

Decoherence and localization in tunneling process under influence of one external degree of freedom

Quanlin Jie,^{1,*} Bambi Hu,^{2,3} and Guangjong Dong²

¹*Department of Physics, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072, P. R. China*

²*Department of Physics and Centre for Nonlinear Studies,
Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong, China*

³*Department of Physics, University of Houston, Houston TX 77204-5506*

(Dated: January 20, 2022)

We investigate numerically the tunneling effect under influence of another particle in a double well system. Such influence from only one degree of freedom makes decoherence and quantum-classical transition, i.e., suppression of the tunneling effect. The decoherence happens even for cases that the influence is from a particle of very small mass, and it has virtually no effect in the corresponding classical dynamics. There are cases similar to dynamical localization that the suppressed tunneling rate is several times smaller than the classical counterpart. This result is relevant for understanding quantitatively the dynamical process of decoherence and quantum to classical transition.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Yz, 03.65.Xp, 05.45.Mt, 03.65.Sq

Decoherence is a time honored problem that attracts many investigations for the mechanism of quantum to classical transition [1, 2]. There are growing interests in decoherence in the field of quantum information [3, 4, 5]. A common approach to decoherence is to study systems that thermally interact with large degrees of freedom, such as environment. This approach needs statistical method to handle the large degrees of freedom of the environment, and one usually resorts to master equation [6, 7, 8] or semiclassical approach [9] for the reduced density matrix. There is little investigation of decoherence that involves few degrees of freedom. One usually expects quantum effect prominent when there are only a few degrees of freedom involved in a physical process. However, as shown in Ref. [10], if a time dependent system is classical chaotic, such as kicked rotator, decoherence happens under influence of its one internal degree of freedom. The chaotic nature of the underlying dynamics makes the internal degree of freedom to behave as a noise [11, 12].

In this Letter, we investigate numerically the tunneling process of a particle in a one dimensional double well system under influence of another particle. Tunneling is a basic quantum effect that has far reaching applications. Understanding decoherence in tunneling effect is of fundamental importance [13, 14, 15]. Our numerical results show that the tunneling can be totally suppressed under influence of only one external degree of freedom. Even such influence has virtually no effect in the corresponding classical dynamics, it is still able to cause decoherence and hence makes the tunneling rate to approach the classical counterpart. Another result is that, similar to dynamical localization, the suppressed tunneling rates are several times smaller than the classical counterpart in some cases.

The Hamiltonian of the two-particle system reads $H = \sum_{i=1,2} \left[\frac{p_i^2}{2m_i} + v_i(x_i) \right] + v(x_1 - x_2)$. Here we consider

the motion of particle 1 under influence of particle 2 through the interaction $v(x_1 - x_2)$. Our tests indicate that the results are rather insensitive to the exact form of the interaction provided that the total system is not integrable classically. We use an attractive interaction $v(x_1 - x_2) = \frac{1}{2}\gamma(x_1 - x_2 - l_0)^2$ in the following discussions. The double well potentials for both particles are a Gaussian shaped barrier at the bottom of a bounded harmonic potential, $v_i(x_i) = \frac{1}{2}k_ix_i^2 + \lambda_i \exp(-x_i^2/a_i^2)$. This form of double well performs similar to the common used form $\lambda(x^2 - a^2)^2$. Yet it is more flexible to control the height and width of the barrier by adjusting parameters λ_i and a_i , and hence is more relevant for experimental realization by imposing a barrier at the minimum of a parabolic trap [16].

We consider each of the two particles initially as a Gaussian wave packet centered at the bottom of one well with vanished central momentum, $\phi_0(x_i) = A \exp(-\alpha(x_i - x_{0i})^2/2\hbar)$, where A is a normalization constant, α is the width parameter, and x_{0i} is center of the wave packet. When the interaction $v(x_1 - x_2)$ vanishes, the behavior of the particle 1 is well known [17]. The quantum motion has virtually only finite number of frequencies, i.e., the initial wave packet is effectively spanned by only finite number of eigenfunctions of the Hamiltonian. In our model, only 2 frequencies actually dominate the one dimensional tunneling processes.

