only in the high temperature and weak coupling limit respectively. Therefore varying the coupling parameter

offers the possibility to adjust the ratio of heat exchange and change in the subsystem's entropy.

Of course, the resulting changes in heat and entropy depend on the chosen interaction between the oscillators. As pointed out at the beginning of the section, this coupling had to be selected carefully to ensure the positive definiteness of the total Hamiltonian. Nevertheless this model provides a good example for studying the influence of additional degrees of freedom.

#### IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We have discussed the statistical thermodynamics of quantum Brownian motion of two coupled oscillators in the strong coupling quantum regime and have compared the results to the case of a single Brownian particle. In both cases quantum correlations between subsystem and bath lead to deviations from the canonical equilibrium thermodynamics. The quantum Langevin equation which has been derived for a system of two coupled Brownian oscillators describes the evolution of the Heisenberg operators. The stationary moments of these operators characterize the reduced density

matrix completely. This density matrix contains all the accessible information about the quantum state. The statistical entropy of this state is measured by the von Neumann entropy. Reducing this entropy by quasi-static parameter variations is equivalent to a decrease in the information which is gained by a measurement. With regard to continuous variable quantum computing we examined the relation between changes in the subsystem's statistical entropy and the exchange of heat with the environment. We found that this relation deviates from the Clausius (in)equality at low temperatures due to the existing correlations between system and bath. Related results of former work [9, 10, 11] were nevertheless put into perspective. Concerning quantum information processing, the validity of the Landauer principle which is based on the Clausius inequality but deals with the statistical entropy seems indeed questionable (at least for open quantum systems which are non-weakly interaction with a low temperature environment).

#### Acknowledgement

One of the authors (C.H.) appreciates a fruitful discussion with Peter Hanggi which helped to clarify some of the controversial points.

- 
- [1] U. Weiss, *Quantum Dissipative Systems* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1999).
  - [2] T. Dittrich, P. Hanggi, G.-L. Ingold, B. Kramer, G. Schon, and W. Zwerger, *Quantum Transport and Dissipation* (Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, 1998).
  - [3] C. W. Gardiner and P. Zoller, *Quantum Noise* (Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 2000).
  - [4] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2003).
  - [5] G. W. Ford, J. T. Lewis, and R. F. O'Connell, *Phys. Rev. A* **37**, 4419 (1988).
  - [6] G. W. Ford and M. Kac, *J. Stat. Phys.* **46**, 803 (1987).
  - [7] R. Landauer, *IBM J. Res. Dev.* **5**, 183 (1961).
  - [8] C. H. Bennett, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **21**, 905 (1982).
  - [9] Th. M. Nieuwenhuizen and A. E. Allahverdyan, *Phys. Rev. E* **66**, 036102 (2002).
  - [10] A. E. Allahverdyan and Th. M. Nieuwenhuizen, *Phys. Rev. B* **66**, 115309 (2002).
  - [11] A. E. Allahverdyan and Th. M. Nieuwenhuizen, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 056117 (2001).
  - [12] E. D. P. Sheehan, *Quantum Limits to the Second Law* (American Inst. of Physics, Melville, NY, 2002).
  - [13] A. K. Rajagopal and R. W. Rendell, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 022116 (2001).
  - [14] A. S. Holevo, M. Sohma, and O. Hirota, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 1820 (1999).
  - [15] G. Adesso, A. Serafini, and F. Illuminati, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 022318 (2004).
  - [16] P. Hanggi and G.-L. Ingold, <http://arxiv.org/quant-ph/0412052>.
  - [17] A. O. Caldeira and A. J. Leggett, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **149**, 374 (1983).
  - [18] A. O. Caldeira and A. J. Leggett, *Physica A* **121**, 587 (1983).
  - [19] P. Ullersma, *Physica* **32**, 27 (1966).
  - [20] H. B. Callen and T. A. Welton, *Phys. Rev.* **83**, 34 (1951).
  - [21] H. Grabert, P. Schramm, and G.-L. Ingold, *Phys. Rep.* **168**, 115 (1988).
  - [22] G. S. Agarwal, *Phys. Rev. A* **3**, 828 (1971).
  - [23] A. N. Jordan and M. Buttiker, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 247901 (2004).
  - [24] G. W. Ford, J. T. Lewis, and R. F. O'Connell, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 2273 (1988).
  - [25] R. Balian, *From Microphysics to Macrophysics* (Springer, Berlin, 1991).
  - [26] H. Zoubi, M. Orenstien, and A. Ron, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 033801 (2000).