

Classical states and decoherence by unitary evolution in the thermodynamic limit

Marco Frasca
Via Erasmo Gattamelata, 3
00176 Roma (Italy)
e-mail:marcofrasca@mclink.it

Abstract

It is shown how classical states, meant as states representing a classical object, can be produced in the thermodynamic limit, retaining the unitary evolution of quantum mechanics. Besides, using a simple model of a single spin interacting with a spin-bath, it is seen how decoherence, with the off-diagonal terms in the density matrix going to zero, can be obtained when the number of the spins in the bath is taken to go formally to infinity. In this case, indeed, the system appears to flop at a frequency being formally infinity that, from a physical standpoint, can be proved equivalent to a time average.

KEYWORDS: Classical states; Thermodynamic limit; Unitary evolution; Decoherence.

The question of how a classical world could emerge from quantum mechanics is a longstanding problem still deeply debated today. A sound solution has been offered by decoherence (see e.g. [1]) that gives also a possible direction to the solution of the problem of measurement.

Decoherence is based on the fact that whatever quantum system we are going to consider, this is unavoidably in contact with an environment and this can be enough to make the system lose the coherence of its quantum evolution. By construction, it appears that decoherence, defined in this way, is a dissipative effect.

Quite recently, non-dissipative approaches have also been proposed by Bonifacio et al. [2] and Sun et al. [3]. Indeed, dissipative decoherence has to cope with the question of a kind of regression to solve the measurement problem as also the measurement apparatus should decohere to be considered a classical system, that is, one has at least three levels to have a quantum system that decoheres and give a pointer on an instrument to indicate a definite value.

Our aim here is to discuss a recent proposal to obtain classical states from quantum unitary evolution [4]. This is based on the formal analogy between quantum mechanics and statistical mechanics (a Wick rotation) that can make the classical world emerge in the “thermodynamic limit” as happens to thermodynamics.

This approach, when applied to a simple model devised by Zurek [5] of a spin in a spin-bath, proves to give rise to ordinary decoherence, that is, erasing of the off-diagonal terms in the density matrix of the spin. In this case one has a spin flopping with a frequency proportional to the number of spins in the bath and this means, in the thermodynamic limit, an infinite frequency. Physically, this is proved to be equivalent to an average in time. Mathematically, this is a typical example of a divergent series [6]. Anyhow, it is essential to emphasize that unitary evolution is retained at each step of our analysis.

An example of a classical system obtained by unitary evolution in the thermodynamic limit is given by ($\hbar = 1$)

$$H = \lambda \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{zi} \quad (1)$$

that is, a set of N two-level systems. It can be proved that, when the system is prepared with the initial wave-function

$$|\psi(0)\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^N (\alpha_i |\downarrow\rangle_i + \beta_i |\uparrow\rangle_i) \quad (2)$$

being $\sigma_{zi} |\uparrow\rangle_i = |\uparrow\rangle_i$ and $\sigma_{zi} |\downarrow\rangle_i = -|\downarrow\rangle_i$, then the quantum fluctuations of the Hamiltonian can be neglected as

$$\frac{\Delta H}{\langle H \rangle} \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \quad (3)$$

in the thermodynamic limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. Then, the spins $\sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{xi}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{yi}$ follows the classical equations of motion without any deviation due to quantum fluctuations. These are the equations for the mean values as given by the Ehrenfest theorem.

So, this system, with a properly prepared initial state, behaves classically. Then, it is also able to induce decoherence [5]: The initial state (2) appears as a generally realistic state for a set of properly disordered two-level systems. An important conclusion from the above example is that such a classical object obtained by unitary evolution depends on the way the system is initially prepared.

Having proved that a set of two-level systems can behaves as a classical system in its quantum evolution, we want to show how it can induce decoherence on a single mode of radiation field.