When the particle is under influence of other degrees of freedom, the tunneling behavior may changes completely. From our numerical tests, the suppression of the tunnel effect happens under influence of only one degree of freedom, and such influence is classically negligibly small. In Fig. 1, we show the tunnel effect of particle 1 under influence of particle 2 with a mass that is 10^4 times smaller than that of particle 1, $m_2 = 10^{-4}m_1$. The top of Fig. 1 is the tunneling rates of particle 1 versus time for various interaction strength γ . The particle 1 with unit mass is




FIG. 1: (Top) Tunneling rates versus time for interaction strength $\gamma = 0.01$ (dot-dashed), 0.05 (dashed), and 0.2 (thick solid), respectively. The thin solid line is the classical counterparts. (Bottom) The von Neumann entropy versus time. From bottom to top, $\gamma = 0.01, 0.02, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2$.

initially rest on the bottom of right well. The tunneling rate (also known as tunneling probability) is the probability to find the particle on the other side of the barrier, $T_r = \int_{-\infty}^0 \rho_1(x_1) dx_1$. Here $\rho_1 = \int |\psi(x_1, x_2)|^2 dx_2$ is the reduced density for the particle 1 by tracing out the other degree of freedom from wave function $\psi(x_1, x_2)$. The double well potential parameters (in arbitrary unit) are $k_1 = 0.5$, $\lambda_1 = 3.0$, $a_1 = 1.0$, and $l_0 = 0.5$ (The Planck constant \hbar is set to 1). The potential for the particle 2 is the same as that of particle 1. We set particle 2 to be the same Gaussian wave packet as particle 1 that initially locates in the bottom of another well with vanished central momentum. The width parameter for both Gaussian wave packets is $\alpha = 3.0$. In classical limit, the particle 2 with such a small mass has virtually no effect on the motion of particle 1. The quantum case, however, is totally a different story. The interaction with particle 2 can completely destroy coherence of particle 1. As shown in Fig. 1, for very weak interaction, $\gamma = 0.01$, the motion of particle 1 is almost unaffected. It is still able to tunnel through the barrier back and forth almost completely. When the interaction becomes a little bit stronger, $\gamma = 0.05$, the decoherence is evident. The maximum tunneling rate is at most 50%, and such maximum decreases gradually in longer time. Further increase of the interaction strength to $\gamma = 0.2$, as shown by the thick solid line, the tunneling effect is virtually suppressed by the decoherence. The resultant tunneling rate approaches to the classical result. As a comparison, we show the corresponding classical counterpart by thin solid line. It is obtained by evolving the Liouville equation from a classical density distribution that is identical

to the quantum Wigner function initially. Similarly, the classical counterpart of the tunneling rate is the probability to find the particle on the other side of the barrier.

Since the mass of particle 2 is smaller than particle 1 by several orders, its effect on particle 1 is just like a small weightless dust on a heavy body in the classical limit. The classical motion of particle 1 is indeed quite regular, and is almost the same as the unperturbed one dimensional case. The classical motion of particle 2, however, is irregular. The interaction with particle 1 is a major force for the chaotic motion of particle 2 which bounces drastically between the two wells. Such irregularity of particle 2 makes the total wave function of the two-particle system to be irregular. Entanglement between the two particles leads to the decoherence of the quantum motion of particle 1. The irregular motion of particle 2 poses some difficulties in numerical calculations. The wave function relates to particle 2 spreads widely in both coordinate and momentum space. One needs dense grid that covers a wide range. Our actual calculations employ periodic boundary condition to particle 2. This indeed restricts particle 2 to a ring. From our test, this restriction does not alter the behavior of particle 1, but saves computation efforts remarkably.

There are more frequencies involved in the two-particle system, and the structure of the frequencies is much complicated than the single particle case. One can obtain the spectrum density by Fourier transformation of the auto-correlation function. Since the mass of particle 2 is much smaller than that of particle 1, the energy spectrum distributes in a wide range with band like structure. Each band consists of several levels. It is virtually impossible to have constructive interference between those frequencies on the other side of the barrier.

The complex structure of the involved frequencies and the corresponding eigenfunctions relates to the entanglement of between the two particles. Such entanglement makes expansion of initial wave packet in terms of the eigenfunction to be complicated. An initially wave packet must evolve into entangled form in such system. The bottom of Fig. 1 shows the von Neumann entropy of particle 1 versus time for various interaction strengths. The von Neumann entropy, $S = -\text{Tr}(\rho_1 \ln(\rho_1))$, is a common used measure for the entanglement between two particles. By comparison with top part of Fig. 1 for the correspondent interaction strength, it is evident that the decoherence in the tunneling process corresponds to the entanglement between the two particles. Increase the interaction between the two particles leads to stronger entanglement (larger entropy), and hence deeper suppression of the quantum effects. An initially Gaussian wave packet needs some time to develop into the final entangled form. The speed of such development increases with the interaction strength.

