# R ecovery of classical chaotic-like behaviour in a conservative quantum three body problem

M J. Everitt

Centre for Theoretical Physics, The British University in Egypt, El Sherouk City, M isr Ism alia Desert Road, Postal No. 11837, P.O. Box 43, Egypt.

Recovering trajectories of quantum system swhose classical counterparts display chaotic behaviour has been a subject that has received a lot of interest over the last decade. However, most of these studies have focused on driven and dissipative systems. The relevance and impact of chaotic-like phenom ena to quantum systems has been highlighted in recent studies which have shown that quantum chaos is signi cant in some aspects of quantum computation and information processing. In this paper we study a three body system comprising of identical particles arranged so that the system's classical trajectories exhibit H am iltonian chaos. Here we show that it is possible to recover very nearly classical-like, conservative, chaotic trajectories from such a system through an unravelling of the master equation. Firstly, this is done through continuous measurem ent of the position of each system. Secondly, and perhaps som ew hat surprisingly, we demonstrate that we still obtain a very good match between the classical and quantum dynamics by weakly measuring the position of only one of the oscillators.

PACS num bers: 05.45 M t 03.65.-w 05.45 Pq

#### I. IN TRODUCTION

Quantum mechanics is perhaps the most powerful and useful theory of physics to date. Indeed, with the possible em ergence of many new quantum technologies in areas such as computation, communication, cryptography and m etrology this trend looks set to continue well into the future. With such strong interest in applications of quantum mechanics comes a concomitant interest in the measurement process and the interaction between \classical" and quantum systems. Indeed, as we wish to understand and apply quantum mechanics within the context ofm odem technology we will need to develop our understanding of what actually constitutes a classical device and how such objects interact with quantum system s. How ever, the recovery of classical mechanics is not always as simple as a implied by a na vete interpretation of the correspondence principle. This essential requirem ent of any physical theory can, for quantum m echanical system s, be stated as:

\If a quantum system has a classical analogue, expectation values of operators behave, in the lim it  $\sim ! 0$ , like the corresponding classical quantities" [1]

We observe that interpretation of this statement can be problematic if, for example, we consider quantum systems that lack a specic dependence on Planks constant [2]. Further di culties arise when attempting to recover the classical trajectories of classically nonlinear and chaotic systems as the Schrödinger equation is strictly linear. We note that these concerns are no longer just of interest to those studying either the measurement problem or the correspondence principle and the emergence of the classical world. Indeed this area has a direct im pact on quantum technologies. In order to fully leverage the power a orded by these emerging elds we must not only understand in depth the measurement process but also many body quantum systems coupled to real environments. This is highlighted by the recent observation of chaos in the spectrum of Shor's algorithm [3] as well as in other studies involving quantum information processing and quantum chaos [4, 5, 6].

A solution to the correspondence problem for chaotic systems which has been employed with great success is found by utilising quantum trajectories m ethods [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17]. Here, introduction of environm ental degrees of freedom and unravelling the master equation yield stochastic Schrodinger equations from which chaotic-like trajectories may be recovered. This process can be considered as comprising of several steps. Firstly, we make the quantum system of an open one. This is archived by coupling the quantum object to an environm ent which m ay take the form of a m easurem ent device. Once the environment has been introduced we m odel the evolution of the system 's density operator (in the presence of the environm ent) using a linear master equation. However, master equations are similar to the Langevin equation insofar as they only predict a set of probable outcom es over an ensem ble of system s or experiments. Therefore, in order to get some idea of the possible behaviour of an individual experiment we next unravel the master equation. In essence, this process involves nding a stochastic di erential equation for the system 's state vector with the proviso that the dynam ics given by the master equation are returned in the ensem ble average over m any solutions. There are an in nitely m any ways to do this each representing a di erent phys-

