Decoherence by a nonlinear environm ent: canonical vs. m icrocanonical case

S.Khlebnikov and G.Sadiek Department of Physics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA (February 2002; revised June 2002)

Abstract

We compare decoherence induced in a simple quantum system (qubit) for two di erent initial states of the environment: canonical (xed temperature) and microcanonical (xed energy), for the general case of a fully interacting oscillator environment. We nd that even a relatively compact oscillator bath (with the e ective number of degrees of freedom of order 10), initially in a microcanonical state, will typically cause decoherence almost indistinguishable from that by a macroscopic, thermal environment, except possibly at singularities of the environment's speci c heat (critical points). In the latter case, the precise magnitude of the di erence between the canonical and microcanonical results depends on the critical behavior of the dissipative coe cient, characterizing the interaction of the qubit with the environment.

Typeset using REV T_EX

On leave of absence from Physics Department, A in Shams University, Cairo, Egypt.

I. IN TRODUCTION

Recent years have seen signi cant experimental advances in manipulation of quantum states in a variety of physical systems [1{5]. In addition to the intrinsic interest that these experiments have with regard to the fundamentals of quantum mechanics, they suggest that a high degree of control and coherence in simple quantum systems can be achieved, perhaps eventually su cient to implement a useful quantum computation [6] in an assembly of such individual units (qubits).

Unlike a classical computer, in which the only source of errors is uncontrolled transitions between the states, a quantum computation is sensitive also to random changes in phases of the basis states. Such changes occur due to interaction of the qubit with the environment. They are referred to as decoherence, and the time scale over which the phase will drift by an amount of order one is referred to as decoherence time t_d . It is advantageous to make t_d or, more precisely, the ratio $t_d=t_s$, where t_s is the switching time, as large as possible.

In many cases, the basic operations on qubits (quantum gates) can be approximated as evolution of certain two-level systems under an external in uence (a pulse of voltage, current, etc.). In this paper, we concentrate on cases when the environment is comprised by interacting oscillators, described for brevity by a single real scalar eld , and the interaction of the two-level system with the environment is linear, with the Ham iltonian of the form 1

$$H_{J}(t) = d^{3}xJ(x;t) (x;t) :$$
 (1)

In addition to H_J , the Ham iltonian of the environm ent contains the free Ham iltonian H_0 and a Ham iltonian H_{int} , the latter describing nonlinear interactions among the oscillators them selves. Our method is su ciently general to include fully interacting oscillator environments, i.e. any reasonable form of H_{int} . One motivation for doing so is the possibility to consider environments that are near phase transitions (or the vestiges of such in nite system s).

The \current" J (x;t) depends on the state of the two-level system and represents its switching history.² This current, of course, does not have to be the usual electric current, although it may coincide with it in some specic cases of interactions. For example, in a persistent current qubit [7], where the basis states di er by the value of the electric current, J can indeed be interpreted as the current density, and as a component of the electrom agnetic eld.

An important example, where (1) applies but J is unrelated to electric current, is the swap gate based on two coupled quantum dots [8]. Key features of this gate are as follows. There is an electronic spin 1/2 associated with each dot. These spins are coupled to each other through an exchange interaction, and the interaction Ham iltonian is given by the

¹Bilinear and higher-order couplings in can be studied in a similar way.

²W e use word \sw itching" to denote a controlled transition between states of a qubit, and not a sw itching on and o the interaction with the bath. The latter interaction in general cannot be sw itched o at will; see, how ever, remarks on the swap gate in the next paragraph.

energy of the singlet-triplet splitting. The exchange interaction can be switched on and o by varying the potential barrier between the dots; the latter is controlled by gate voltage v, which can be viewed as a sum of some average voltage v and a uctuation v. Then, the singlet-triplet splitting energy can be written as

$$E_{TS}(v) = E_{TS}(v) + \frac{\partial E_{TS}}{\partial v} v:$$
 (2)

The rst term contributes to the H am iltonian of the qubit, while the second term describes the interaction of the qubit with the environment. We see that this second term is precisely of the form (1), with $@E_{T S} = @v playing$ the role of the \current", and v the role of the environment. For the case when uctuations of v are the usual thermal (N yquist) uctuations, decoherence induced by v was considered previously in ref. [9].

The splitting energy E_{TS} is substantial only during a pulse of voltage that tem porarily lowers the potential barrier. Thus, the duration of the pulse is the switching time of the gate. From (2), we see that in this particular case the duration of the pulse also determ ines the duration of the interaction between the qubit and the environment.

W henever (1) applies, the evolution of the eld from a known initial state is completely determined by the current J(x;t), i.e. the switching history. In other words, the gate in this case works as an antenna, producing a de nite \radiation" state of . (Again, this \radiation" does not have to be an electrom agnetic wave, but can be any kind of propagating excitation.) D ecoherence can be associated with the probability to emit or absorb a nonzero num ber of quanta of .

Typically, the initial state of is taken to be a them all state, with probabilities of different energy levels given by the canonical distribution at some temperature T. In this paper, we want to deviate from this practice and consider a microcanonical initial state, in which the oscillators are constrained to have their total energy equal to some E³. There are several reasons why we think that this problem is interesting and potentially important for analysis of various qubit designs.

