

# Decoherence Sturdy Memories in the Presence of Quantum Dissipation

K. M. Fonseca Romero<sup>1</sup>, S. G. Mocarzel<sup>2,3</sup>, and M. C. Nemes<sup>2,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Departamento de Física, Universidad Nacional, Bogotá, Colombia

<sup>2</sup> Departamento de Física–Matemática, Instituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo, CP 66318, 05315-970 São Paulo, S.P., Brazil

<sup>3</sup> Departamento de Física, Pontificia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, R. Marquês de Paranaguá, 111, São Paulo, S. P., Brazil

<sup>4</sup> Departamento de Física, ICEX, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, M.G., Brazil

January 11, 2022

## Abstract

We consider  $N$  identical oscillators coupled to a single environment and show that the conditions for the existence of decoherence free subspaces are degeneracy of the oscillator frequencies and separability of the coupling with the environment. A formal exact equation for the evolution in the case of two oscillators is found and the decoherence free subspace is explicitly determined. A full analytical solution for any initial condition and general parameters (frequencies and dissipation constants) is given in the markovian approximation and zero temperature. We find that slight relaxation of degeneracy and separability conditions leads to the appearance of two components in the dynamical evolution with very different decoherence times. The ratio between the characteristic time of the weak and strong decoherent components is given by  $\tau_{WD}/\tau_{SD} \approx k/\delta k$ , where  $\delta k$  is a measure of the nonseparability of the coupling to the environment and  $k$  is the mean decay constant of the oscillators.

## 1 Introduction

The very same mechanism responsible for the potential improvements on computation speed using quantum mechanics, is the one which greatly hinders immediate technical implementation. Entanglement between different subsystems is essential for the production of the states used in information processing; at the same time it prevents these qubits to be completely isolated from its environment, producing undesired entanglement with the environmental degrees of freedom. The deleterious effect of this coupling is usually called decoherence. Therefore much effort has been devoted to finding ways around decoherence in quantum computation, such as error correcting codes[2], dynamical decoupling[3] and computation in decoherence free subspaces[4]. Experimental observations of decoherence free evolution have been reported.[5, 6] Many physical implementations have been proposed including cavity QED[7], ions traps [8], nuclear magnetic resonance [9] and semiconductor quantum dots[10]. From the theoretical point of view, recent work has been mainly on proving the existence of DF subspaces. Much less work, however has been devoted to the dynamics. In general those models are highly idealized, and it is of interest at least to relax some of the stringent conditions, e.g. degeneracy of the free modes, and calculate such effects on the time evolution of the system. This could be considered as an important step towards realistic implementations of the models.

In the present work we consider the case of  $N$  independent oscillators linearly coupled to a single environment, and show that the existence of strict decoherence free subspaces can only be obtained under the

following two conditions: degeneracy of the oscillators, and separability of the coupling with the environment. Both the exact form of the spectral density and the temperature of the environment are immaterial in what concerns the existence of DFS. A formal equation for the dynamics of the reduced density matrix of the oscillators is derived which resembles the corresponding master equation, but with time dependent coefficients. For two independent oscillators we solve the dynamics of the reduced density and construct the decoherence free subspace. Moreover under Markov approximation, and zero temperature, we are able to give an analytical expression for the time evolution of the system of interest, in the general case (i.e. non degenerate modes and nonseparable coupling). We study the effect of a slight breaking of the degeneracy and separability and show that the dynamics will in general produce a long lived and a short live components. The time scale for the duration of these components is derived in terms of the appropriate parameters.

## 2 The model

Let us consider a collection of  $N$  identical harmonic oscillators linearly coupled to a single environment, modelled as a large set of harmonic oscillators,

$$\hat{H} = \omega \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i + \sum_k \omega_k \hat{\mathbf{b}}_k^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{b}}_k + \sum_{i,k} (g_{ik}^* \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{b}}_k + g_{ik} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i \hat{\mathbf{b}}_k^\dagger)$$

