arXiv:quant-ph/0501017v1 4 Jan 2005

Entanglem ent Energetics in the G round State

Andrew N. Jordan and Markus Buttiker

Departem ent de Physique Theorique, Universite de Geneve, CH-1211 Geneve 4, Switzerland

(D ated: 14 February, 2004)

We show how many-body ground state entanglement information may be extracted from subsystem energy measurements at zero temperature. A precise relation between entanglement and energy uctuations is demonstrated in the weak coupling limit. Examples are given with the two-state system and the harmonic oscillator, and energy probability distributions are calculated. Comparisons made with recent qubit experiments show this type of measurement provides another method to quantify entanglement with the environment.

A standard assumption in them odynam ics is that the coupling energy of the system to the therm odynam ic bath must be smaller than any other energy scale in the problem. In this paper, we explore the consequences of the violation of this assumption when the combined system and bath are together in the overall ground state (or at zero temperature).¹ From the therm odynam ic point of view, this is a boring situation because nothing can happen: the system and bath cannot exchange energy. However, from a quantum mechanical point of view, the non-vanishing of the coupling energy can play an in portant role for mesoscopic system s (where the therm odynam ic lim it cannot be applied). Therm odynam ic relations must be applied only to the entire system .^{2,3} In fact, even though the system is at zero tem perature, if a measurement of a sub-system H am iltonian is made, it can be found in an excited state with a probability that depends on the coupling to its environment. This non-intuitive result is a purely quantum phenom enon: it is a consequence of entanglement⁴ of the sub-system with the environment. In fact, we demonstrate that know ledge of the probability to not the system in an excited state can be used to determ ine the degree of entanglem ent of the sub-system and bath consequently, sim ple system swith wellknown isolated quantum mechanical properties (such as the two-state system and harm onic oscillator) become e \entanglem ent-meters".

There is growing interest in ground-state entanglement from the condensed matter physics community. Theoretical works on ground state entanglement have addressed entropy scaling in harmonic networks,⁵ spin-spin entanglement in quantum spin chains⁶ and quantum phase transitions.^{7,8} Entanglement properties of the ground state are also essential in the eld of adiabatic quantum computing.⁹ R ecently, there has also been interest in the relationship between energy frustration and entanglement.¹⁰ It is also interesting to link other ground state properties of a variety of mesoscopic systems to the zero-temperature entanglement energetics. These properties include the persistent current of sm all mesoscopic rings^{11,12,13} or of doubly connected C cooper pair boxes,^{14,15,16} single C cooper pair boxes measured by a dc-SQ U ID,^{17,18} and the occupation of resonant states.¹⁹ Furthermore, the role of entanglement with an unmonitored environment in the decoherence of scattering quantum particles has been considered for many-body quantum chaotic baths²⁰ and recently at zero temperature.²¹

It has long been recognized that the ground state properties ofm esoscopic system s are very interesting. In particular, a sm all metallic loop penetrated by an A haronov-B ohm ux exhibits a persistent current if the tem perature is so low that the phase coherence length becomes larger than the circum ference. It is therefore of interest to investigate the persistent current in rings coupled to a bath.²² The ground state of a model of a ring with a quantum dot coupled capacitively to a resistor was exam ined by C edraschi et al.¹¹ and it was found that the persistent current decreases with increasing coupling strength and at the same time that the persistent current is not sharp but uctuates with a variance that increases with increasing coupling strength. To explain these results these authors already alluded to energy uctuations. Such an explanation im plies a close connection between energy uctuations and persistent current uctuations. Indeed in the work presented here we substantiate this relationship. A simple and transparent m odel in which energy uctuations can be investigated is that of an oscillator coupled to a bath of harm onic oscillators. N agaev and one of the authors³ calculated the variance of the energy of the oscillator as a function of the coupling strength to the bath. In the work presented here, we analyze not only the variance but the entire distribution function of energy of the oscillator in its ground state, and show how these uctuations originate from entanglem ent.