E lectronic address: m .jeveritt@ physics.org

ical process. In this work we employ the quantum state di usion (Q SD) unravelling which corresponds to a unite ciency heterodyne measurement (or am bi-quadrature hom odyne detection) on the environmental degrees of freedom [16] (for an detailed introduction to this approach please see [18]). Here the evolution of the state vector j i is given by the Itô increment equation [13, 14]

$$j\mathbf{l} \quad \mathbf{i} = \frac{\mathbf{i}}{\mathbf{H}} \mathbf{j} \quad \mathbf{i} \, \mathbf{d} \mathbf{t}$$

$$+ \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{X} \quad \mathbf{D} \quad \mathbf{E} \\ \mathbf{L}_{j}^{\mathbf{Y}} \quad \mathbf{L}_{j} \quad \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{L}_{j}^{\mathbf{Y}} \mathbf{L}_{j} \quad \frac{1}{2} \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{L}_{j}^{\mathbf{Y}} \quad \mathbf{L}_{j} \\ \mathbf{L}_{j}^{\mathbf{Y}} \quad \mathbf{L}_{j} \\ \mathbf{X}^{j} \\ \mathbf{L}_{j} \quad \mathbf{h} \mathbf{L}_{j} \mathbf{i} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{i} \mathbf{d} \end{array}$$

$$\mathbf{I}$$

$$\mathbf{I}$$

where the Lindblad operators  $L_i$  represent coupling to environmental degrees of freedom, dt is the time increment, and <u>d</u> are complex W einer increments de ned such that  $d^2 = d = 0$  and d d = dt [13, 14]. Throughout this work a bar over a quantity denotes the average over stochastic processes whilst the notation h i is used for quantum mechanical expectation values. The rst term on the right hand side of this equation is the Schrödinger evolution of the system while the second (driff) and third (uctuation) terms describe the decohering e ects of the environment on the evolution of the system s state vector.

However, to date the body of work which uses quantum trajectories to recover classically chaotic-like trajectories has focused on those systems that are dissipative. There are several notable exceptions that demonstrate that continuous measurement of both driven and undriven conservative system s that can recover classical like behaviour [19, 20, 21, 22]. How ever, these works consider systems with only a single degree of freedom . Recently we became interested in whether it was possible, using a sim ilar analysis, to recover chaotic trajectories of classical, multi-component, systems undergoing Ham iltonian chaos. Initially we wished to consider the traditional three body problem of classical mechanics for particles with similar masses [30]. This problem, although historically very signi cant, is non-trivial to solve. Consequently, in this work we consider a som ewhat sim plied system comprising of three coupled one-dimensional anham onic oscillators.

#### II. BACKGROUND

The Ham iltonian for our chosen three body system, comprising of one-dimensional anharmonic oscillators with a quartic potential and unit mass, is given by

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{X^3} p_i^2 + 2 \frac{q_1^2 q_2^2 + q_2^2 q_3^2 + q_1^2 q_3^2}{2} + \frac{q_1^4 + q_2^4 + q_3^4}{32}$$
(2)

The classical dynam ics associated with this Ham iltonian can be chaotic and are known to have positive Lyapunov exponents [23]. When we consider classical mechanics  $q_i$  and  $p_i$  are taken to represent the classical values of position and momentum. However, when we consider the quantum mechanics they are replaced by their operator counterparts. As we shall always be clear as to which description we are considering at any one time this does not lead to any ambiguity.

W e have already stated one expression of the correspondence principal in quantum mechanics. An alternative de nition, which we nd preferable, is to

In either case this is the rôle of the term in the H am iltonian, i.e.  $\sim ! \sim \infty$  that the sm aller the larger the dynam ics when compared to a plank cell.