First, in therm odynam ics we are accustom ed to canonical and m icrocanonical ensembles being essentially equivalent in the m acroscopic lim it. It is interesting to see if, and to what accuracy, the same applies to calculations of quantum coherence, which is an intrinsically tim e-dependent quantity.

Second, some of the environments important for current qubit designs are in fact comprised by relatively few degrees of freedom. Consider, for example, the swap gate described by eq. (2), and suppose that the pulse of voltage is delivered to the gate via a transmission line. Suppose further that the line is open at one end (where it attaches to the gate) and closed at the other (and the pulse is obtained, say, through inductive coupling of the line to some control circuit). For a line of length L, the number of modes signi cantly populated at temperature T is of order

³ The current J will be set to zero at the initial moment, which can always be done by a timeindependent rede nition of . This makes choosing a microcanonical initial state for the bath equivalent to choosing it for the entire qubit+ bath system.

$$N_{e} = \frac{k_{B}TL}{hc} :$$
 (3)

For L = 1 m and T = 0.1 K, we obtain N_e 10. At this point, it is actually not obvious that this N_e , i.e. the number of populated modes, is what controls the transition to the therm odynamic limit. However, later in the paper we show that this is indeed the case.

Now, although an ensemble of identical oscillators baths contained in identical experimental apparata may be well described by a thermal density matrix, in each individual experiment the bath initially has nearly xed energy, with some broadening due to the initial state's preparation. If the broadening is larger than the level spacing of the bath but smaller than the typical energy uctuation in a thermal state, the microcanonical initial state is a better approximation than the canonical one. Because the level spacing decreases exponentially with the size of the bath, while relative thermal uctuations only go as inverse square root of N_e, we expect that such a situation will in fact be typical for relatively small, \mesoscopic" environments. In this case, one may wonder how much the microcanonical decoherence, induced by the interaction of the qubit with the bath, di ers from the thermal (canonical) result. In particular, one of the main goals of our project was to see if such a small environment can cause any signi cant decoherence at all.

Finally, because decoherence is associated with the response of the environment to changes in the system, one may expect that anom abusly large deviations from the thermal result will occur when uctuations in the environment are large and the relaxation is slow, e.g. near a critical point. Our calculation lends som e supports to this idea.

Ourmain results are as follows. (i) If, for a microcanonical state of energy E , we form ally de ne tem perature T by the usual therm odynam ic form ula, then the expansion param eter that controls the di erence between the canonical and m icrocanonical results for decoherence is $1=N_e$, where by de nition $N_e = E = k_B T$. For a one-dimensional transmission line, this is of the same order as eq. (3). (ii) We consider an expansion of microcanonical decoherence in powers of 1=Ne and nd that the leading di erence between the canonical and m icrocanonical results is formally of order $1=N_e$. We present both a general formula for this correction, applicable for any nonlinear environment, and an explicit formula for an environment with 0 hm ic dissipation. In particular, for the case of a transmission line we nd that already for N_{e} 10 the environm ent causes signi cant decoherence, which is practically indistinguishable from the therm al result. (iii) The $1=N_e$ correction contains a term proportional to the derivative of the heat capacity of the environm ent with respect to the tem perature, $@C_v = @T$, which becomes singular near a critical point. A lthough in a nite system there can be no \true" critical singularity, a nite enhancement of $C_V = CT$ remains. It is significant in this respect that our results apply to the general case of a fully nonlinear environment, rather than to a collection of harm onic oscillators, for which no critical phenom ena are expected. A simple application of nite-size scaling shows that the critical singularity of $C_V = CT$ alone cannot completely cancel the $1=N_e$ suppression factor (although it can reduce the suppression considerably). However, the correction also depends on the dissipative coe cient, characterizing the interactions of the qubit with the environment, and it is ultimately the critical behavior of this coe cient that determines both the size and the sign of the correction at a critical point.

In sum m ary, while our results are som ewhat inconclusive on the critical behavior of decoherence (due to the lack of understanding of the critical behavior of the dissipative coe - cient), we obtain a clear dem onstration that away from criticality even a relatively com pact, \m esoscopic" bath of oscillators, initially in a m icrocanonical state, induces decoherence of practically the sam e m agnitude as a truly m acroscopic, therm all environm ent.

In the course of the evolution, the qubit and the bath exchange energy, as described by the interaction H am iltonian (1). M oreover, because the qubit itself is controlled by some external m eans, even the compound qubit + bath system is not strictly isolated (except at times before and after the switching). W e assume, however, that there is no additional, \direct" interaction of the bath with the outside world. This seem s to us a reasonable assumption, since in m ost cases one will want to isolate the qubit and its immediate surroundings from the larger room temperature environment.

Our work, then, has some elements in common with the earlier work of Jensen and Shankar [10] on a strictly isolated small system. These authors have observed statistical behavior in a numerical solution of the Schrödinger equation for seven interacting spins. In particular, they have found that the distribution of probabilities for one spin in their system closely resembles the canonical distribution expected if the full spin chain were in a m icrocanonical state. In the present context, the selected spin plays the role of the qubit (albeit not subject to any external control), while the remaining spins play the role of the bath.