We consider a general H am iltonian $H = H_s + H_c + H_E$, that couples (c) the system (s) we are interested in to a quantum environment (E) such as a network of harmonic oscillators.^{23,24} The lowest energy separable state is $\beta i = \beta i_s \beta i_E$, where $\beta i_{fs;Eg}$ are the lowest uncoupled energy state of both systems. However, if the system H am iltonian and the total H am iltonian do not commute (which is the generic situation), then βi is not an energy eigenstate of the total H am iltonian. Thus, there must be a lower energy eigenstate (βi) of the total H am iltonian which is by de nition an entangled state. Because time evolution is governed by the full H am iltonian, the ground state expectation of any operator with no explicit time dependence will have no time evolution, insuring that any m easurement outcome is static in time. This situation is in contrast to the usual starting point of assuming that the initial state is a separable state and studying how it becomes entangled. The reduced density operator of the system is given by tracing out the environmental degrees of freedom, $= T_{1E} \beta i h 0_j$. A ssuming the full state of the whole



FIG.1: A mesoscopic ring with in-line quantum dot and Aharonov-Bohm ux, coupled to an environment comprised of an in nite chain of LC -oscillators. This system exhibits a persistent current in its ground state, which is related to the entanglement energetics. A fter R ef. 11.

system is pure, the reduced density matrix contains all accessible system information, including entanglement of the system with its environment. Because repeated measurements of H_s will give dierent energies as the sub-system is not in an energy eigenstate, we are interested in a complete description of the statistical energy uctuations. These uctuations may be described in two equivalent ways. The rst way is to not the diagonal density matrix elements in the basis where H_s is diagonal. These elements represent the probability to measure a particular excited state of H_s. A second way is to not all energy cumulants. A cumulant of arbitrary order may be calculated from the sub-system energy generating function, Z () = hexp(H_s)i (as always, hO i = Tr O) so that the nth energy cumulant is given by

$$hhH_{s}^{n}ii = ()^{n}\frac{d^{n}}{d^{n}}\ln Z() = 0$$
(1)

These cum ulants give inform ation about the measured energy distribution around the average.

Before proceeding to calculate these energy uctuations, we ask a general question about entanglement. Given the energy distribution function (the diagonalmatrix elements of the density matrix only), can anything be said in general about the purity or entropy of the state? Surprisingly, because we are given the additional information that we are at zero temperature, the answer is yes. If we ever measure the sub-system's energy and nd an excited energy, then we know the state is entangled. A lthough this statement alone links energy uctuations with entanglement, a further quantitative statement may be made in the weak coupling limit. The reason for this is the following: the assumptions exponentially suppress higher states, so to rst order in the coupling constant, we can consider a two-state system where the density matrix has the form

$$= \begin{array}{cccc} & & & & & & \\ 1 & 0 & & & p & c \\ & & + & & & + & 0 & (^{2}) \\ 0 & 0 & & c & p \end{array}$$
(2)

For vanishing coupling constant = 0, the rst term is just the density matrix for the separable state. The linear dependence of on holds to rst order for the model system s considered below and is the entanglement contribution. If one measures the diagonal elements of , one obtains $p_{\text{dow }n} = 1$ p and $p_{\text{up}} = p$ as the probability to be measured in the ground or excited state (because is small, there is only a small probability to nd the sub-system in the upper state). If we now diagonalize , the eigenvalues are $_{1;2} = f1$ p ;p g + 0 (2). To rst order in , the eigenvalues are the diagonal matrix elements, so we may (to a good approximation) write the purity or entropy in term s of these probabilities even if the energy di erence remains unknow n.