## III. RESULTS

From the Hamiltonian (2) we not the three classical equations of motion are

$$q_{i} + {2 \atop {i \in j}} {8 \atop {i \in j}} {9 \atop {i \in j}} = 0; where i; j = 1; 2; 3: (3)$$

W hen we solve these coupled equations of motion with the initial conditions  $q_1 = 0.2 = ; q_2 = 0.05 = ; q_3 = 0.15 =$  and  $p_i = 0$  for all i we nd that the dynamics are chaotic. We show the phase portrait for the solutions to these equations in gure 1(a) where, without loss of generality, we have set = 1. We note as an interesting aside, one feature of this system is that if  $q_i = p_i = 0$  for any i then  $q_i = p_i = 0$  always.

We now proceed to discuss the quantum mechanical description of these coupled oscillators. Unlike the classical equations of motion the Schrodinger equation for this, or any other, system is strictly linear. We nd that solutions to the Schrodinger equation for this system, even for moderate values of , delocalise so rapidly that obtaining accurate solutions is not possible for us. This does, how ever, reinforce the lack of correspondence between classical dynam ics and Schrodinger evolution for this system.

Following past work [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17] on recovering classically chaotic like orbits from a system's quantum counterpart we solve the unravelling of the master equation (1) with Hamiltonian (2). For this example there are three points of note with regard to possible choices of the environmental degrees of freedom. Firstly, coupling to an environment helps localise the system's state vector and hence produce a well dened, classical-like, trajectory. Secondly, as the classical system is Hamiltonian and therefore conservative, we



FIG.1: (colour on-line) An example chaotic trajectory (a) solutions to the classical equations of motion (3) for the initial conditions  $q_1 = 0.2$ ,  $q_2 = 0.05$ ,  $q_3 = 0.15$  for our chosen system and (b) scaled quantum expectation values  $hq_1$  i and

hp<sub>i</sub>i versus time for an unravelling of the m aster equation with initial state  $D_1$  (0.2=) $D_2$  (0.05=) $D_3$  (0.15=) j000i and = 1=2000. Trajectories for oscillator one are shown in magenta (m edium grey), for two in blue (dark grey) and three in green (light grey). Note, all quantities are dimensionless.



FIG.2: (colour on-line) A comparison between the classical position  $q_1$  (dashed grey) and  $hq_1$  i for three di erent couplings () to the environment. Note, all quantities are dimensionless.

m ust chose the environm ent of each oscillator so that energy exchange is m inim ised between any part of the system and the environm ental degrees of freedom. Thirdly, we should specify a physically reasonable environm ent.

In this work we have chosen initially one of the most obvious candidates for the environment which satis es all. these conditions. Explicitly we have set each Lindblad  $L_i = q_i$ ; i = 1;2;3 corresponding to the continuous m easurem ent of position. This unravelling also corresponds to that of the M aster equation for a weakly coupled, high tem perature, therm all environm ent [19]. Here

represents the m agnitude of the coupling between each component of the system and its respective environment. In this work we use several values of . In gure 1(b) we use an intermediate coupling (= 0:1) whilst in gures 2, 3, 4 and 5 we also present results for weak (= 0:01) and strong (= 0:5) couplings.

As our initial state, and for the best possible match with the classical initial conditions, we chose a tensor product of coherent states for which the quantum expectation values in position and momentum are centred in q p phase plane at  $q_1 = 0.2 = ; q_2 = 0.05 = ; q_3 =$ 0:15= and p<sub>i</sub> = 0 where i = 1;2;3. A Iternatively, we can express this initial condition explicitly as translated vacuum states by D<sub>1</sub> ( 0.2= )D<sub>2</sub> (0.05= )D<sub>3</sub> ( 0.15= ) 000iwhere  $D_{i}(:)$  is the displacement operator in position for each component of the system. Here we have chosen = 1=2000 as this is the sm allest value for which we can solve (1) both accurately and within a reasonable time frame. In order to help the reader quantify the time scale over which our results are presented we note that the log time associated with our chosen value of beta is 3:3 [24, 25]. This is much shorter than the pe- $\log(1=)$ riod over which we present the evolution of the system 's tra jectories.