Apart from the question of perfect versus imperfect isolation of the compound qubit+ bath system, the main di erence between the work of ref. [10] and ours is that [10] compares results for a pure initial state to those for a microcanonical ensemble, for a compound system, while we are interested in comparing results between canonical and microcanonical initial states for such a system. As we will see, that latter comparison can be done, for a rather general case, without a recourse to num erical integrations. Instead, our calculation makes use of a steepest-descent evaluation of an integral relating the canonical and microcanonical averages, the accuracy of this procedure being again controlled by $1=\!\mathrm{N}_{\rm e}$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sect. 2 we present the de nition of coherence as a functional of the switching history, the latter being represented by the current in (1). We discuss a suitable form of the current. A lthough our main results are not based on a perturbative expansion of coherence, we pause in Sect. 3 to describe a convenient way to perform such an expansion, based on the coherent-state form alism. In Sect. 4, we com pute coherence, as de ned in Sect. 2, for a therm al initial state and recover som e fam iliar expressions. In Sect. 5, we construct the density matrix for a microcanonical initial state. In Sect. 6, we com pute microcanonical decoherence. Sect. 7 is a conclusion.

In what follows we use the system of units with h = 1 and $k_B = 1$.

II. DEFINITION OF COHERENCE

If we know that at some initial time t = 0, the environment started out in a denite quantum state j (0) i, we can de ne coherence remaining in the qubit at arbitrary time t in the following way. Find the nal state of the environment using the evolution operator U_J (t;0), where the \current" J represents the switching history of the qubit. Coherence equals the overlap of that nalwith the state that would obtain if no switching took place:

C (t) = h (0)
$$\frac{1}{7} U_0^{Y}$$
 (t; 0) U_J (t; 0) j (0) i: (4)

A decrease of the overlap with time (decoherence) is due to the divergence of the evolution histories of the environment corresponding to dierent histories of the qubit. It therefore re ects the measuring in uence that the environment had on the qubit.

An obvious extension of this de nition to the case when the state at t = 0 is a mixed state with a density matrix (0) is

C (t) =
$$\operatorname{Tr} U_{\mathrm{J}}(t;0)$$
 (0) $U_{0}^{\mathrm{Y}}(t;0)^{\mathrm{i}}$: (5)

It is convenient to incorporate the moments of time 0 and t in the de nition of the current. To save notation, we describe the environment by a single real scalar (x;t) with real-valued oscillator modes $_{n}$:

$$(x;t) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} (t) (x)$$
 (6)

(generalizations are of course possible). We assume that each mode couples to some smooth J_n (), which is zero at < 0, switches on at 0, stays on a plateau until t, and then switches o, see Fig. 1. Thus, the Lagrangian of the eld is

$$L = \sum_{n}^{X} \frac{1}{2} - \sum_{n}^{2} \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{n}^{2} + J_{n} + J_{n} + L_{int}[];$$
(7)

where L_{int} describes a self-interaction.



FIG.1. Pro le of the current of representing the switching history of the qubit.

The above form of the current can describe either of the following two experimental setups. For the swap gate described by the Ham iltonian (2), the prole shown in Fig. 1 represents a single gate operation: both the initial and nal states of the qubit correspond to $J_n = 0$. So, the switching time of the qubit is the entire time t. On the other hand, if one basis state of the qubit corresponds to $J_n = 0$, and another to the plateau value $J_n = A_n$, then the current of Fig. 1 represents two switching operations: from the rst state to the second and back. In this case, the switching time is the ramp time of the current, r.⁴

⁴And coherence de ned by (5) coincides in this case with what is perhaps a more familiar de nition: the value at time to f the o -diagonal element of the qubit's density matrix, relative to its value at $t = 0; !_r = 2 = r$ acts as a frequency cuto .

For this form of the current, we can relate (0) to the density matrix at some $T_{\rm i}<$ 0 in the distant past as

$$(0) = U_{J} (0; T_{i}) (T_{i}) U_{0}^{Y} (0; T_{i})$$
(8)

(since at $t < 0 U_J$ and U_0 coincide) and also extend t in (5) to some T_f in the distant future. In this way, we obtain coherence as a functional of J_n ():

Further, using the environm ent's S-m atrix

$$S_{J} = e^{iH_{free}T_{f}}U_{J} (T_{f};T_{i})e^{iH_{free}T_{i}};$$
(10)

where H $_{\rm free}$ is the H am iltonian in the absence of self-interactions (and interaction with the system), we can rewrite (9) as

$$C[J] = Tr S_{J} i S_{0}^{Y}; \qquad (11)$$

where

$$_{i} = e^{iH_{\text{free}}T_{i}} (T_{i})e^{iH_{\text{free}}T_{i}} :$$
 (12)

Under the usual assumption of adiabatic switching on of the interaction in the distant past, i is independent of T_i . Thus, specifying it is a convenient way to impose initial conditions.

Eq. (11) is the de nition of coherence that we use in what follows. We observe that coherence de ned in this way coincides with the generating functional of the G reen functions corresponding to the state $_i$. In perturbation theory, it can be computed order by order with the help of the Schwinger-Keldysh diagram technique.