The Qubit. Let us now rst evaluate the energy uctuations of a qubit, a two-state system. The most general (trace 1) spin density matrix is = $(1 + h_x i_x + h_y i_y + h_z i_z)=2$. A simple measure of the entanglement is given by the purity, Tr² = $(1=2)(1 + X^2 + Y^2 + Z^2)$, where $X_i = h_i i$. It is well known that (X;Y;Z) form coordinates in the B lock sphere. Purity lies at the surface where $X^2 + Y^2 + Z^2 = 1$, whereas corruption lies deep in the migdle.

We take the system Hamiltonian²⁵ to be $H_s = (=2)_z + (=2)_x$. Introducing the frequency $= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} +$



FIG.2: Energy probabilities p_{up} and p_{down} for the spin-boson problem. With increasing coupling to the environment it it is more likely to measure the qubit in the excited state. For the symmetric case (= 0), we use the Bethe ansatz solution, while for the general case, we use a perturbative solution which is only valid for large or large. A fler Ref. 1.

 $(n_z = -h, n_x = -h)$, it is straightforward to show

$$Z(i) = \cos(h = 2) \quad i \frac{\sin(h = 2)}{h} (h_z i + h_x i):$$
 (3)

The energy probability distribution m ay be easily found by Fourier transform ing Eq. (3), or by tracing in the diagonal basis of the system H am iltonian. The answer m ay be expressed with only the average energy, $h_{si} = \frac{1}{2}h_{zi} + \frac{1}{2}h_{xi}$ as a sum of delta functions at the system energies h = 2 with weights of the diagonal density m atrix elements,

$$h (E H_s)i = \frac{(E + h = 2)}{2} 1 \frac{hH_si}{h = 2} + \frac{(E h = 2)}{2} 1 + \frac{hH_si}{h = 2} :$$
(4)

C learly, if the spin is isolated from the environment, $hH_s i = h = 2$ (the ground state energy), the probability weight to be in an excited state vanishes. This distribution m ay also be found from know ledge of the isolated eigenenergies, the fact that $hH_s i = \int_j E_j j_j$, and that Tr = 1. This later argument m ay be extended to n-state system s given the rst n 1 m oments of the H am iltonian and the n eigenenergies.

C onnection with RealQ ubits. The probability weights depend on the energy parameters and , and the expectation values of the Paulim atrices. For real qubits produced in the lab, these will depend on the environment.²⁶ O ften, we can link the basic phenomena we have been describing to physical measurements other than energy. Consider, for example, a mesoscopic ring threaded by an Aharonov-Bohm ux shown in Fig. 1. The ring has an in-line quantum dot coupled to it with tunneling contacts, where the tunneling matrix elements t_L ; t_R depend on the ux . Interactions between the ring and dot are described with the capacitances C_L and C_R . The dot-ring structure is capacitively coupled to an external in pedance Z_{ext} modeled by an in nite chain of LC -oscillators. This external in pedance plays the role of the quantum environment. The equilibrium state of the dot-ring system supports a persistent current as a function of ux. The persistent current is related to the elective two-level system operators only, and in turn may be related to the probability to not the excited energy state (for the symmetric case of = 0),

$$p_{up} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{hH_{si}}{h = 2} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{I()}{I_{0}()} ;$$
(5)

where I_0 () is the uncoupled value of the persistent current. This physical in plem entation gives a direct translation between the measured persistent current and the entanglement between ring and dot. Dierent discussions of the e ect of a bath on persistent current should be classified as whether the system H am iltonian commutes with the total H am iltonian (see Ref. 13) or does not (see Refs. 11,12). A nother physical system that shows similar physics is a quantum dot connected in series with a tunnel junction, metallic reservoir and quantum impedance represented by a bosonic environment.²⁷

A common model for environmental e ects is given by coupling the two-state system to a series of harmonic oscillators, the spin-boson model 11,23,24,26 In Fig. 2, we have plotted the upper and lower occupation probabilities for the spin-boson model as a function of the coupling constant . For the symmetric case (= 0), we have used the

4

Bethe ansatz solution^{11,28}, while for nite, we have used the perturbative solution in $=!_{c}$ which is valid only for larger or 11 . Thus the plot is cut o at a small . A computational approach calculating the expectation values of the Paulim atrices over the whole parameter range was given in Ref. 26. The quantum dynamics of this system was studied in Ref. 29. One sim ple measure of the bath type is the slope of the occupation probability in the vicinity of = 0.