In gure 1 (b) we show the dynam ics of the quantum expectation values of the position and momentum operators for each oscillator. These have been scaled by a factor of so that they may be compared with gure 1 (a). Here we see very good agreem ent initially, and sim ilar characteristics throughout, the displayed dynam ics. Indeed the trajectories are similar enough that it is in possible to determ ine from the graph alone which plot shows the classical and which the quantum evolution. We note that these curves begin to di er after a short period of time. However, this is not unexpected as the system we are analysing is chaotic. In order to make the reasonable com parison of these results readily available we also include a graph of the evolution of q1 and hq1 i as a function of time in Fig. 2 for three di erent couplings to the environm ent. It is apparent that there is a very good m atch between the quantum expectation values and the classical trajectory for = 0.01.

W e note that simply by including an environm ent our system no longer undergoes H am iltonian evolution. In other words, in order to be able to recover classical like trajectories of quantum systems whose classical counterparts exhibit H am iltonian chaos we include environm entaldegrees of freedom that im ply non-H am iltonian evolution of the quantum system. How ever, using a su ciently low coupling strength to the environm ent results in a concom itant reduction both in energy exchange between the system and it's environm ent and the localisation of the state vector. W e now verify that the solutions to equa-



FIG. 3: (colour on-line) Total system energy, with magnied section inset, computed by substituting  $hq_i i$  and  $hp_i i$  into the H am iltonian (2) for three di erent couplings () to the environm ent. N ote, all quantities are dimensionless.

tion (1) are to, good approximation, conservative. This does indeed appear to be the case for both intermediate and weak couplings (= 0.1 and 0.01) but not for the stronger coupling (= 0.5). This can be seen in gure 3 where we show the total energy found by substituting hq\_i and hp\_i i for q\_i and p\_i into the Ham iltonian (2), i.e.

Energy = 
$$\sum_{i=1}^{X} \frac{1}{2} \ln^{2} i^{2} + \frac{2}{32} \ln^{2} i^{4} + \frac{2}{2} \sum_{i \in j}^{X} \ln^{2} i^{2} \ln^{2} i^{2}$$
 (4)

where i; j = 1;2;3. We note that we do not compute hH i as we wish to compare directly with the equivalent classical calculation.

Next we verify localisation of the state vector by com puting the uncertainty in position and momentum for the rst oscillator for three di erent<sub>q</sub> couplings to the environment. Because both  $q_i =$ hq<sup>2</sup>i hq<sub>i</sub>i<sup>2</sup> and q  $hp_i^2 i hp_i i^2$  between components behave in a p<sub>i</sub> = sim ilar fashion, we do not show results for the other two oscillators here. As is evident from gure 4 the interaction with the environment causes system's state vector to localise within each of the component spaces. It is also apparent from this gure that the level of localisation is dependent of the coupling between each of the system 's components and their respective environments. W e also note that as the system evolves it's states become squeezed in each of the momentum variables. Unlike the results presented in gure 1 (b) we have not scaled these uncertainty values by = 1=2000. Consequently, for direct comparison with the rst two gures the results presented in gure 4 should be divided by 2000. Hence, the uncertainty in either position or momentum can be seen to be quite negligible when compared with the trajectory of quantum expectation values plotted in gure 1(b).

W e can extract further inform ation on the dynam ics of this system simply by borrowing a technique from quantum optics. Namely through analysing the photon statis-



FIG. 4: (colour on-line) Uncertainty in position (light grey/m agenta) and m om entum (dark grey/blue) as a function of time for the rst component for three di erent couplings () to the environm ent. Values beneath the dashed (green) line indicate squeezing. N ote, all quantities are dimension less.

tics (bunching of photons) described by the second order correlations [26, 27]

$$g_{i}^{(2)} = \frac{n_{i}^{2} \quad m_{i}i}{m_{i}i^{2}}; i = 1;2;3$$
 (5)