If we are to have small decoherence, it is natural to assume that the currents J_n are weak. Then, provided that the eld does not have a nontrivial expectation value, the leading term in $Q[J] = \ln C[J]$ is bilinear in J:

$$Q[J] = \frac{i X^{2}}{2 m n} dt dt^{0} J_{m} (t) m n (t; t^{0}) J_{n} (t^{0}) + O(J^{3});$$
(13)

where m_n is the full (connected) G reen function of in the state i:

$$m_{n}(t;t^{0}) = iTr^{T}S_{0}^{Y}T[_{m}^{I}(t)_{n}^{I}(t^{0})S_{0}]_{i}^{V};$$
 (14)

 $^{\rm I}$ is the eld operator in the interaction representation. The real part of Q, related to the imaginary part of , determ ines the exponential suppression of coherence due to switching and can be called the decoherence exponent.

For speci c calculations, we will use the following expression for the Fourier transform of the current:

$$J_{n}() = \frac{A_{n}}{i} e^{it} 1 \exp(j \frac{j}{2}2!_{r});$$
 (15)

where $!_r = 2 = r$, and A_n are real constants. In the lim it $!_r ! 1$, eq. (15) becomes the Fourier transform of a rectangular pulse: J_n () = A_n for 0 < < t and zero otherwise.

A lthough our main results are not based on a perturbative expansion, we pause here to outline a convenient way to carry it out.

A swe have seen, coherence naturally acquires an exponential form. So, it is convenient to compute (11) in a representation in which the trace reduces to a saddle-point integral: such integrals produce exponentials automatically. A good choice is the coherent-state (holom orphic) representation [11,12], which we now review. (For a scattering problem with a large but not m acroscopic number of particles and m icrocanonical initial conditions, the coherent state representation was used in ref. [13].)

A ny state of the environment can be represented by an anti-analytical function (a) of the complex variable a labeling the coherent states. Action of an arbitrary operator \hat{A} is represented by an integral of the form

$$(\hat{A})(b) = \frac{2}{2i} \frac{da \, da}{2i} e^{a \, a} A(b;a) (a);$$
 (16)

where A (b; a) is the kernel of the operator \hat{A} de ned by

A product of two operators is represented by the convolution of their kernels:

$$(\hat{A}_{1}\hat{A}_{2})(b;b) = \frac{Z}{2i} \frac{da \, da}{2i} e^{a} \hat{A}_{1}(b;a) A_{2}(a;b):$$
 (18)

The S-matrix is given by [11{13]

$$S_{J} (b;a) = hb_{J}S_{J} jai = d_{i}d_{f}D e^{B_{i}+B_{f}+i_{L}dt};$$
(19)

which contains a functional integral over the eld as well as ordinary integrals over the eld's boundary values $_{in}$ and $_{fn}$. The boundary term s B_i and B_f read

$$B_{i} = \sum_{n}^{X} \frac{1}{2} a_{n}^{2} e^{2i!_{n}T_{i}} \frac{1}{2}!_{n} \frac{1}{2!_{n}} + \frac{p}{2!_{n}} a_{n} i_{m} e^{i!_{n}T_{i}} ; \qquad (20)$$

$$B_{f} = \sum_{n}^{X} \frac{1}{2} (b_{n})^{2} e^{2i!_{n}T_{f}} \frac{1}{2}!_{n} \frac{2}{f_{f}} + \frac{p}{2!_{n}} b_{n} \frac{1}{f_{f}} e^{i!_{n}T_{i}}$$
(21)

The perturbation expansion for S_J is generated in the usual way via the relation (see e.g. ref. [12])

$$S_{J} = \exp[i L_{int} (=i J)dt]S_{J}^{0}; \qquad (22)$$

where

$$S_{J}^{0} = {}^{Z} d_{i}d_{f}D e^{B_{i}+B_{f}+i_{(L_{free}+J_{i})dt}};$$
 (23)

and $\mathrm{L}_{\,\mathrm{free}}$ is the Lagrangian of free oscillators.

The integrals in (23) are Gaussian and can be evaluated exactly at the corresponding saddle points. The saddle-point equation for n_n (t) is simply the equation of motion

$$_{n} + !_{n}^{2} _{n} = J_{n} (t) ;$$
 (24)

while the saddle-point equations for $_{i}$ and $_{f}$ supply the boundary conditions

$$!_{n in} + i_{-in} = \frac{p}{p} \frac{2!_{n}}{2!_{n}} e^{i!_{n}T_{i}} a_{n}; \qquad (25)$$

$$!_{n f,n} = \frac{1}{2!_{n}} e^{i!_{n}T_{f}} b_{n} :$$
(26)

The solution to (24) with these boundary conditions is

$$(t) = p \frac{1}{2!_{n}} [a_{n} e^{i!_{n}t} + b_{n} e^{i!_{n}t}] + dt^{0} G_{n} (t - t^{0}) J_{n} (t^{0})$$
(27)

where $G_{\,n}\,$ is the free causal G reen function

$$G_{n}(t \quad t) = \frac{i}{2!_{n}} e^{i!_{n}t t^{0}j}$$
 (28)

