

# Relaxation process in a regime of quantum chaos

Giulio Casati<sup>(a,b,c)</sup>, Giulio Maspero<sup>(a,b)</sup> and Dima L. Shepelyansky<sup>(d)</sup>

<sup>(a)</sup> Università di Milano, sede di Como, Via Lucini 3, 22100 Como, Italy

<sup>(b)</sup> Istituto Nazionale di Fisica della Materia, Unità di Milano, Via Celoria 16, 20133 Milano, Italy

<sup>(c)</sup> Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Milano, Via Celoria 16, 20133 Milano, Italy

<sup>(d)</sup> Laboratoire de Physique Quantique, UMR C5626 du CNRS, Université Paul Sabatier, F-31062 Toulouse, France

(received 11 June, revised 11 October, 1997)

We show that the quantum relaxation process in a classically chaotic open dynamical system is characterized by a quantum relaxation time scale  $t_q$ . This scale is much shorter than the Heisenberg time and much larger than the Ehrenfest time:  $t_q \sim t_H / g$  where  $g$  is the conductance of the system and the exponent is close to 1=2. As a result, quantum and classical decay probabilities remain close up to values  $P \sim \exp(-P/g)$  similarly to the case of open disordered systems.

PACS numbers: 05.45.+b, 03.65.Sq

Recently there has been a considerable interest in the statistical properties of the poles of the S matrix in mesoscopic quantum dots coupled to conducting metallic leads [1,2]. The statistical properties of these poles determine the effective life time of particles inside the dot and therefore are directly related to the conductance fluctuations and current relaxation inside the dot. In fact, the problem of current relaxation in disusive mesoscopic samples connected to leads has been addressed long time ago [3]. Recently the interest to this problem was renewed and new effective methods based on the supersymmetry approach have been developed to study the problem in more detail [4]. For quasi one-dimensional metallic samples the results of [3,4] predict that the current in the sample, being proportional to the probability  $P(t)$  to stay inside the sample, will decay, up to a very long time, in an exponential way according to the classical solution of disusive equation which describes the electron dynamics in disordered metallic samples:  $P(t) \sim \exp(-t/t_c)$ . Here  $t_c = t_H = N^2/D$  is the disusion time for a system of size  $N$  with disusion coefficient  $D$ .

According to [3,4] the strong deviation of quantum probability  $P_q$  from its classical value  $P$  takes place only for  $t > t_H$  where the quantum probability decays as  $P_q(t) \sim \exp(-g^2 t/t_H)$ . Here,  $t_H = 1/(h = 1)$  is the Heisenberg time,  $h$  is the level spacing inside the sample and  $g = t_H/t_c = E_c$  is the conductance of the sample with Thouless energy  $E_c = 1/t_c$ . At time  $t_H$ ,  $\ln P_q(t_H) = \ln P(t_H) - 2$ . As it was pointed out recently [5], less strong deviations ( $\ln P_q(t_q) = \ln P(t_q) - 1$ ) should take place at a shorter time  $t_q \sim t_H / g$  due to weak localization corrections according to equations obtained in [4]. Up to now these theoretical predictions for open systems have not been checked neither by numerical computations nor by laboratory experiments. Also the above results are based on an ensemble averaging over disorder and their validity for a quantum dynamical system which has one fixed classical limit is not evident. The investigation of this problem is also interesting from

the view point of semiclassical correspondence in a regime with exponentially fast spreading of narrow wavepackets due to which the Ehrenfest time scale [6] is very short:  $t_E \sim \ln N$  where  $\lambda$  is the Liapunov exponent.

In this paper we study the quantum relaxation process in a dynamical model of quantum chaos where disusion is caused by the underlying classical chaotic dynamics. This model, introduced in [7], describes a kicked rotator with absorbing boundary conditions (when the momentum is larger than some critical value). This open system can be considered as a model of light trapped in a small liquid droplet with a deformed boundary in which the rays, with orbital momentum less than some critical value, escape from the droplet because the refraction angle exceeds the critical value [8].