W here n is the number operator. Values of  $g^{(2)}$  greater than 1 indicate photon bunching where photons arrive in groups while values of  $g^{(2)}$  smaller than one indicate antibunching, a purely quantum mechanical phenomena representing precisely regular arrival of photons. However  $g^{(2)} = 1$  corresponds to Poissonian statistics and which is what we would expect from the state of our system should it be undergoing a classical like evolution. As



FIG.5:  $g_i^{(2)}$  (i = 1) coe cient, with magni ed section inset, as a function of time for three di erent couplings () to the environment. Classical-like motion yields  $g_i^{(2)}$  = 1 as this implies a Poissonian statistics for the state of the system. Note, all quantities are dimensionless.

we can see from gure 5 this is indeed the case (where, again, we have only shown data for the rst component).

In the discussion above we have considered what happens when we perform simultaneous, continuous, measurements of the position of each of the components of the system . As the weak measurement limit is approached we nd good agreem ent between classical and quantum dynam ics and the system becomes, to good approximation, conservative. We now demonstrate that there exists a weaker condition under which we can produce the same outcome. That is, we show that weak m easurem ent of only one of the position variables is sufcient produce, to very good approximation, classicallike trajectories. As no one oscillator has a privileged status over the others we set, without loss of generality,  $L_1 = q_1; L_2 = L_3 = 0$  with = 0:01 and = 1=2000. Again we solve the unravelling of the master equation (1) with Hamiltonian (2) and the initial state D<sub>1</sub> ( 0.2= )D<sub>2</sub> (0.05= )D<sub>3</sub> ( 0.15= ) D00i. As we can see from qure 6 even under these conditions we recover quantum trajectories whose expectation values m atch very well indeed with those of the equivalent classical system .

## IV. CONCLUSION

For any given and an initially localised state there will be some agreem ent between the dynam ics of the classical system and the evolution of the quantum expectation values of the corresponding quantum operators. How ever, after a short period of time the quantum state vector will begin to delocalise and di erences between the predictions of each theory become apparent. We have demonstrated, by localising the state vector through m easurem ent of the position of one or all components of the system, that near classical like dynam ics can be re-



FIG.6: (colour on-line) An example chaotic-like trajectory for the scaled quantum expectation values  $hq_i i$  and  $hp_i i$ , for weak measurement of the rst oscillator only. Here  $L_1 = q_i; L_2 = L_3 = 0$  for = 0.01 and = 1=2000. Quantum trajectories for oscillator one are shown in magenta (medium grey), for two in blue (dark grey) and three in green (light grey). The corresponding classical dynamics are shown with a dashed grey line. Note, all quantities are dimensionless.

covered through an unravelling the m aster equation. For this work we have chosen quantum state di usion. However, it is likely that any other unravelling will produce sim ilar results. Such detailed analysis is beyond the scope of this work and would belong in a more in depth study. We also note, as a subject for future study, that it would be interesting to determ ine the conditions under which m easurement of a subset of the degrees of freedom of an N-body system results in the localisation of the state vector.

Finally we would like to observe that following [28] it would be interesting to characterise the entanglem ent between the components of this system . As it may well be the case that for this example, as well as the one studied in [28], that the entanglem ent does not necessarily vanish in the classical lim it. Unfortunately current restrictions on computational power prevent us from conducting this study at the present time. However, from the last result presented here we intuitively feel that there must persistently exist at least a sm all degree of entanglem ent between the rst component and each of the other two. In order to justify this statem ent we propose the follow ing argum ent. First, consider the extension to the tensor product space of the Lindblad operator, explicitly this is  $q_1$   $1_2$   $1_3$ . Now, by examining equation (1) we see that if the state of the system was separable, the last two term s (those responsible for the localisation of j i) would not a ect the components of the state vector for the second and third degrees of freedom . As introduction of this environm ental degree of freedom localises the state vector and result in the recovery of a classical like traectory, we therefore propose that the state vector must posses som e non-zero entanglem ent.