If the coupling of the  $N$  oscillators to the environment does not depend on the particular oscillator, apart from an overall factor, the coupling constants  $g_{ik}$  can be written as a product  $G_i D_k$ . In this case it is immediate to verify that there is a single collective mode which will remain coupled to the environment, while the other  $N-1$  collective modes form a decoherent free (infinite) subspace.[4] The collective mode can be easily visualized if we rewrite the hamiltonian as follows

$$\hat{H} = \omega \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i + \sum_k \omega_k \hat{\mathbf{b}}_k^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{b}}_k + \sum_k \left( D_k^* \left( \sum_i G_i^* \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^\dagger \right) \hat{\mathbf{b}}_k + D_k \left( \sum_i G_i \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i \right) \hat{\mathbf{b}}_k^\dagger \right),$$

where it is clear that the collective mode coupled to the environment has the following creation and annihilation operators

$$\hat{\mathbf{A}}_1^\dagger = \frac{\sum_i G_i^* \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^\dagger}{\sum_i |G_i|^2}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1 = \frac{\sum_i G_i \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i}{\sum_i |G_i|^2}.$$

This can be viewed as a  $N$ -dimensional rotation in the space of the original creation and annihilation operators, which maps the set  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i$  onto the set  $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_i$  in terms of which the hamiltonian is rewritten as

$$\hat{H} = \omega \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{A}}_i^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{A}}_i + \sum_k \omega_k \hat{\mathbf{b}}_k^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{b}}_k + \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1^\dagger \sum_k c_k \hat{\mathbf{b}}_k + \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1 \sum_k c_k^* \hat{\mathbf{b}}_k^\dagger,$$

with  $c_k = \sum_i |G_i|^2 D_k^*$ . The rotation leading to the equation above defines the relation between the new and old operators. This rotation is not unique except in the case of two identical operators. We show next that in contrast with other commonly studied models, in the present one we are able to introduce both decoherence and dissipation, for arbitrary environmental spectral densities (ohmic, subohmic, etc) and temperatures. A long but straightforward procedure[11] leads to the following exact generalized master equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\hat{\rho}}{dt} = & \frac{1}{i\hbar} [\hat{H}_0, \hat{\rho}] + (\lambda + \epsilon)(2\hat{\mathbf{A}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1^\dagger - \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1 - \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1) \hat{\rho} \\ & + \epsilon(2\hat{\mathbf{A}}_1^\dagger \cdot \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1 - \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1^\dagger - \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1^\dagger) \hat{\rho}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}}_0 = \hbar\omega \sum_{i=2}^N \hat{\mathbf{A}}_i^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{A}}_i + \hbar(\omega + \delta) \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1.$$

The real functions  $\lambda, \delta, \epsilon$  are implicitly defined in terms of the auxiliary function  $\eta(t)$

$$\eta(t) = \exp \left( - \int_0^t \lambda(t') dt' - i\omega t - i \int_0^t \delta(t') dt' \right) \quad (2)$$

which satisfies the integrodifferential equation

$$\dot{\eta} + i\omega\eta + \int_0^t d\tau \sum_k |c_k|^2 e^{i\omega_k(t-\tau)} \eta(\tau) = 0, \quad (3)$$

subject to the initial condition  $\eta(0) = 1$ . Moreover we have

$$\epsilon(t) = \frac{|\eta(t)|^2}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left( \sum_k \frac{|c_k|^2 n_k(\beta)}{|\eta(t)|^2} \left| \int_0^t d\tau e^{-i\omega_k(t-\tau)} \eta(\tau) \right|^2 \right).$$

where  $n_k(\beta)$  is the mean excitation number for the  $k$ -th mode of the environment at inverse temperature  $\beta = 1/k_B T$ . If the usual Born-Markov approximations hold, then  $\delta(t) = 0$ ,  $\lambda(t) = \sum_i k_i$ , and  $\epsilon = \sum_i k_i \bar{n}$ , where  $k_i$  characterize the markovian evolution when the only the  $i$ -th original oscillator is coupled to the bath, and  $\bar{n}$  is the environment mean number of thermal excitations. In this case the master equation simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\hat{\rho}}{dt} = & -i\omega \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \hat{\mathbf{A}}_i^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{A}}_i, \hat{\rho} \right] + \sum_{i=1}^N k_i (\bar{n} + 1) (2\hat{\mathbf{A}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1^\dagger - \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1 \cdot - \cdot \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1) \hat{\rho} \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^N k_i \bar{n} (2\hat{\mathbf{A}}_1^\dagger \cdot \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1 - \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1^\dagger \cdot - \cdot \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1^\dagger) \hat{\rho}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Note that the collective mode which couples to the environmental degrees of freedom decoheres much faster than any of the individual oscillators.