Experiments are always carried out at nite temperature, and it is important to demonstrate that there exists a cross-over temperature to the quantum behavior discussed here. For an isolated system in therm all equilibrium, where the coupling energy plays no role, the (low-temperature) therm alloccupation probability is $p_{th} = \exp[(E_2 - E_1)=kT]$. In the weak coupling limit for the symmetric spin boson problem, the probability to measure the excited state scales as $p_{up} = \log(=!_c)$.³⁰ Setting these factors equal and solving for T yields

$$kT = \frac{E_2 E_1}{\log(\log \frac{l_c}{c})} :$$
 (6)

Since T scales as the inverse logarithm of the coupling constant, it is experimentally possible to reach a regime where therm alexcitation is negligible. If one carefully calculates many-body low temperature corrections to the zero temperature results, one obtain corrections quadratic in temperature.²³

As an order of m agnitude estimate, we compare with the Cooper pair box^{14,15} which is among the most environmentally isolated solid state qubits¹⁶. From ¹⁵ which found a Q 10⁴, we estimate the quantum probability for the box to be measured in the excited state as p_{up} 10³ 10⁴, which is of same order or larger than the therm all probability, p_{th} 10⁴. Experimentally, p_{up} and p_{th} may be confused by tting data with an elective temperature, th / exp($_{e}$ H $_{s}$).³¹ However, one may distinguish true therm all behavior from the elect described here because p_{up} and p_{th} depend dimently on tunable system parameters such as . In fact, $_{e}$ is an entanglement measure. The behavior discussed here is closely related to the breakdown of the concept of local temperature discussed in Ref. 32

The H arm onic O scillator. We now consider the entanglem ent energetics of a harm onic oscillator, $H_s = p^2 = (2m) + (1=2)m ! ^2q^2$. Since there are an in nite number of states, the problem is harder. To simplify our task, we assume a linear coupling with an harm onic oscillator bath. This im plies that the density matrix is G aussian so that environmental information is contained in the second moments $h_1^2 i$ and $h_2^2 i j^{5,23}$

hqj
$$\dot{p}^{i} = p \frac{1}{2 hq^{2} i} \exp \left(\frac{(\frac{q+q^{0}}{2})^{2}}{2hq^{2} i} - \frac{hp^{2} i(q-q^{0})^{2}}{2h^{2}} \right)$$
 (7)

Expectation values of higher powers of H $_{\rm s}$ are non-trivial because q and p do not com m ute. The purity of the density m atrix Eq. (7) is

$$Tr^{2} = \frac{h=2}{hq^{2}ihq^{0}jjq^{i}} = \frac{h=2}{hq^{2}ihq^{2}j};$$
(8)

The uncertainty relation, $p \frac{p}{hq^2 i hp^2 i}$ h=2, guarantees that Tr² 1, with the inequality becoming sharp if the oscillator is isolated from the environment. As the environment causes greater deviation from the Planck scale limit, the state loss purity.

The generating function Z may be calculated conveniently by tracing in the position basis and inserting a complete set of position states between the operators,

$$Z () = dqdq^{0}hqj jq^{0}hq^{0}je^{H_{s}}jqi:$$
(9)

The rst object in Eq. (9) is the density matrix in position representation, given by Eq. (7). The second object may be interpreted as the uncoupled position-space propagator of the harm onic oscillator from position q to q^0 in time in ,

$$hq^{0}\dot{\mathbf{p}}^{\text{H}} \stackrel{\text{H}}{=} \frac{m!}{2 \text{ h}\sinh h!} \exp \frac{m!}{2 \text{ h}\sinh h!} [(q^{2} + q^{0})\cosh h! 2qq^{0}] ; \qquad (10)$$