When the interaction is too strong, the two particles can bind together like a single one. When this hap-




FIG. 2: The tunneling rate versus interaction strength γ . The circle (diamond), down and up triangle symbols correspond to quantum (classical) mean value, typical maximum and minimum value of the quantum tunneling rates, respectively. (Inset) The density distribution ρ of particle 1 versus the coordinate X at time $t = 400$ for $\gamma = 0.2$.

pen, the quantum coherence emerges again. In other words, when the interaction strength is stronger than some value, the degree of freedom for the relative motion is hard to excite, and there is enhancement of the quantum coherence with the increase of the parameter γ . Note that when two particles bind together, they behave like a particle of mass $m_1 + m_2$ in a potential $v_1 + v_2$. Here m_1 , m_2 and v_1 , v_2 are the masses and potentials of particles 1 and 2, respectively. Fig. 2 shows averaged tunneling rate of particle 1 versus the interaction parameter γ for both quantum and the corresponding classical cases. The open circles and diamonds are quantum and classical mean tunneling rate, respectively. The down and up triangles are a pair of typical maximum and minimum tunneling rates chosen from a tunneling cycle. The range between such a pair of the triangles relates to the degree of coherence in the tunneling process. The initial states of the two particles and potential parameters are the same as that of Fig. 1. In classical limit, because of small mass, the particle 2 possesses little energy and momentum to affect the motion of particle 1. In contrast, the quantum motion of particle 1 exhibits decoherence by interaction with particle 2 for a wide range of interaction strength. As the interaction strength parameter γ grows from 0, the averaged quantum tunneling rate approaches to classical limit exponentially. Then quantum and classical mean tunneling rates coincide for a wide range of strength parameter γ . When $\gamma > 0.8$, the binding energy between the two particles becomes hard to excite, quantum tunneling rate increases and deviates from the classical counterpart. Further increase of γ makes the quantum motion to gain more coherence, and to behave more like the motion of a single particle. In all the cases, corresponding to the regular classical motion, the reduced density distribution for particle 1, as shown in the inset of Fig. 2, is quite regular. Another point

to note is that when the quantum mean tunneling rate approaches to the classical counterpart, its fluctuation, as shown by the range between up and down triangles, is larger than the classical case. This is resultant from the fact that the dynamics of the two-particle system has only finite number of frequencies.




FIG. 3: Tunneling rate versus time for interaction strength $\gamma = 0.01$ (Top), and $\gamma = 0.1$ (Bottom), respectively. The solid and dashed lines are quantum and classical results, respectively.

In some cases, the fact of finite frequencies makes the quantum tunneling rate several times smaller than the classical counterpart. Such cases occur at some interaction strengths and the masses of the two particles close to each other. We show such a case in Fig 3. The parameters for the on site potentials and interaction, as well as the initial states of the two particles, are the same as that of Fig. 1 except $\lambda_2 = 15$. The masses of the two particles are same, $m_1 = m_2 = 1$. As shown in the top part of Fig. 3, when the interaction is weak ($\gamma = 0.01$), the quantum coherence is almost untouched. As the strength of interaction increase, quantum and classical behaviors change in opposite way. Quantum tunneling rate is quickly suppressed by decoherence. The classical counterpart, however, increases with the interaction strength. This is because the two particles are initially located on the different sides of the barrier, each particle has a pull force on the other one. As the parameter γ increase, they pull each other with larger force. This leads to increase on the classical motion's energy to climb over the barrier. When the parameter $\gamma = 0.1$, as shown in the bottom of Fig. 3, the quantum tunneling rate is about 3 times smaller than its classical counterpart.

This effect, similar to the dynamical localization [18], results from destructive interferences between involved frequencies. It relates to two factors: decoherence from interaction with particle 2 and only finite frequencies in-

volved in the quantum motion. In classical limit, the attractive interaction between the two particles makes each particle gaining energy from other one for climbing over the barrier. The energy transformation between the two particles is prominent when the frequency of the relative motion matches the overall motion, i.e., resonance between relative motion and overall motion. For the given parameters, the system is close to the classical resonance when $\gamma = 0.1$. For quantum motion, however, both relative and overall motions contain only finite frequencies. There is little chance that the two kinds of frequencies match. In other words, the quantum motion doesn't feel the resonance. On the other hand, the interaction with particle 2 destroys coherence between these involved frequencies. It is virtually impossible to make constructive interference on the other side of the barrier. Thus the quantum motion behaves like a classical motion without the resonance effect. This is in fact a kind of quantum dynamical localization to the classical resonance.