Contrary to the standard kicked rotator model [6] in which the matrix of the evolution operator is unitary, the absorption breaks the unitarity of the evolution matrix so that all eigenvalues move inside the unit circle. In other words, each eigenvalue can be written in the form  $\lambda = e^{-i} = \exp(-iE - \gamma/2)$  where  $\gamma$  characterizes the decay rate of the eigenstate. In this way absorption corresponds to ideal leads without reflections back to the sample. A similar approach, in which coupling to continuum was studied on the basis of non Hermitian Hamiltonians, has been developed and widely used by Weidenmüller et al. (see for example [9]).

In our model the quantum evolution of the wavefunction is described by the following quantum map:

$$\hat{U} = \hat{P} e^{iT\hat{n}^2/4} e^{ik \cos \hat{\theta}} e^{iT\hat{n}^2/4} ; \quad (1)$$

where  $\hat{P}$  is a projection operator over quantum states  $n$  in the interval  $(-N/2; N/2)$ . Here, the commutator is  $[\hat{n}, \hat{\theta}] = i$  and the classical limit corresponds to  $k \rightarrow 1$ ,  $T \rightarrow 0$  while the classical chaos parameter  $K = kT$  remains constant. In the classical limit the dynamics is described by the Chirikov standard map [6]:

$$n = n + k \sin \theta + \frac{Tn}{2} ; \quad \theta = \theta + \frac{T}{2}(n + n) : \quad (2)$$

For the classical computations, in analogy with the quantum model, all classical trajectories escaped from the interval ( $N=2; N=2$ ) are absorbed and never return back. Due to this absorption, in the regime of strong chaos ( $K=1$ ) with one chaotic component (no islands of stability), the classical probability to stay inside the interval ( $N=2; N=2$ ) decays exponentially with time:  $P(t) = \exp(-t/t_c)$ . The time scale  $t_c = 1/\lambda_c$  is determined by the diffusion time  $t_D$  required to reach the absorbing boundary from the center. Since the diffusion rate is  $D = \langle \dot{n}^2 \rangle = t_k^2/2$  then  $\lambda_c = E_c/1/t_k = k^2/N^2$ . In order to study the quantum relaxation we fixed the classical chaos parameter  $K = 7$  and the ratio  $N=k = 4$ . In this way the diffusion time  $t_D$  is constant when  $N \rightarrow 1$  and this allows to investigate the semiclassical behavior. Moreover  $t_D \gg 1$  which justifies the diffusive approximation. We note also that the system (1) with  $N=2 < n < N=2$  and  $\vec{p} = \hat{1}$  coupled to open leads ( $T = 0$  for  $j \neq N=2$ ) had been studied in [10]. The results obtained there showed that this model has universal conductance fluctuations [11] and other properties very similar to mesoscopic metallic samples.

The numerical solution of the classical problem was obtained by iterating map (2) for  $M = 9 \cdot 10^4$  different initial conditions homogeneously distributed on the line  $n = 0$ . The results demonstrate a clear exponential decay  $P(t) = \exp(-t/t_c)$  with  $t_c = 0.101882(1); b = 0.17774(5)$  (see Fig.1). This exponential decay shows that for  $K = 7$  the phase space is completely chaotic without any island of stability. Even with such a high number of orbits, the classical computations allow to obtain directly the probability  $P(t)$  with 10 % accuracy only up to the level  $P = 5 \cdot 10^{-16}$  ( $t = 165$ ). This limitation is due to statistical errors appearing for finite number of trajectories. In spite of this, the decay rate  $\lambda_c$  can be found with very high precision which allows to extrapolate the probability behaviour to larger times.

For the quantum evolution we choose the corresponding initial condition in which only the level  $n = 0$  is populated and we studied numerically the quantum dynamics (1) for different  $N$ . We have found that the quantum probability  $P_q(t)$  follows the classical one up to a time  $t_q$  after which it starts to decay at a slower rate (Fig.1). We determined the quantum relaxation time  $t_q$  by the condition  $\ln |P_q(t_q) - P(t_q)| = 0.1$  which corresponds to 10% deviation. The comparison of quantum and classical probabilities is shown in Fig.1. The values of  $t_q$ , obtained in this way, strongly fluctuate with changing the system size  $N$  as is typical for mesoscopic systems (Fig.2). These fluctuations are satisfactorily described by a log normal distribution (insert in Fig.2), but a more detailed analysis is required to determine precisely their statistical properties.