Substituting the saddle-point solution (27) into (19), we obtain (cf. ref. [12])

$$S_{J}^{0}(b;a) = \exp^{X} a_{n}b_{n} + (i = \frac{p}{2!_{n}})^{Z} dt J_{n}(t) [a_{n}e^{i!_{n}t} + b_{n}e^{i!_{n}t}] + \frac{i}{2}^{Z} dt dt^{0}J_{n}(t)G_{n}(t - t)J_{n}(t^{0}) :$$
(29)

This can be conveniently rewritten in terms of Fourier transforms of J_n and ${\sf G\,}_n$, dened as

$$J_{n}() = \int_{-\pi}^{Z_{1}} J_{n}() e^{i} d;$$
 (30)

$$G_{n}() = \int_{1}^{2} G_{n}() e^{i} d$$
: (31)

W e obtain

$$S_{J}^{0}(b;a) = \exp_{n}^{X} \left(a_{n}b_{n} + \frac{i}{2!n} [J_{n}(!_{n})a_{n} + J_{n}(!_{n})b_{n}] + \frac{i}{2}^{Z} \frac{d}{2}G_{n}()J_{n}()J_{n}()^{2} : (32)\right)$$

This can be used in eq. (22) to produce a perturbative expansion for the S-m atrix.

IV.THERMAL DECOHERENCE

Returning to our de nition of coherence, eq. (11), we see that in the absence of selfinteraction we would have $S_0 = 1$ and $S_J = S_J^0$, so that

$$C[J] = Tr[S_J^0_i] = \frac{Z}{2i} \frac{da \, da \, db \, db}{2i} e^{a a} e^{b b}_i (a;b) S_J^0 (b;a) : \qquad (33)$$

In particular, for a therm al initial state with inverse tem perature ,

$$_{i}(a;b) = {}^{Y} 1 e^{!n} \exp a_{n}b_{n}e^{!n}$$
 (34)

In this case, the integrals in (33) are Gaussian and can be evaluated explicitly. We obtain $C[J] = \exp(Q[J])$ with

$$Q[J] = \sum_{n}^{X} \left(\frac{j \mathcal{J}_{n}(!_{n})^{2}}{4!_{n}} \left[2n_{B}(!_{n}) + 1 \right] - \frac{i}{2}^{Z} \left[\frac{d}{2} - j \mathcal{J}_{n}()^{2} R \in \mathcal{G}_{n}() \right] ; \qquad (35)$$

where n_B (!) = [exp(!) 1]¹ is the Bose distribution. Eq. (35) is the noninteracting lim it of the more general eq. (13).

For an interacting environment, (34) is still the correct initial condition for a therm all state, because the interaction is assumed absent in the distant past (and the interacting state is obtained by an adiabatic switching on of the interaction, while maintaining the xed temperature 1=). In the limit of small J, we now use eq. (13), according to which the real and imaginary parts of Q are determined, respectively, by the anti-H ermitean and H ermitean parts of $^{\sim}_{mn}$ () (the Fourier transform of $_{mn}$). The anti-H ermitean part (which itself is an H ermitean matrix)

$${}^{00}_{mn}() = \frac{1}{2i} {}^{h}_{mn}() {}^{2}_{nm}()$$
(36)

can be expressed through the spectral density of the environm ent D_{mn} in the corresponding channel: at ! > 0,

$${}^{00}_{mn}(!) = {}^{00}_{nm}(!) = \frac{1}{2!} D_{mn}(!) \operatorname{coth}(!=2) :$$
 (37)

 $D_{\,m\,n}$ includes e ects of the self-interaction.

The real part of Q (the decoherence exponent) becomes

$$Q_{R}[J] = \frac{X \overset{Z_{1}}{=} \frac{d!}{4!} J_{m}(!) D_{mn}(!) J_{n}(!) \text{ coth } (!=2):$$
(38)

The imaginary part is given by

$$Q_{I}[J] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{mn=1}^{X} \frac{d}{2} J_{m}() \sum_{mn=1}^{0} J_{n}() J_{n}(); \qquad (39)$$

where the Herm itean part $~^0_{m\,n}$ () can be expressed through the spectral density D $_{m\,n}$ via a dispersion relation:

$${}^{0}_{mn}() = P {}^{Z_{1}}_{0} \frac{d!}{2!} \frac{D_{mn}(!)}{!} + \frac{D_{nm}(!)}{!} + \frac{D_{m}(!)}{!} + (40)$$

P denotes the principal value.

For a current of the form (15), we can introduce also another kind of spectral density, which takes into account the interaction of with the current:

F (!) =
$$\frac{X}{2!} A_m A_n D_{mn}$$
 (!): (41)

W e can now rewrite the decoherence exponent as

$$Q_{R}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{2} \frac{d!}{!^{2}} F(!) [1 \cos !t] e^{!=!r} \coth (!=2):$$
(42)

This is, of course, a familiar expression for thermal decoherence, although it is usually discussed for an environment comprised by harmonic oscillators. Here, we obtain it for the fully nonlinear case.