This interpretation is quite general and may be used to extend this analysis to other system s. We nd

Z () = 2E
$$\frac{\sinh "}{"}$$
 + 2A ($\cosh "$ 1) + $\frac{1 + \cosh "}{2}$; (11)

where " = h!, $2E = m ! ^{2}hq^{2}i + hp^{2}i = m$ and $A = hq^{2}ihp^{2}i = h^{2}$. E is the average energy of the oscillator, while A 1 is a measure of satisfaction of the uncertainty principle. Eq. (11) has a pleasing limit for the free particle ! ! 0,

Z ()_{free} = 1 + hp² i=m
$$\frac{1}{2}$$
; (12)

which is just the generating function for W ick contractions, $hp^{2n}i = (2n \quad 1) !! (hp^2 i)^n$. Thus, in Eq. (11), the inverse square root generates the right combinatorial factors under di erentiation, and the nontrivial dependence accounts for the commutation relations between q and p. The rst few harm onic oscillator energy cum ulants m ay now be straightforw ardly found via Eq. (1),

$$hhH_{s}^{2}ii = (1=2)[(n^{2}=2) + 4E^{2} 2n^{2}A];$$
(13)

$$hhH_{s}^{3}ii = (E=2) [16E^{2} + "^{2}(1+12A)];$$
(14)

$$hhH_{s}^{4}ii = 48E^{4} \quad 4^{n^{2}}E^{2}(1+12A) + {}^{n^{4}}[(1=8)+2A+6A^{2}]:$$
(15)

A fier inserting the mean square values for an ohm ic bath (see the discussion above eqs. (21,22)), Eq. (13) is identical to the main result of N agaev and one of the authors.³

A lternatively, we now consider the diagonal matrix elements $_{nn}$. An analytical expression for the density matrix in the energy basis may be found by using the wavefunctions of the harm onic oscillator,

$$_{n}(q) = \frac{1}{2^{n} n!} = e^{2q^{2} = 2} H_{n}(q)$$
(16)

where $= {}_{R}^{P} \overline{m!} = h$ and $H_{n}(x)$ is the nth Herm ite polynom ial.³³ In the energy basis, the density matrix is given by $_{nm} = dqdq^{0}_{n}(q)hqj jq^{0}i_{m}(q^{0})$. The position space integrals may be done using two dimensions of the generating function for the Herm ite polynom ials.³³

G (q;s) = e^{s²+2sq} =
$$\frac{X^{l}}{m=0} \frac{H_{m}(q)s^{m}}{m!}$$
: (17)

The diagonal elements may be found by equating equal powers of the generating variables. We est dene the dimensionless variables $x = 2^{-2} \ln^2 i$, $y = 2 \ln^2 i = (^{-2} h^2)$, and D = 1 + x + y + xy. x and y are related to the major and m inor axes of an uncertainty ellipse. The isolated harm onic oscillator (in it's ground state) obeys two in portant properties: m inimum uncertainty (in position and momentum) and equipartition of energy between average kinetic and potential energies. The in uence of the environment causes deviations from these ideal behaviors which may be accounted for by introducing two new parameters, a = (y - x) = D; b = (xy - 1) = D with 1 - a - 1 and 0 - b - 1. The deviation from equipartition of energy is measured by a, while the deviation from the ideal uncertainty relation is measured by b. We nd

$$_{nn} = \frac{1}{D} (p^{2} a^{2})^{n=2} P_{n} b = \frac{h}{b^{2}} p_{2}^{1} i; \qquad (18)$$

where $P_n[z]$ are the Legendre polynom ials. The rst few energy probabilities are given below (without the $p_{4=D}$ prefactor).