To suppress the fluctuations, we average  $\ln P_q(t)$  over different system sizes by changing  $N$  in a small interval  $N$  around a given  $N$ . Typically we averaged up to 500

different  $N$  values. This allows to determine the averaged ratio  $R(t) = \ln(P_q(t)/P(t))$  of quantum to classical probability. For all these  $N$  values the classical dynamics is exactly the same since we kept  $K = 7$  and  $N=k = 4$ . Then the quantum relaxation time  $t_q$  (averaged) at 10% level, is determined by the condition  $R(t_q) = 0.1$ . The dependence of  $R(t)$  on time, for different  $N$ , is shown in Fig.3. It is clearly seen that  $t_q$  grows as we approach the semiclassical limit  $N \rightarrow 1$ . The rescaling of data for  $R(t)$  as a function of  $t/t_q$  shows a satisfactory global scaling behaviour of quantum probability (see insert in Fig.3). The dependence of  $t_q$  on  $N$  is shown in Fig. 4 for the semiclassical regime  $500 < N < 130001$ . This regime corresponds to a variation of conductance  $g = N/t_c$  in the interval  $50 < g < 13000$ . The fit of numerical data gives a power law dependence  $t_q \propto t_c^{0.19} N^{0.41}$ . This power remains the same for 5% deviation level (Fig.4).

Here we propose a qualitative explanation of  $t_q$  value based on the fact that in the open system the physics is affected not by the level spacing but by the distribution of poles of the scattering matrix  $S$  which describes the coupling to the leads. These poles are located in the complex energy plane and their imaginary parts determine the decay probability of eigenmodes inside the sample. For our model, the poles are simply given by the evolution operator (1). The eigenvalues of  $\hat{U}$  are distributed in a narrow ring of width  $E_c$  inside the unitary circle [7]. This is typical for diffusive samples coupled to strongly absorbing leads. As a result,  $N$  complex eigenvalues are homogeneously distributed in a ring of total area  $A \sim E_c$  and the distance between them, in the complex plane, is  $\Delta E_c \sim E_c/N$ . In the classical limit this spacing goes to zero and one obtains a continuous density of poles. However, for finite  $N$ , the separation of poles is finite and can be resolved after a time  $t_q \sim 1/\Delta E_c$ . According to this argument, which is independent of the symmetry and dimensionality of the problem, the deviation between quantum and classical probabilities will take place at

$$t_q \sim 0.38 \frac{P}{t_c N} = 0.38 t_c \frac{P}{g} \quad (3)$$

where the numerical coefficient has been extracted from Fig.4. The theoretical dependence (3), which corresponds to  $\alpha = 1/2$ , is different but close to the numerical value  $\alpha = 0.41$ . We attribute this difference to a not sufficiently large value of  $P/g$ . Indeed, neglecting the values with  $P/g < 15$ , we obtain  $\alpha = 0.44$  for 10 % deviation and  $\alpha = 0.45$  for 5% deviation; these values are closer to the theoretical prediction  $\alpha = 0.5$ .

The scale  $t_q$  can be also explained in a more standard way based on weak localization corrections [5,4]. Indeed, the quantum interference gives a decrease of the diffusion rate  $1/t_c \rightarrow D/(1 + a t/t_H)$  where  $a$  is some constant (diffusion stops at time  $t_H$ ). As a result  $\ln(P_q/P) = a^2 t^2/(t_c t_H) \sim 1$  and one gets (3).