For 0 hm ic dissipation, when

$$F(!) = !;$$
 (43)

the integral in (42) coincides with an integral computed by Chakravarty and Leggett [14], so we can use their result to obtain an explicit functional form of Q_R (t):

$$Q_{\rm R}$$
 (t) = $\frac{1}{2} \ln (1 + \frac{1}{r}t^2) + -\ln -\frac{t}{t} \sinh -\frac{t}{t}^{*}$: (44)

O ne should keep in m ind, though, that despite this form alsim ilarity, the m acroscopic quantum coherence (MQC) problem, considered in ref. [14], is di erent from ours. In the MQC case, transitions between basis states occur spontaneously, while in a quantum gate they are externally induced. In particular, the cuto frequency $!_r$ in our case in general depends on the switching m ethod. We also reiterate that in our treatm ent, the Ohm ic form (43) refers to a fully interacting environm ent, rather than to a collection of harm onic oscillators. So, for example, the dissipative coe cient can now depend on tem perature.

V.M ICROCANON ICAL DENSITY MATRIX

In the operator language, the m icrocanonical density m atrix for energy E can be written as (cf. ref. [13])

^ = N¹ (
$$\hat{H}$$
 E) = $\frac{N^{1}}{2} c^{2} d \exp[i (\hat{H} E)];$ (45)

where \hat{H} is the Ham iltonian of , and N is a norm alization factor. The contour C runs just above the real axis (as shown in Fig. 2 by a dashed line): a sm all positive in aginary part of regulates the contribution of states with large eigenvalues of \hat{H} .



FIG.2. The original contour C (dashed line), used in the de nition (45) of the microcanonical density matrix, and the deformed contour (solid line), passing through saddle points (circles). Locations of the four saddle points correspond to an environment with an acoustic dispersion law in three spatial dimensions, see eq. (53).

In this section, we calculate N , starting from the norm alization condition

$$Tr^{*} = \frac{N^{-1}}{2} \int_{C}^{Z} de^{iE} Z(i) = 1:$$
 (46)

Here Z (i) = Trexp (iff) is the therm algorithtic sum analytically continued to a complex inverse tem perature i.

The integrand in (46) has a saddle point at = i, where is determined by

$$E = \frac{0}{0} \ln Z$$
 (): (47)

Hence, is the inverse tem perature related to energy E in the usual therm odynam ic fashion. The integration contour can be deformed to pass through the saddle point. Note that it is essential that the contour was originally de ned to run above the real axis, as the point

= 0 is typically an essential singularity of the integrand in (46). Calculation by steepest descent in the vicinity of = i gives

$$N = (2 = C_V)^{1=2} \exp [E + \ln Z()];$$
(48)

where C_V is the eld's heat capacity:⁵

⁵N ote that using steepest descent near = i implies $C_V > 0$, the usual condition of them odynam ic stability. It is curious that we have in e ect derived this condition without ever referring directly to the second law of therm odynam ics, the usual source of such inequalities.

$$C_{V}() = \frac{2}{Q^{2}} \ln Z()$$
 (49)

For (48) to be a good approximation, two conditions must be satisted. First, to use the steepest descent, we must have

and, second, no other saddle point should give a contribution larger than (48). The left-hand side of (50) is our de nition of the elective number of degrees of freedom, N $_{\rm e}$. (Recall for comparison that, for a collection of noninteracting classical oscillators at temperature T, E =T is precisely the number of oscillators). So, (50) is the condition that the environment is relatively macroscopic.

As for the role of other saddle points, it has, strictly speaking, to be checked case by case, i.e. for each speci c model of the environment. As an illustration, we include here results for two simple cases: noninteracting (linear) environments with an acoustic dispersion law,

$$!_{n} = v_{s}k_{n}$$
; (51)

in three and one spatial dimensions. The rst case can correspond for example to phonons, while the second to electrom agnetic waves in a one-dimensional transmission line (then, v_s c).

For linear environm ents,

$$\ln Z(i) = \ln (1 e^{i!_n}):$$
(52)

So, in the 1st case

$$\ln Z$$
 (i) = const $\frac{iV}{3}$ + O (L²); (53)

where the volum e of the tree-dimensional region is denoted by ${\tt V}$, and its characteristic linear size by L . In the second case,

$$\ln Z (i) = \operatorname{const} \frac{\mathrm{i}L}{-} + O (\ln L); \qquad (54)$$

where L is the length of the one-dimensional region. In both (53) and (54), the constants are positive. Note that in the case of a transmission line, the eld is the 'prepotential", related to uctuations of voltage along the line, v(x;t), via

$$v = \frac{1}{\frac{P}{C}} \frac{\theta}{\theta t} ;$$
 (55)

where C is the line capacitance per unit length. So, the correlator of v at coincident x will be 0 hm ic, with the \dissipative coe cient" proportional to the (L=C) ¹⁼² in pedance of the line.

We assume that in both cases the environment is relatively macroscopic, so that the nite-size corrections indicated in (53), (54) are negligible. Then, in the case of eq. (53), the integrand of (46) has four saddle-points | at =, , i, and i. The integration contour can be deformed to pass through the rst three of these, as shown in Fig. 2, and we nd that under condition (50) the main contribution to the integral indeed comes from the vicinity of = i. In the case of eq. (54), there are only two saddle points, at = i, and only the upper one contributes to the integral after deform ation of the contour.

U sing the denition (11) with $_{i}$ given by eq. (45), we obtain microcanonical decoherence in the form

$$C[J] = N^{-1} \frac{d}{c} \frac{d}{2} \exp f \quad i \in I + \ln Z \quad (i) \quad Q[;J]g;$$
 (56)

where Q [;J] is the therm all decoherence analytically continued to a complex inverse tem – perature equal to i. In the limit of small J (weak decoherence), the real and in aginary parts of the therm al Q are given by (38), (39).