## 2.1 Two Identical Oscillators

For the sake of definiteness we restrict ourselves to the case of two identical oscillators. Let us see that in this case the collective mode  $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_1$  ( $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_2$ ) which couples (decouples) to the environment is given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{A}}_1^{(\dagger)} = \cos(\theta) \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^{(\dagger)} + \sin(\theta) \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2^{(\dagger)}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{A}}_2^{(\dagger)} = -\sin(\theta) \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^{(\dagger)} + \cos(\theta) \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2^{(\dagger)},$$

with  $\tan(\theta) = G_2/G_1$ , which reduces to  $\tan(\theta) = \sqrt{k_2/k_1}$  when the markovian approximation is valid. Let us see that the transformation above can be implemented as using an appropriate rotation operator. The generalized master equation (1) for two identical oscillator can be exactly solved using the evolution superoperator  $\mathcal{U}(t)$

$$\mathcal{U}(t) = e^{-i\theta[i(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2^\dagger - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2 \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^\dagger), \cdot]} e^{-i\omega t[\hat{\mathbf{a}}_2^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2, \cdot]} v e^{(1-v) \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^\dagger \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1} e^{x \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1 \cdot} e^{x^* \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1} e^{z \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^\dagger} e^{i\theta[i(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2^\dagger - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2 \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^\dagger), \cdot]} \quad (5)$$

where the coefficients  $v(t)$ ,  $x(t)$  and  $z(t)$  can be given in terms of the functions  $\eta(t)$ , eq. (2), and  $\mathcal{N}(t)$ ,

$$\mathcal{N}(t) = \int_0^t d\tau \epsilon(\tau) \left| \frac{\eta(\tau)}{\eta(t)} \right|^2,$$

as follows

$$v(t) = \frac{1}{1 + \mathcal{N}(t)}, \quad x(t) = \ln \frac{\eta(t)}{\sqrt{1 + \mathcal{N}(t)}}, \quad z(t) = 1 - \frac{|\eta(t)|^{-2}}{1 + \mathcal{N}(t)}.$$

In the markovian limit the preceding formulas reduce to

$$v = \frac{1}{1 + \bar{n}(1 - e^{-2(k_1+k_2)t})}, \quad x = \ln \frac{e^{(-i\omega - k_1 - k_2)t}}{\sqrt{1 + \bar{n}(1 - e^{-2(k_1+k_2)t})}}, \quad z = \frac{(\bar{n} + 1)(1 - e^{-2(k_1+k_2)t})}{1 + \bar{n}(1 - e^{-2(k_1+k_2)t})}.$$

In eq. (5) the first and last terms of the rhs correspond to the rotation which leads to the coupled and uncoupled collective modes.

Since the second collective mode is effectively decoupled from the environment, any density operator in the Hilbert space of this mode, times the asymptotic density operator of the coupled collective mode, provided it exists, will experience a unitary evolution. For simplicity we will further on restrict ourselves to the zero temperature case. Any density operator of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\rho} &= \sum_{n,m} \frac{\hat{\rho}_{n,m}}{n!m!} (-\hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^\dagger \sin(\theta) + \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2^\dagger \cos(\theta))^n |0,0\rangle \langle 0,0| (-\hat{\mathbf{a}}_1 \sin(\theta) + \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2 \cos(\theta))^m \\ &= \sum_{n,m,n_1,m_1} \hat{\rho}_{n,m} \frac{\sqrt{n!m!} (-\sin \theta)^{n+m-n_1-m_1} (\cos \theta)^{n_1+m_1}}{\sqrt{(n-n_1)!n_1!(m-m_1)!m_1!}} \\ &\quad \times |n_1, n-n_1\rangle \langle m_1, m-m_1|, \end{aligned}$$

will be protected against dissipation and decoherence. In fact, applying the evolution superoperator to an initial density matrix of this form, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\rho}(t) &= \sum_{n,m,n_1,m_1} e^{-i\omega t(n-m)} \hat{\rho}_{n,m} \frac{\sqrt{n!m!} (-\sin \theta)^{n+m-n_1-m_1} (\cos \theta)^{n_1+m_1}}{\sqrt{(n-n_1)!n_1!(m-m_1)!m_1!}} \\ &\quad \times |n_1, n-n_1\rangle \langle m_1, m-m_1|, \end{aligned}$$