For very large times, the decay of  $P_q(t)$  is determined by the eigenvalue  $\lambda = E_1 - E_2$  with minimal  $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}$ . This asymptotic behaviour should start from some time scale  $t_f$ , which can be estimated in a following way. Similarly to the results obtained for complex matrices [12], the eigenvalues should be distributed in a region with smooth boundary in the complex plane with approximately constant density of points for  $\lambda_c$ . Typically this boundary is parabolic near the extremal  $\lambda_0$  close to  $\lambda_{\min}$ . Due to this, the relative number of eigenvalues  $dW$  in the interval  $d\lambda$  is given by  $dW = d\lambda \sqrt{\lambda - \lambda_0} = \frac{3}{2} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda_0}$ . The total probability in the interval  $\lambda = \lambda_0$  is  $W(\lambda = \lambda_0) = \frac{3}{2}$ . The distance between the two lowest values of  $\lambda$  can be estimated from the condition  $W(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) = 1/N$  which gives  $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \approx \frac{2}{3} N^{-2/3}$ . Then  $t_f \approx 0.4 t_N N^{-2/3}$  which is much larger than  $t_q$ . The numerical factor here was determined from the two lowest values of  $\lambda$  for  $N = 5001$ :  $\lambda_{\min} = \lambda_1 = 0.065309$  and nearest  $\lambda_2 = 0.066203$ . These values were obtained by direct diagonalization of the matrix  $U$ . The rate of the asymptotic decay of  $P_q(t)$  for  $N = 5001$  (Fig.1) agrees, up to 6 digits accuracy, with the above value of  $\lambda_{\min}$ . We note that a typical size of fluctuations for poles is  $\lambda_c$  and so we expect that  $\lambda_c \approx \lambda_{\min} \approx \frac{1}{N}$ . Since in our model  $t_f \approx t_h$  and the classical limit is fixed we do not see the quantum deviations discussed in [3,4] for  $t > t_h$ . At large  $g$  one should average over exponentially large number of realizations to observe them.

The largest value of  $t_q$  we have numerically obtained (at  $N = 1:3 \cdot 10^3$ ) is  $t_q = 254$  which corresponds to a probability  $P_q(t_q) \approx 5 \cdot 10^{-2}$ . On the other hand, the classical simulation with  $M = 9 \cdot 10^3$  orbits allows to directly compute the classical  $P(t)$  with 10% accuracy only up to  $t = 165$  which corresponds to a probability  $\bar{P} \approx 5 \cdot 10^{-1}$ . In order to reach the above level of quantum accuracy one should iterate  $M \approx 10^4$  orbits, which is already out of the possibility of present day computers. Moreover, the value of  $P_q$  at 10% accuracy level can be easily increased by orders of magnitude since according to (3)  $t_q$  grows proportionally to  $N$ . Instead, for classical computations, the number of required orbits  $M$  will increase exponentially ( $\bar{P} \approx 1/M$ ). This demonstrates that quantum computations of exponential relaxation processes are much more efficient than classical simulations with large number of orbits. The possibility to efficiently compute the quantum probability  $P_q(t)$  up to very long times  $t_q \gg 1$ , allows to numerically estimate the measure of the integrable component in the phase space of the classical system. Indeed, for  $g > 0$ , the existence of integrable islands leads to an asymptotic power law decay of correlations  $P(t) / t^{0.5}$  [13]. Since in our numerical data the quantum probability decays exponentially up to  $P_q(t_q) \approx 5 \cdot 10^{-2}$  we assume that the measure of the integrable component is  $< P_q(t_q) \approx 5 \cdot 10^{-2}$  ( $1 - 0.1$ ) being much smaller

than the relative size of quantum cell  $1/N$ . Here, the error bar gives the average fluctuation of  $P_q(t_q = 254)$  obtained for 77 values of  $N$ .

Also it is interesting to note that the Ehrenfest time scale  $t_E$  is much smaller than the quantum relaxation time  $t_q$ :  $t_E \approx t_q \ln N = \frac{1}{N} \ll 1$ . For example for  $N = 1:3 \cdot 10^3$  we have  $t_q = 254$  while  $t_E = \ln N = 9.4$  ( $\ln K = 2 \cdot 1.25$ ). This shows that the agreement between quantum and classical relaxation continues for a time scale which is much larger than the time of wave packet spreading. However, for  $t > t_E$  there is no exponential instability in the quantum motion [6,14]. As a result, correlation functions of the type  $C(t) = \langle \sin(t) \sin(t + \tau) \rangle$  which, in the regime of strong chaos, decay exponentially in the classical case ( $\ln |C| \approx -t$ ), in the quantum case decay only during the Ehrenfest time scale up to  $\ln |C| \approx -t \ln N$  ( $t \approx t_E$ ). This is similar to what happens in closed (unitary) systems such as the kicked rotator [14]. This example shows that exponential relaxation is not necessarily related to exponential local instability and positive Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy.

After the submission of this paper the scale  $t_q$  has been obtained on the basis of random matrix theory and supersymmetry for kicked rotator with random phases [15]. The related results for pre-localized states in closed systems were discussed in [16].