## A cknow ledgm ents

The author would like to thank P rofessor F V. K usm artsev, P rofessor S A. A lexandrov, and D r J H. Sam – son whose stimulating discussion with the author regarding [28, 29] and system s that exhibit H am iltonian chaos whilst visiting Loughborough University originated this work. The author would also like to thank D r J F. R alph, P rof T D. C lark and D r T P. Spiller for interesting and inform ative discussions.

- [L] E. Merzbacher, Quantum Mechanics (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1998), 3rd ed.
- [2] G.Casati, B.Chirikov, F.Israilev, and J.Ford, Stochastic Behaviour in Classical and Quantum Hamiltonian Systems, vol. 93 of Springer Lecture Notes in Physics (Springer, Berlin, 1979).
- [3] K. Maity and A. Lakshm inarayan, Phys. Rev. E 74, 035203 (2006).
- [4] J. Lages and D. Shepelyansky, Phys. Rev. E 74, 026208 (2006).
- [5] T.Kiss, I.Jex, G.Alber, and S.Vym etal, Phys. Rev. A 74,040301 (R) (2006).
- [6] D. Rossini, G. Benenti, and G. Casati, Phys. Rev. E 74, 036209 (2006).
- [7] T. P. Spiller and J. F. Ralph, Phys. Lett. A 194, 235 (1994).
- [8] T. A. Brun, N. Gisin, P. F. O'M ahony, and M. Rigo, Phys.Lett.A 229, 267 (1997).
- [9] T.Brun, I.Percival, and R.Schack, J.Phys. A 29, 2077 (1996).
- [10] W .H.Zurek, Rev.M od.Phys.75, 715 (2003).
- [11] R.Schack, T.Brun, and I.Percival, J.Phys. A 28, 5401 (1995).
- [12] H. Cam ichael, An Open Systems Approach to Quantum Optics, vol. 18 of Lecture Notes in Physics (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993).
- [13] N.G isin and I.C.Percival, J.Phys. A-M ath.Gen. 26, 2233 (1993).
- [14] N.G isin and I.C.Percival, J.Phys. A-M ath.Gen.26, 2245 (1993).
- [15] G.C.Hegerfeldt, Phys.Rev.A 47, 449 (1993).

- [16] H.M.W isem an, Quantum Sem iclass. Opt. 8, 205 (1996).
- [17] M.B.Plenio and P.L.Knight, Rev.M od.Phys.70, 101 (1998).
- [18] I. Percival, Quantum State Di usion (Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- [19] T. Bhattacharya, S. Habib, and K. Jacobs, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 4852 (2000).
- [20] T.Bhattacharya, S.Habib, and K.Jacobs, Phys. Rev. A 67, 042103 (2003).
- [21] A.J.Scott and G.J.M ilbum, Phys. Rev. A 63, 042101 (2001).
- [22] S. Ghose, P. Alsing, I. Deutsch, T. Bhattacharya, and S. Habib, Phys. Rev. A 69, 052116 (2004).
- [23] F. Christiansen and H. Rugh, Nonlinearity 10, 1063 (1997).
- [24] D. Steck (2002), lecture N otes for 2002 Los A lam os Sum m er School.
- [25] W .Zurek and J.Paz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 2508 (1994).
- [26] M. Scully and M. Zubairy, Quantum Optics (John W iley & Sons, Inc., Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- [27] C. Gerry and P. Knight, Introductory quantum optics (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2005).
- [28] M. Everitt, T. Clark, P. Sti ell, J. Ralph, and A. Bulsara, N. J. Phys 7 (2005).
- [29] M. Everitt, T. Clark, P. Sti ell, J. Ralph, A. Bulsara, and C. Harland, Phys. Rev. E 7, 066209 (2005).
- [30] W enote that although the helium atom is also a standard example of a three body system, due to the very large m ass of the nucleus, this particular example simpli es to the restricted three body problem