Now, we use the evolution superoperator on the initial operator density

$$\hat{\rho}(0) = (\cos(\alpha)|1,0\rangle + \sin(\alpha)e^{i\phi}|0,1\rangle)(\cos(\alpha)\langle 1,0| + \sin(\alpha)e^{-i\phi}\langle 0,1|), \quad (6)$$

to obtain the time dependent evolution, which can be given in closed form and corresponds to the limit where the frequencies are degenerate and coupling is separable, of the formulas given in the next section. For now we show the asymptotic limit,

$$\hat{\rho}(t \rightarrow \infty) = P|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + (1-P)|0,0\rangle\langle 0,0|$$

where the probability to go to the state  $|\psi\rangle$ ,

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{k_2}|1,0\rangle - \sqrt{k_1}|0,1\rangle}{\sqrt{k_1 + k_2}}$$

is given by

$$P = \left\| \frac{\sqrt{k_2} \cos(\alpha) - \sqrt{k_1} e^{i\phi} \sin(\alpha)}{\sqrt{k_1 + k_2}} \right\|^2,$$

and the probability to go to the joint ground state is  $1 - P$ .

Observe that varying  $\alpha$  and  $\phi$  we can go from total preservation to total leakage. For example, if we set  $\tan(\alpha) = \sqrt{k_1/k_2}$ , and  $\phi = 0$  then the full state will leak to the ground state  $|0,0\rangle$ . On the other hand, if we set  $\tan(\alpha) = -\sqrt{k_2/k_1}$ , and  $\phi = 0$  then the initial state will be exactly equal to  $|\psi\rangle$ , and will persist at all times with probability 1. All other combinations will go to the asymptotic state  $|\psi\rangle$  with probability  $P$  and to the ground state  $|0,0\rangle$  with probability  $1 - P$ . The asymptotic fidelity,  $F(\infty)$ , which is the overlap between the initial and final density matrices, is given by

$$F(\infty) = \left\| \frac{(\sqrt{k_2} \cos(\alpha) - \sqrt{k_1} e^{i\phi} \sin(\alpha))(\sqrt{k_2} \cos(\alpha) - \sqrt{k_1} e^{-i\phi} \sin(\alpha))}{k_1 + k_2} \right\|^2$$

### 3 Effects of more Realistic Modelling

We remark that the results above were obtained under a number of assumptions, which will be relaxed below. Notice that the use of the rotating wave approximation (RWA) is not essential in obtaining the decoupled mode: any interaction linear in the field operators would be as good (provided the other assumptions hold). Had we chosen an interaction linear in the identical oscillators but nonlinear on the environmental operators we would have obtained also a decoupled collective mode. In these cases, however, the complication would be only of technical nature leading to (much) more complex dynamics.

Another important hypothesis to obtain DFS is that of identical frequencies of the original main oscillators. Of course, any interaction between them would destroy the symmetry upon which the existence of DFS rests. On the other hand, we have assumed that the oscillator-environment coupling satisfies  $g_{ik} = G_i D_k$ , which amounts to a separable coupling. It is not an easy task to find realizations of such interactions in nature given its nonlocal character. However, it might be a good approximation in special circumstances, as e.g. optical cavities. A particular consequence of the separability hypothesis can be seen writing the master equation, in the zero temperature limit, in terms of the original oscillators (with different frequencies for generality)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0 = & \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1 \cdot (-i\omega_1 - k_1) + \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{a}} (i\omega_1 - k_1) + 2k_1 \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^\dagger \\ & + \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2 \cdot (-i\omega_2 - k_2) + \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{a}} (i\omega_2 - k_2) + 2k_2 \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2^\dagger \\ & + k_3 \left( 2\hat{\mathbf{a}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2^\dagger - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2 \cdot - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2 \right) + k_3 \left( 2\hat{\mathbf{a}}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^\dagger - \hat{\mathbf{a}} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2^\dagger \cdot - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2^\dagger \right). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Notice that we have introduced a new quantity  $k_3$ , which is the environment induced coupling. When the separability condition holds the three dissipation constants,  $k_1, k_2, k_3$  satisfy the relationship  $k_3^2 = k_1 k_2$ . Since these constants are given by the expressions