n	nn = 00
0	1
1	b
2	$a^2=2+b^2$
3	$3a^2b=2+b^3$
4	$3a^4 = 8 + 3a^2b^2 + b^4$
5	$15a^4b=8+5a^2b^3+b^5$
6	$5a^6 = 16 + 45a^4b^2 = 8 + 15a^2b^4 = 2 + b^6$
7	$35a^{6}b=16+105a^{4}b^{3}=8+21a^{2}b^{5}=2+b^{7}$

If we try and choose x and y so as to violate the uncertainty principle, unphysical results appear as some of the probabilities exceed 1, or become negative. The probabilities (18) also revealenvironmental information. For example, $_{11} = _{00} = b$ and is thus only sensitive to the area of the state, while $_{22} = _{00} = a^2 = 2 + b^2$ depends on both the



FIG.3: The probability to measure a harm onic oscillator in the ground and st three excited states as a function of x and y (see text). The line traces out the behavior of the ohm ic bath as a function of the coupling in the under-dam ped range. A fler Ref. 1.

uncertainty and energy asymmetry. Additionally, if we expand the st density matrix eigenvalue^{5,23} with respect to small deviations of x and y, we recover $_{11}$ in agreement with our general argument. To complete the circle, we may make an \energy transform " on these probabilities,

$$Z() = e^{\sum_{n=0}^{X^{2}} e_{n}} \sum_{n=0}^{E_{n}} (19)$$

where $E_n = (n + 1=2)h!$ are the uncoupled energy eigenvalues of the harm onic oscillator. If we now identify the new generating variable $t = \frac{p}{b^2} \frac{1}{a^2} \exp(h!)$ and deviation variable $z = b = \frac{p}{b^2} \frac{1}{a^2}$, we may make use of the sum mation form ula for the Legendre polynom ials,³³

$$\begin{array}{c} \chi^{2} \\ t^{n} P_{n} [z] = f1 \quad 2zt + t^{2}g^{\frac{1}{2}}; \\ n = 0 \end{array}$$
(20)

to recover (after som e algebra) the energy generating function Eq. (11).

A lthough x and y have been treated as independent variables, the kind of environm ent the system is coupled to replaces these variables with two functions of the coupling constant. For example, with the ohm ic bath^{3,23} (in the under-dam ped lim it), the variables are

x() =
$$p \frac{1}{1^{2}} = 1 - \frac{2}{arctan} p \frac{1}{1^{2}}$$
; (21)

$$y() = (1 \ 2^{2})x() + \frac{4}{\dots} \ln \frac{!_{c}}{!};$$
 (22)

where is the coupling to the environment in units of the oscillator frequency and $!_c$ is a high frequency cuto. This bath information is shown in Fig. 3 with $!_c = 10!$. The trajectory of the line over the surface shows how the probabilities evolve as the coupling is increased from 0 to 1.0 ther kinds of environments would trace out di erent contours on the probability surface.

In conclusion, we have shown that projective measurements of the system Ham iltonian at zero temperature reveal entanglement properties of the many-body quantum mechanical ground state. Consequently, repeated experiments on simple quantum systems give information about the nature of the environment, the strength of the coupling and entanglement. The larger the energy uctuations, the greater the entanglement. There are several possibilities for experimental in plementations. We have mentioned measurement of persistent current^{11,12,13} as well as projecting on the system's energy eigenstates. Another measurement possibility is a zero temperature activation-like process³⁴ where the dominant mechanism is not tunneling, but the same quantum elects of the environment which we have discussed here.

This work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation.