The interaction of N two-level systems with a single radiation mode is given by

$$H = \Delta \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{zi} + \omega a^\dagger a + g(a + a^\dagger) \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{xi} \quad (4)$$

with no rotating wave approximation. Indeed, we aim to study this model in the strong coupling regime. That is, we want to apply a dual Dyson series [7]

$$U_D(t) = U_F(t) T \exp \left[-i \int_0^t dt' U_F^\dagger(t') H_0 U_F(t') \right] \quad (5)$$

being T the time-ordering operator with

$$H_0 = \Delta \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{zi} \quad (6)$$

and

$$\left[\omega a^\dagger a + g(a + a^\dagger) \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{xi} \right] U_F(t) = i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} U_F(t). \quad (7)$$

The solution at the leading order, a non trivial one, is then written as

$$|\psi(t)\rangle \approx U_F(t) |\psi(0)\rangle. \quad (8)$$

The unitary evolution to evaluate the perturbation series is easily written down as [4]

$$U_F(t) = e^{i\hat{\xi}(t)} e^{-i\omega a^\dagger a t} \exp[\hat{\alpha}(t) a^\dagger - \hat{\alpha}^*(t) a] \quad (9)$$

being

$$\hat{\xi}(t) = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{xi} \right)^2 g^2}{\omega^2} (\omega t - \sin(\omega t)) \quad (10)$$

and

$$\hat{\alpha}(t) = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{xi} \right) g}{\omega} (1 - e^{i\omega t}). \quad (11)$$

Assuming the initial state being $|\psi(0)\rangle = |0\rangle \prod_{i=1}^N |-1\rangle_i$ where the environment is taken to be in eigenstates of σ_{xi} and the field in the ground state, we obtain the leading order solution

$$|\psi(t)\rangle \approx e^{i\frac{N^2g^2}{\omega^2}(\omega t - \sin(\omega t))} |\alpha(t)\rangle \prod_{i=1}^N |-1\rangle_i \quad (12)$$

having set

$$\alpha(t) = \frac{Ng}{\omega}(1 - e^{-i\omega t}) \quad (13)$$

that means that at the leading order the field evolves as a coherent state. This in turns means that, in the thermodynamic limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, the radiation mode is described by a classical field[8].

It is interesting to note that the environment is left untouched at this order.

The first order correction is easily written down as

$$|\psi^{(1)}(t)\rangle = -iU_F(t) \int_0^t dt' U_F^\dagger(t') \Delta \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{zi} U_F(t') |\psi(0)\rangle. \quad (14)$$

But,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{zi} \prod_{i=1}^N |-1\rangle_i = |\chi'_0\rangle \quad (15)$$

where

$$|\chi'_0\rangle = |1\rangle_1 |-1\rangle_2 \cdots |-1\rangle_N + |-1\rangle_1 |1\rangle_2 \cdots |-1\rangle_N + \cdots + |-1\rangle_1 |-1\rangle_2 \cdots |1\rangle_N \quad (16)$$

giving a modified state of the environment. This gives

$$|\psi^{(1)}(t)\rangle = -i\Delta U_F(t) \int_0^t dt' e^{i(2N-1)\frac{g^2}{\omega^2}(\omega t' - \sin(\omega t'))} \exp[\beta(t')a^\dagger - \beta^*(t')a] |0\rangle |\chi'_0\rangle \quad (17)$$

being

$$\beta(t) = \frac{g}{\omega}(e^{i\omega t} - 1). \quad (18)$$

The point here is that, when the environment is traced away, it does not give any contribution as the modified environment state is orthogonal (but not normalized) to the initial state.

Finally, we easily recognize that, in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, using the Riemann's lemma, the first order correction goes to zero.

In this way, we have found a method to generate classical radiation fields of arbitrary amplitude by unitary evolution in the thermodynamic limit.

Now, we prove that a single spin interacting with a spin-bath of two-level systems as the one of our first example can, actually, produced decoherence. This model was considered initially by Zurek in [5]. We want to

prove in a different way that the limit of increasing number of spins in the bath can make the single spin decohere directly from unitary evolution. The Hamiltonian can be written as

$$H = \lambda \tau_x \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{xi} \quad (19)$$

being λ an energy scale, τ_x the Pauli matrix for the single spin interacting with the bath and σ_{xi} the Pauli matrix for the i -th spin in the bath. Now, as we are aware that the way the system is prepared is critical, we take as an initial state as

$$|\psi(0)\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle \prod_{i=1}^N | - 1 \rangle_i \quad (20)$$

being $|\downarrow\rangle$ the initial state of the interacting spin eigenstate of τ_z and $| - 1 \rangle_i$ eigenstate of σ_{xi} in the bath. The unitary evolution gives the exact solution