$$|g_{1k}|^2 \approx \frac{k_1}{\pi}, \quad |g_{2k}|^2 \approx \frac{k_2}{\pi}, \quad g_{1k} g_{2k}^*(\omega) \approx \frac{k_3}{\pi} \quad (8)$$

Schwarz inequality implies immediately that  $|k_3|^2 \leq k_1 k_2$  in the general (nonseparable) case. In what follows we present the general solution to eq. (7) and study, in particular, the dynamics for parameters which do not quite satisfy the condition for DFS, but both the frequency degeneracy and coupling separability are almost fulfilled.

The evolution superoperator for eq.(7) is given by[12]

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\rho}(t) = & e^{j_1(t) \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^\dagger} e^{j_2(t) \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2^\dagger} e^{z(t) \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^\dagger} e^{z^*(t) \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2^\dagger} e^{q(t) \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2^\dagger} e^{q^*(t) \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2} e^{m_2(t) \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2} e^{m_2^*(t) \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2 \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2^\dagger} \odot \\ & \odot e^{m_1(t) \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1} e^{m_1^*(t) \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^\dagger} e^{q(t) \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2} e^{q^*(t) \hat{\mathbf{a}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2^\dagger} e^{c \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2^\dagger} \hat{\rho}_0 \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
R &= \frac{k_2 + k_1}{2} + \frac{i(\omega_2 + \omega_1)}{2}, \quad c = k_2 - k_1 + i(\omega_2 - \omega_1), \quad r = \sqrt{c^2 + 4k_3^2}, \quad \Delta_{\pm} = c \pm r \\
q(t) &= 2k_3 (1 - e^{rt}) (\Delta_+ e^{rt} - \Delta_-)^{-1} \quad \text{for } r \neq 0 \\
e^{m_1(t)} &= \frac{e^{-Rt}}{2r} e^{-\frac{r}{2}t} (\Delta_+ e^{rt} - \Delta_-), \quad e^{m_2(t)} = e^{-2Rt} e^{-m_1(t)} \\
j_2(t) &= (1 + |q(t)|^2) \left( |e^{m_2(t)}|^{-2} \right) - 1 \\
j_1(t) &= \left| e^{-m_1(t)} + q(t)^2 e^{-m_2(t)} \right|^2 + (|q(t)|^2) \left( |e^{m_2(t)}|^{-2} \right) - 1 \\
z(t) &= -q(t) e^{-(m_1^*(t) + m_2(t))} - q^*(t) (1 + |q(t)|^2) |e^{m_2(t)}|^{-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the neither the separability nor the degeneracy conditions have been used so far in obtaining the solution. For the sake of comparison we use the same initial condition of the precedent section (eq. (6)). In the general case its time evolution is given by

$$\hat{\rho}(t) = P(t) |\psi(t)\rangle \langle \psi(t)| + (1 - P(t)) |0, 0\rangle \langle 0, 0|$$

where the probability to go to the state  $|\psi(t)\rangle$ ,

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \frac{(\cos(\theta)M_-(t) + \sin(\theta)e^{i\phi}Q(t))|1, 0\rangle + (\sin(\theta)e^{i\phi}M_+(t) + \cos(\theta)Q(t))|0, 1\rangle}{\sqrt{P(t)}}$$

is given by

$$P(t) = \left| \cos(\theta)M_-(t) + \sin(\theta)e^{i\phi}Q(t) \right|^2 + \left| \sin(\theta)e^{i\phi}M_+(t) + \cos(\theta)Q(t) \right|^2,$$

and the probability to go to the joint ground state is  $1 - P(t)$ . The functions  $M_{\pm}(t)$  and  $Q(t)$  are given by

$$M_{\pm}(t) = \frac{e^{-Rt}}{2} \left( e^{-rt/2} \left( 1 \mp \frac{c}{r} \right) + e^{rt/2} \left( 1 \pm \frac{c}{r} \right) \right), \quad Q(t) = \frac{k_3}{r} e^{-Rt} \left( e^{-rt/2} - e^{rt/2} \right).$$