Let us compare the magnitudes of di erent term s in the exponent of (56) on the saddle point = i with determined from (47). The rst two term s are macroscopically enhanced: they are proportional to the elective number of degrees of freedom

$$N_{e} = E$$
 : (57)

The third term, Q[;J], although a sum over n;m, in most cases does not have any macroscopic enhancement, because the couplings J_n scale as $1 = N_e$, and, while the diagonal entries of D_{mn} are O (1), most of the o-diagonal entries are O (1=N_e). As a result, to the leading order in N_e, the microcanonical decoherence coincides with therm aldecoherence at inverse temperature, while corrections are form ally O (1=N_e).

Even though Q [i ;J] is not enhanced by N_e , in some cases (e.g. for 0 hm ic dissipation, cf. (44)) it grows with t (the time for which J_n is on) and at large t can in principle become a large correction. However, for applications to qubits, we are interested only in cases when Q_R [i ;J], i.e. decoherence accumulated during time t, is much smaller than one. In these cases, corrections to the thermal result remain form ally suppressed by $1=N_e$.

Let us calculate the rst of these corrections. The exponent of eq. (56) can be written as

$$f[;J] = iE + lnZ(i) Q[;J]_0(f) Q[;J]: (58)$$

Here, $f_0() = f[;0]$ has a saddle point at = i, found in the previous section. The corresponding saddle point of the full f[;J] is shifted to

$$= i + ; \tag{59}$$

with a small . Treating Q[;J] in (58) as a perturbation, we nd

$$=\frac{Q^{0}[\mathbf{\dot{i}};J]}{f_{0}^{0}(\mathbf{\dot{i}})};$$
(60)

where primes denote derivatives with respect to (so that is in general complex). Note that $f_0^{00}(i) = C_V = {}^2$, where C_V / N_e is the heat capacity given by (49). Therefore, = 0 (1=N_e).

The saddle-point calculation that led to eq. (48) in the previous section is now modiled in two ways. First, both the extra term in (58) and the shift of the saddle point contribute to the saddle-point exponent. Second, they also modify the second derivative of f, which determ ines the preexponent. As a result, to the leading order in $1=C_v$, we obtain

$$C (t) = \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\frac{0}{0} + \frac{Q_{i}}{f_{0i}}\right) \exp\left(Q[i;J] + \frac{1}{2}\frac{Q_{i}^{2}}{f_{0i}}\right) ;$$
(61)

where subscripts following commas are used to denote derivatives with respect to . The correction to the exponent is always negative, since $f_{0;} = C_V = {}^2 > 0$. Note, however, that although the corrections to both the exponent and preexponent are of the same order in $1=C_V$, the rst is also 0 (Q²), while the second is 0 (Q). Thus, in the most interesting to us limit of weak decoherence, the correction to the preexponent is more important.

In fact, for an interacting environment, we are not really allowed to keep the correction in the exponent, since the higher-order term s in Q, due to the self-interaction, can give rise to corrections of the same order, cf. eq. (13). We nevertheless retain this correction in (61) (and in (63) below) because of the traditional interest in linear environments, for which it is the main O (Q^2) correction.

As an example, let us take a bok at eq. (61) for the case of 0 hm ic dissipation. We specialize further to the large-t lim it, t , so we can use for Q_R [i ;J] the large-t lim it of the therm al expression (44):

$$Q_{R}[i;J] = -t;$$
(62)

while Q_I, which is not Bose-enhanced, can be neglected. We nd

$$C(t) = 1 + \frac{t}{2^{2}} \frac{\theta}{\theta T} \frac{\theta}{C_{v}} \exp \left(-\frac{t}{2^{2}} \frac{2t^{2}}{2^{2}C_{v}}\right); \qquad (63)$$

where T = 1 = 1 is the tem perature. The correction to the preexponent, which is the main correction in the lim it

$$1 t = 1 = (64)$$

is negative whenever $C_v = is a \text{ grow ing function of } T$. That is the case, for example, for linear environments with acoustic dispersion laws, such as those considered in the previous section. However, as we discuss in the conclusion, there are interesting cases when $C_v = C_v = C_v = C_v$, and it is in principle possible to have a positive correction to coherence.

For the transm ission line considered in the previous section, E / T^2 , so that $C_V = 2N_e / T$, while is T-independent. Then, the preexponent in (63) is equal to 1 t=4 N_e, which should be compared to 1 t= , the expansion of the exponent in the lim it (64). We see that already for $N_e = 10$, the correction to the therm alresult is only 2.5%.

VII.CONCLUSION

Our main result is the calculation of a correction to the thermal result for decoherence, for a system interacting with a nonlinear environment that is initially in a microcanonical (rather than canonical) state. We expect this result to apply when a qubit interacts mainly with a relatively compact, $\mbox{messoppic}$ " environment, whose initial spread in energy is smaller that the typical size of $1 = \frac{P}{N_e}$ relative uctuations characteristic of a canonical ensemble.