FIG. 4: Tunneling rate versus the barrier height λ of the particle 2. The circle (diamond), down and up triangle symbols have the same meaning as that of Fig. 2. (Inset) Density spectrum ρ_E versus energy E for $\lambda = 15$.

To verify the above explanation, we rerun the calculation with different barrier height for particle 2. The result is shown in Fig. 4. The symbols and their meanings are the same as that of Fig. 2 except the horizontal axis is the barrier's height of particle 2. As the height of the barrier increase, the particle 2 becomes harder and harder to move across barrier, and it is virtually trapped in the left well. This makes the classical motion always from the resonance region. When this happens, as shown in Fig. 4, the classical tunneling rate drops. The restriction on the particle 2 has virtually no effect on the quantum motion of particle 1. Thus when the classical dynamics leaves the resonance region, the quantum tunnel rate approaches to its classical counterpart. As shown by the inset, when the masses of the two particles close to each other, there are less involved frequencies than the cases shown in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2. This means the involved frequencies have larger level space, i.e., the frequencies are more discrete.

In conclusion, we numerically show that decoherence and quantum-classical transition occur in the tunneling process under influence of only one external degree of freedom. Such influence can be negligibly small in the classical limit. Here, the correspondent classical motion of the one dimensional tunneling is regular when there is no interaction with external degree of freedom, and such regularity of classical motion is almost unchanged by such negligible interaction. However, the interaction makes the motion of external degree of freedom to be chaotic. It is such irregularity of the external degree of freedom that causes decoherence in the quantum motion by entanglement with the external degree of freedom. Since there is only finite number of frequencies involved in quantum motion, the quantum motion is unable to feel classical resonance. This makes quantum tunneling to behave similar to the dynamical localization in the kicked rotator, i.e., the tunneling rate is several times smaller than the classical counterpart in some cases.

This work is supported in part by the National Science Foundation (Grant No. 10375042), grants from the Hong Kong Grants Council (GRC), and the Hong Kong Baptist University Faculty Research Grant (FRG).

* E-mail: qljie@whu.edu.cn

- [1] M. Schlosshauer, Rev. Mod. Phys. **76**, 1267 (2004).
- [2] W. H. Zurek, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 715 (2003).
- [3] I. Žutić, J. Fabian, S. D. Sarma, Rev. Mod. Phys. **76**, 323 (2004).
- [4] G. Burkard, F. Brito, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 054528 (2005).
- [5] B. K. Nikolić, S. Souma, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 195328 (2005).
- [6] D. J. Heijs, V. A. Malyshev, and J. Knoester, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 177402 (2005).
- [7] Carlos Calero, E. M. Chudnovsky, and D. A. Garanin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 166603 (2005).
- [8] J. L. García-Palacios, and S. Dattagupta, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 190401 (2005).
- [9] P. Jacquod, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 150403 (2004).
- [10] H.K. Park, and S. W. Kim, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 060102(R) (2003).
- [11] H. Ammann, R. Gray, I. Shvarchuck, and N. Christensen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 4111 (1998).
- [12] B. G. Klappauf, W. H. Oskay, D. A. Steck, and M. G. Raizen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1203 (1998).
- [13] A. O. Caldeira and A. J. Leggett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **46**, 211 (1981).
- [14] A. N. Salgueiro, A. F. Piza, J. G. Faria, and M. C. Nemes, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 032113 (2001).
- [15] Daniel A. Steck, Windell H. Oskay, and Mark G. Raizen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 120406 (2002).
- [16] T. Schumm, S. Hofferberth, L. M. Andersson, S. Wildermuth, S. Groth, I. Bar-Joseph, J. Schmiedmayer and P. Krüger, Nature Physics **1**, 57 (2005).
- [17] F. Grossmann, T. Dittrich, P. Jung, and P. Hänggi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 516 (1991).

- [18] G. Casati, B. V. Chirikov, D. L. Shepelyansky, and I. Guarneri, Phys. Rep, **154**, 77 (1987); F. M. Izrailev, Phys. Rep. **196**, 299 (1990).