- ¹ A.N.Jordan and M.Buttiker, Phys.Rev.Lett. 92, 247901 (2004).
- ² Th.M.Nieuwenhuizen, J.m od. Optics 50, 2433 (2003).
- ³ K.E.Nagaev and M.Buttiker, Europhys. Lett. 58, 475 (2002).
- ⁴ E. Schrödinger, Naturwissenschaffen 23, 807 (1935); J. S. Bell, Physics 1, 195 (1964); M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, (Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- ⁵ M. Srednicki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 666 (1993).
- ⁶ M.C.Amesen, S.Bose, and V.Vedral, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 017901 (2001).
- ⁷ T.J.O sborne and M.A.Nielsen, Phys. Rev. A 66, 032110 (2002).
- ⁸ A.O sterloh, L.Am ico, G.Falci, and R.Fazio, Nature 416, 608 (2002).
- ⁹ G.Falci, R.Fazio, G.M.Palma, J.Siewert, and V.Vedral, Nature 407, 355 (2000).
- ¹⁰ C.M.Dawson and M.A.Nielsen, quant-ph/0401061.
- ¹¹ P.Cedraschi, V.V.Ponom arenko, and M.Buttiker, Phys.Rev.Lett. 84, 346 (2000); P.Cedraschi and M.Buttiker, Annals of Physics 289, 1 (2001).
- ¹² F.Guinea, Phys. Rev. B 67, 045103 (2003); D.S.Golubev, C.P.Herrero, and A.D.Zaikin, Europhys. Lett. 63, 426 (2003).
- ¹³ F.M arquardt and C.Bruder, Phys. Rev. B 65, 125315 (2002); O.Entin-W ohlman, Y.Imry, and A.Aharony, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 046802 (2003).
- ¹⁴ V.Bouchiat, D.Vion, P.Joyez, D.Esteve, and M.H.Devoret, Phys. Scr. T 76, 165 (1998).
- ¹⁵ Y.Nakamura, Yu.A.Pashkin, and J.S.Tsai, Nature 398, 786 (1999).
- ¹⁶ D.Vion, A.Aassime, A.Cottet, P.Joyez, H.Pothier, C.Urbina, D.Esteve, and M.H.Devoret, Science 296, 886 (2002).
- ¹⁷ F.Balestro, J.C laudon, J.P.Pekola, and O.Buisson, Phys.Rev.Lett. 91, 158301 (2003).
- ¹⁸ O.Buisson, F.Balestro, J.P.Pekola, and F.W.J.Hekking, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 238304 (2003).
- ¹⁹ A.Furusakiand K.A.M atveev, Phys.Rev.Lett.88, 226404 (2002).
- $^{\rm 20}$ A.Jordan and M.Srednicki, quant-ph/0112139.
- 21 A.Ratchov, F.Faure, and F.W .J.Hekking, quant-ph/0402176.
- ²² M .Buttiker, Phys.Rev.B 32, 1846 (1985).
- ²³ U.W eiss, Quantum Dissipative Systems, (W orld Scientic, 2000).
- ²⁴ A.J.Leggett, S.Chakravarty, A.T.Dorsey, M.P.A.Fisher, A.Garg, and W.Zwerger, Rev.Mod.Phys.59, 1 (1987).
- 25 All system parameters include the high-frequency renormalization (Frank-Condon e ect 23).
- ²⁶ T.A.Costi and R.H.M cK enzie, Phys. Rev.A 68, 034301 (2003).
- ²⁷ K.LeHur, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 196804 (2004).
- ²⁸ V.V.Ponom arenko, Phys.Rev.B 48, 5265 (1993).
- ²⁹ R.A guado and T.Brandes, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 206601 (2004).
- 30 ! $_{\rm c}$ is the high frequency cuto needed to regularize the theory.
- ³¹ cannot always be written as an elective therm all distribution. Ref. 5 explicitly demonstrates this if the system contains two or more oscillators.
- $^{\rm 32}$ M .Hartmann,G.Mahler, and O.Hess, quant-ph/0312214.
- ³³ G.B.Arfken and H.J.W eber, M athem atical M ethods for Physicists, (A cadem ic P ress, 1995).
- ³⁴ D.Arteaga, E.Calzetta, A.Roura, and E.Verdaguer, Int.J.Theor.Phys. 42, 1257 (2003).