Now, we assume slight deviations from degeneracy and separability, that is,  $\omega_1 = \omega - \delta\omega$ ,  $\omega_2 = \omega + \delta\omega$ ,  $k_3 = \sqrt{k_1 k_2} - \delta k$ , with  $\delta\omega \ll \omega$ ,  $\delta k \ll \sqrt{k_1 k_2}$ . Then, the state  $|\psi(t)\rangle$  can be approximated as

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = e^{-i\omega t} \times \left( \frac{\zeta_1 |1, 0\rangle + \xi_1 |0, 1\rangle}{\sqrt{P(t)}} e^{-(k_1 + k_2)t} + \frac{\zeta_2 |1, 0\rangle + \xi_2 |0, 1\rangle}{\sqrt{P(t)}} e^{-\frac{2\delta k \sqrt{k_1 k_2}}{k_1 + k_2} t} \right),$$

where  $\zeta_i, \xi_i$  do not have any temporal dependence and are given by

$$\zeta_{(2)}^{(1)} = \frac{(k_{(2)}^{(1)} \mp i\delta\omega) \cos(\alpha) \pm \sqrt{k_1 k_2} \sin(\alpha) e^{i\phi}}{k_1 + k_2}, \quad (10)$$

$$\xi_{(2)}^{(1)} = \frac{(k_{(2)}^{(1)} \pm i\delta\omega) e^{i\phi} \sin(\alpha) \pm \sqrt{k_1 k_2} \cos(\alpha)}{k_1 + k_2}. \quad (11)$$

In the general case it is not possible to find initial conditions which are completely decoherence free. Nor it is possible to find orthogonal subspaces with very different characters in what decoherence is concerned. However, we can choose the initial condition as to have a minimal component either in a strong decoherence (SD) or in a weak decoherence (WD) subspaces, by choosing, e.g.

$$\tan(\alpha)_{(\text{SD})} = \pm \sqrt{\frac{k_{(2)}^{(1)}}{k_{(1)}^{(2)}}}, \quad \phi_{(\text{SD})} = \pm \frac{\delta\omega}{k},$$

where  $k$  is some average dissipation constant. The corresponding subspaces, apart from a phase, can be written as

$$|\psi_{(\text{WD})}^{(\text{SD})}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k_1 + k_2}} \left( \sqrt{k_{(2)}} |1, 0\rangle \pm \sqrt{k_{(1)}} e^{\pm i\delta\omega/k} |0, 1\rangle \right). \quad (12)$$

If  $\delta\omega \ll k_1, k_2$  the phase can be ignored. Moreover, if  $k_1 = k_2$  then we have  $k = k_1 = k_2$  and the phase can be unambiguously determined. The weak decoherence wavefunction defines a space which is robust against decoherence with typical decoherence time scale of the order

$$\tau_{WD} = \frac{k_1 + k_2}{2\delta k \sqrt{k_1 k_2}},$$

which is to be compared with the strong decoherence time associated to  $|\psi_{SD}\rangle$  given by

$$\tau_{SD} = \frac{1}{k_1 + k_2}.$$

If  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  are of approximately the same order ( $k$ ), then the weak decoherence time is about  $k/\delta k$  times greater than the strong decoherence time. In all other cases (different from  $\delta\omega = 0$  or  $k_1 = k_2$  one always has, for any initial condition (of the form (6)), a term which decays slowly and one which decays rapidly comparatively. However, the forms given above may help one to choose the initial condition in such a way that the time evolution is robust against decoherence (it should be close to form (12) with  $k = (k_1 + k_2)/2$ ).