---

Also Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, 630090 Novosibirsk, Russia

- [1] Y.V. Fyodorov, and H.-J. Sommers, J. Math. Phys. 38, 1918 (1997).
- [2] P.W. Brouwer, K.M. Frahm, and C.W.J. Beenakker, Phys. Rev. Lett. June (1997) (to appear).
- [3] B.L. Altshuler, V.E. Kravtsov, and I.V. Lerner, JETP Lett. 45, 199 (1987); Sov. Phys. JETP 67, 795 (1988).
- [4] B.A. Muzikantskii, and D.E. Khmelnitskii, Phys. Rev. B 51, 5481 (1995); preprint cond-mat/9601045.
- [5] A.D. Mirlin, B.A. Muzikantskii, and D.E. Khmelnitskii, private communication (1997).
- [6] B.V. Chirikov, Les Houches Lecture Series 52, 443, Eds. M.-J. G. Jannoni, A. Voros, and J. Zinn-Justin (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1991).
- [7] F. Borgonovi, I. Guameri and D.L. Shepelyansky, Phys. Rev. A 43, 4517 (1991).
- [8] J.J. Nockel, and A.D. Stone, Nature 385, 45 (1997).
- [9] C.H. Lewenkopf, and H.A. Weidenmüller, Ann. Phys. 212, 53 (1991).
- [10] F. Borgonovi, I. Guameri, and L. Rebuzzini, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 1463 (1994).
- [11] B.L. Altshuler, JETP Lett., 41, 648 (1985); P.A. Lee, A.D. Stone, and J. Fukuyama, Phys. Rev. B, 35, 1039 (1987).
- [12] F. Haake, F. Izrailev, N. Lehmann, D. Saher and H.-

- J. Sommers, Z. Phys. B 88, 359 (1992).
- [13] B. V. Chirikov, and D. L. Shepelyansky, Physica D, 13, 395 (1984).
- [14] D. L. Shepelyansky, Teor. Math. Fiz. 49, 117 (1981); Physica D 8, 208 (1983).
- [15] D. V. Savin and V. V. Sokolov, Phys. Rev. E, Rap. Comm. (to appear); K. Frahm, *ibid.*.
- [16] V. I. Falko and K. B. Efetov, Phys. Rev. B 52, 17413 (1995).




FIG. 1. Classical and quantum probability decay for  $K = 7$  and  $N = k = 4$ . The full line shows the  $t$  to the classical decay. Dotted lines give the quantum probability  $P_q(t)$  for  $N = 5001; 20001; 130001$  (upper, middle and lower curves respectively). The lower insert shows the classical probability actually computed from  $M = 9 \cdot 10^5$  orbits and the  $t$  is shown by the dotted line. The upper insert shows the classical (full line) and the quantum (dotted line) asymptotic decay for  $N = 5001$ .




FIG. 3. The average ratio  $R(t) = \ln(P_q(t)/P(t))$  as a function of time for different  $N$  from  $N = 2500$  (left curve) to  $N = 129500$  (right curve). The horizontal full line corresponds to  $P_q(t) = P(t)$ . The probability  $P(t)$  is given by numerical data obtained with  $M = 9 \cdot 10^5$  orbits for  $t \leq 70$  and by the  $t$  from Fig. 1 (see text) for  $t > 70$ . The left insert shows the ratio of the numerically computed classical probability  $P(t)$  to the  $t$  function. The deviations from the  $t$ , for  $t > 70$ , are due to statistical errors related to finite  $M$ . The right insert demonstrates the scaling behaviour of  $P_q(t)$  on the variable  $t/t_q$  where the  $t_q$  values are determined by condition  $R(t_q) = 0.1$ .




FIG. 2. Mesoscopic fluctuations of the quantum relaxation time  $t_q$  for different system sizes  $N$ . The insert shows the statistical distribution of fluctuations  $f$  which is close to a log normal distribution of width 0.22.




FIG. 4. Dependence of the quantum relaxation time  $t_q$  on the system size  $N = gt_c$  in logarithmic scale. Points with error bars refer to 10% deviation level ( $R = 0.1$ ) while circles refer to 5% deviation ( $R = 0.05$ ). The two dotted lines give the  $t_q = 1.9N^{0.41}$  and  $t_q = 1.5N^{0.41}$  respectively. The full line gives the theoretical prediction with  $\alpha = 1/2$  (3). The insert shows the 10% data in a semi-log scale.