The correction is given by eq. (61) for the general case, and by eq. (63) for an 0 hm ic environment. We see that the correction is in general of order $1=N_e$ and so is typically small already for N_e 10, but it may be enhanced where $@C_V = @T$ diverges, i.e. in a proximity of a critical point.

M athem atically, the correction to the exponent in (61), (63) results from the shift in the saddle-point value of . A coording to (59), such a shift can be interpreted as a change in the elective temperature of the environment, due to its interaction with the system. In view of its relation (38) to the anti-H em itean part of the full G reen function, the decoherence exponent Q_R (when it is small) can be interpreted as the probability for the system to emit or absorb an excitation quantum, as a result of the current switching from $J_n = 0$ to $J_n = A_n$. Since in a thermal state the emission is more probable than the absorption, it is easy to imagine that the change in the elective temperature will be positive, leading to an increase in decoherence. (The emission probability is proportional to $(n_B + 1)$, and the absorption probability to n_B ; combined, the two make the coth (!=2) factor in (38).) For example, for 0 hm ic dissipation in the t

$$= \frac{i t}{C_v};$$
(65)

which indeed corresponds to an increase in the elective temperature. We recall, however, that the corresponding increase in decoherence is an O (Q^2) elect, subleading in the limit of weak decoherence.

The correction to the preexponent, which is the leading correction in the weakdecoherence limit, represents a di erent phenom enon, namely, a change in the typical size of uctuations in the environment as it interacts with the system. The enhancement of the correction near a critical point rejects the presence of large uctuations at $T = T_c$. Given that, as a condition of therm odynamic stability, $C_V > 0$, and that it peaks at $T = T_c$, we notice that $@C_V = @T < 0$ whenever T is su ciently close to T_c from above. From (61), we see that in this case the term containing $@C_V = @T$ is positive, i.e. it tends to suppress decoherence.

For an environment of a nite size, the singularity of C_V at $T = T_c$ appears through $C_V^{-1} \ \ensuremath{\mathbb{Q}C_V} = \ensuremath{\mathbb{Q}T}$ scaling as some positive power of the total volume. An application of the standard nite-size scaling techniques [15], together with hyperscaling, gives C_V / L^{d+} = $L^{2=}$ and

$$\frac{1}{C_V^2} \frac{QC_V}{QT} / L^{1=};$$
(66)

where L is the linear size of the volume, d is the number of dimensions, is the speci-cheat exponent, and is the correlation-length one. Since > 0, (66) shows that the critical singularity of $@C_V = @T$ cannot completely overcome the macroscopic suppression (but can reduce it signi cantly: for comparison, away from the critical point, the left-hand side of (66) scales as L^d). However, according to eq. (61), the part of the correction that is proportional to $@C_V = @T$ is also proportional to the relevant dissipative coe cient, such as

in eq. (63). In addition, there is a part of the correction containing the derivative of . Thus, it is the scaling of the dissipative coe cient that ultimately determines whether the correction to the thermal result can be large enough to be experimentally observable. We note that the critical behavior of the dissipative coe cient determ ines also the leading, therm alpart of decoherence near a critical point. As far as we can tell, how ever, speci c results regarding that behavior are not readily obtainable. In particular, these dissipative coe cients are distinct from the usual kinetic coe cients introduced in the dynam ical theory [16], since they involve a sum mation over the modes of the environment, cf. eq. (41). O ur results, then, can be taken to underscore the importance of a study of these quantities for di erent types of interacting environments.

ACKNOW LEDGM ENTS

G S. was supported in part by a grant from Purdue Research Foundation.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Nakamura, Yu. A. Pashkin, and J. S. Tsai, Nature 398, 786 (1999).
- [2] J.R. Friedman et al, Nature 406, 43 (2000).
- [3] C.H. van der W alet al, Science 290, 773 (2000).
- [4] H. Jeong, A. M. Chang, and M. R. Melloch, Science 293, 2221 (2001).
- [5] L.M.K.Vandersypen et al, Nature 414, 883 (2001).
- [6] D. Deutsch, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A 400, 97 (1985).
- [7] T.P.O rlando et al, Phys. Rev. B 60, 15398 (1999).
- [8] D. Loss and D. P. D IV incenzo, Phys. Rev. A 57, 120 (1998).
- [9] X.Hu and S.Das Sama, Phys. Rev. A 61, 062301 (2000).
- [10] R.V. Jensen and R. Shankar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 54, 1879 (1985).
- [11] F.A. Berezin, The M ethod of Second Quantization (Nauka, Moscow, 1987) [in Russian];
 (A cadem ic Press, New York, 1966).
- [12] L.D.Faddeev and A.A.Slavnov, Gauge Fields, Introduction to Quantum Theory (Benjam in/Cummings, Reading, Mass., 1980).
- [13] S.Khlebnikov, V.Rubakov, and P.Tinyakov, Nucl. Phys. B 367, 334 (1991).
- [14] S. Chakravarty and A. J. Leggett, Phys. Rev. Lett. 52, 5 (1984).
- [15] F in ite Size Scaling and Num erical Sim ulation of Statistical System s, edited by V. Privm an (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 1990).
- [16] P.C. Hohenberg and B.I. Halperin, Rev. Mod. Phys. 49, 435 (1977).