Had we chosen other Fock subspaces (for example those of  $m$  total excitations), we would have obtained also an analytical solution showing both slowly and fast decaying components. Of course, the expressions get more involved.

## 4 Concluding Remarks

We have studied decoherence and dissipation free subspaces for systems involving  $N$  identical harmonic oscillators linearly coupled to a single environment. The conditions for the existence of such decoherent free subspaces are too stringent, and hardly implementable in practice. Therefore, we studied the dynamics of such systems when these conditions are slightly broken. This may serve as a guide for preparation of initial conditions which are fairly robust against decoherence. To the extent that this model is adequate for the description of modes in a QED cavity, it would be possible to use it to generate good quantum memories in the presence of dissipation and decoherence.

## 5 Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge comments from A. N. Salgueiro. This work was partly funded by FAPESP, CNPq and PRONEX (Brazil), and Colciencias, DINAIN (Colombia). K.M.F.R. gratefully acknowledges the Instituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo, for their hospitality and PRONEX for partial support.

## References

- [1] P. W. Shor, *37th Symposium on Foundations of Computing* (IEEE, N.Y., 1996), pp. 56-65; D. Gottesman, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 127 (1998).
- [2] P. W. Shor, *Phys. Rev. A* **52**, 2493 (1995); A. Ekert and C. Macchiavello, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 2585 (1996); D. Gottesman, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 1862 (1996); A. R. Calderbank *et. al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 405 (1997).

- [3] L. Viola, E. Knill, and S. Lloyd. *Phys. Rev. Lett.***82**, 2417 (1999). D. Vitali, and P. Tombesi. *Phys. Rev. A***65**, 012305 (2001).
- [4] G. M. Palma, K.-A. Suominen, A. K. Ekert. *Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. A*, **452**, 567 (1996); L.-M. Duan, G.-C. Guo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.***79**, 1953 (1997); P. Zanardi, M. Rasetti. *Phys. Rev. Lett.***79**, 3306 (1997); D. A. Lidar, I. L. Chuang, K. B. Whaley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.***81**, 2594 (1998); P. Zanardi, *Phys. Rev. A***60**, R729 (1999); A. Beige, D. Braun, B. Tregenna, P. L. Knight. *Phys. Rev. Lett.***85**, 1762 (2000).
- [5] P. G.Kwiat *et. al.*, *Science*, **290**, 498 (2000).
- [6] D. Kielpinski *et. al.*, *Science*, **291**, 1013 (2001).
- [7] Q. A. Turchette *et. al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.***75**, 4710 (1995); A. Imamoglu, *et. al.*, *ibid.*, **83**, 4204 (1999); A. Rauschenbeutel *et. al.*, *ibid.*, **83**, 5166 (1999).
- [8] J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller. *Nature*, **404**, 579, (2000), *Phys. Rev. Lett.***74**, 4091 (1995); C. Monroe *et. al.*, *ibid.*, **75**, 4714 (1995); K. Molmer, and A. Sorensen, *ibid.*, **82**, 1835 (1999); C. A. Sackett *et. al.*, *Nature*, **393**, 133, (2000).
- [9] N. A. Garshenfeld, and I. L. Chuang, *Science*, **275**, 350 (1997); E. Knill *et. al.*, *Phys. Rev. A***57**, 3348 (1998); J. A. Jones *et. al.* *Nature*, **393**, 344, (1998); B. E. Kane, *Nature*, **393**, 133, (1998).
- [10] A. Barenco *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.***74**, 4083 (1995); D. Loss, and D.P. DiVincenzo, *Phys. Rev. A***57** 120 (1998); G. Burkard *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. B***59**, 2070 (1999); L. Quiroga and N.F. Johnson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.***83**, 2270 (1999); J.H. Reina *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. A***62**, 12305 (2000); J.H. Reina *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. B***62**, R2267 (2000), F. Troiani *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. B***62**, R2263 (2000); E. Biolatti *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.***85**, 5647 (2000).
- [11] K. M. Fonseca-Romero, and M. C. Nemes, Report No. quant-ph/0201107.
- [12] S. G. Mokalzel, *Ph.D. Thesis*, State University of São Paulo, 2000.