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \exp(iN\lambda t \tau_x) |\psi(0)\rangle \quad (21)$$

and this yields, for the interacting spin, a coherent spin state with a parameter N . We rewrite it, omitting the bath, as

$$|\psi(t)\rangle_I = \cos(iN\lambda t) |\downarrow\rangle + i \sin(iN\lambda t) |\uparrow\rangle \quad (22)$$

and we have Rabi flopping with a frequency $\Omega = 2N\lambda$ that goes to infinity in the thermodynamic limit. A meaning should be attached to the limits

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \cos(Nx) \quad (23)$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sin(Nx) \quad (24)$$

and this can be done if we rewrite the above as

$$\cos(Nx) = 1 - \int_0^{Nx} \sin(y) dy \quad (25)$$

$$\sin(Nx) = \int_0^{Nx} \cos(y) dy \quad (26)$$

that we can reinterpret e.g. through the Abel summation to divergent integrals [6]

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{Nx} e^{-\epsilon y} \cos(y) dy \quad (27)$$

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{Nx} e^{-\epsilon y} \sin(y) dy, \quad (28)$$

where the order with which the limits are taken is important. These give 0 and 1 respectively that means average in time. This is, indeed, the only meaning that can be attached to functions having time scales of variation going to 0.

This conclusion is fundamental for the density matrix as, in this way, turns out to have the off-diagonal terms averaged to zero. This is decoherence but obtained in the thermodynamic limit through unitary evolution. In fact, one has

$$\rho(t) = \exp(itN\lambda\tau_x) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \exp(-it\lambda\tau_x) \quad (29)$$

that yields

$$\rho_{\uparrow\uparrow}(t) = \frac{1 - \cos(2N\lambda t)}{2} \quad (30)$$

$$\rho_{\uparrow\downarrow}(t) = i\frac{1}{2} \sin 2N\lambda t \quad (31)$$

$$\rho_{\downarrow\uparrow}(t) = -i\frac{1}{2} \sin 2N\lambda t \quad (32)$$

$$\rho_{\downarrow\downarrow}(t) = \frac{1 + \cos(2N\lambda t)}{2}. \quad (33)$$

and applying the above argument in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ gives the required result $\rho_{\uparrow\downarrow}(t) = \rho_{\downarrow\uparrow}(t) = 0$ and $\rho_{\uparrow\uparrow}(t) = \rho_{\downarrow\downarrow}(t) = \frac{1}{2}$.

The main conclusion is that quantum mechanics can generate by itself classical objects without interaction with an external environment. Although this cannot be seen as decoherence, the latter can be recovered in some cases as oscillations that are washed out in the thermodynamic limit.

The foundation of this approach is the formal analogy between the time evolution operator in quantum mechanics and the density matrix for a thermodynamical system. This can be obtained by a Wick rotation $t \rightarrow -i\beta$.

This, in turn, means that the thermodynamic limit can have a meaning also for quantal evolution. The laws of motion obtained in this limit are so given, through the Ehrenfest theorem, by the classical equations of motion without any deviation due to quantum fluctuations. This is analogous to the laws of thermodynamics obtained from the partition function.

This means that quantum mechanics can prove to be just the bootstrap program of the classical world.

References

- [1] W. H. Zurek, *Phys. Today* **44**, 36 (1991); D. Giulini, E. Joos, C. Kiefer, I.-O. Stamatescu, H. D. Zeh, *Decoherence and the Appearance of a Classical World in Quantum Theory*, (Springer, Berlin, 1996).
- [2] R. Bonifacio, *Nuovo Cimento* **114B**, 473 (1999); R. Bonifacio, S. Olivares, P Tombesi, D. Vitali, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 053802 (2000).
- [3] C. P. Sun, D. L. Zhou, S. X. Yu, X. F. Liu, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 12111 (2000).

- [4] M. Frasca, Phys. Lett. A **283**, 271 (2001).
- [5] W. H. Zurek, quant-ph/0105127; Phys. Rev. D **26**, 1862 (1982).
- [6] G. H. Hardy, *Divergent Series*, (AMS Chelsea, Providence, 1991).
- [7] M. Frasca, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 3439 (1998).
- [8] L. Mandel, E. Wolf, *Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995).