

# The effect of quantum memory on quantum speed limit time

K.G. Paulson<sup>a,\*</sup> Subhashish Banerjee<sup>b,†</sup> and R. Srikanth<sup>c,‡</sup>

*Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar-751005, India<sup>a</sup>*

*Indian Institute of Technology Jodhpur, Jodhpur-342011, India<sup>c</sup>*

*Poornaprajna Institute of Scientific Research, Sadashivnagar, Bengaluru-560080, India<sup>d</sup>*

(Dated: January 13, 2022)

Quantum speed limit time defines the limit on the minimum time required for a quantum system to evolve between two states. Investigation of bounds on speed limit time of quantum system under non-unitary evolution is of fundamental interest, as it reveals interesting connections to quantum (non-)Markovianity. Here, we discuss the characteristics of quantum speed limit time as a function of quantum memory, quantified as the deviation from temporal self-similarity of quantum dynamical maps for CP-divisible as well as indivisible maps. This provides an operational meaning to CP-divisible (non-)Markovianity.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The dynamical characteristics of open quantum systems (OQS), a quantum system coupled to its environment, have received wide attention [1, 2]. The coupling of a quantum system to its environment gives rise to realistically unavoidable processes, such as dissipation and decoherence. Memory effects lead to the evolution of the system of interest being classified as (non-)Markovian. Due to theoretical as well as technological advances, the study of non-Markovian phenomena has attracted much attention in recent times [3–10]. Typically, in a non-Markovian evolution, the system and environment time scales are not well separated, which could lead to information backflow from the environment to the system [11–14]. It is known that a quantum system coupled to a non-Markovian environment can evolve faster than the corresponding case of Markovian environment. This has been experimentally verified in a cavity QED system [15]. Since a study of quantum speed limit is helpful in obtaining physical insight into the dynamical properties of quantum systems, it would be worthwhile to make a detailed understanding of the quantum speed limit with memory.

Heisenberg's energy-time uncertainty principle sets the bound on the minimum time required to evolve between two quantum states. Mandelstam and Tamm (MT) [16] provided an interpretation of energy-time uncertainty with the time scale of the quantum state's evolution. Later, Margolus and Levitin (ML) [17] derived an alternate bound for the minimal time evolution of a quantum system between two orthogonal states. The combined bound of  $\tau_{QSL}$  quantum speed limit time, which is tight [18] for a closed quantum system, is  $\max\left\{\frac{\pi\hbar}{2\Delta H}, \frac{\pi\hbar}{2\langle H \rangle}\right\}$ . Here,  $\Delta H$  and  $\langle H \rangle$  are the square roots of the variance, and the expectation

value of the Hamiltonian, respectively. The bound on speed limit time was further refined for initial mixed and driven systems for arbitrary angles of separation [19, 20]. In [21, 22] MT and ML bounds were generalized to arbitrary initial and final mixed states based on geometrical distance between them for time independent Hamiltonian, and is  $\max\left\{\frac{\hbar}{\Delta H}\mathcal{B}(\rho_0, \rho_\tau), \frac{2\hbar}{\pi\langle H \rangle}\mathcal{B}(\rho_0, \rho_\tau)^2\right\}$ , where  $\mathcal{B}(\rho_0, \rho_\tau)$  is the Bures angle between the initial and final states.

In reality, quantum systems are not isolated; interactions of the system with the environment reveal interesting properties of the system's evolution. Different approaches to estimate the bound on the speed of evolution of open quantum systems have been discussed in the literature. Quantum speed limit for open quantum systems in terms of quantum Fisher information and relative purity was derived in [23], and [24], respectively. In [25], geometric generalization of both the Mandelstam–Tamm and the Margolus–Levitin bounds was derived. In [26, 27] tighter bounds on speed limit time for mixed initial states were defined. In the present work, we consider the above-described approaches to bounds on the speed limit for open quantum systems in the context of quantum non-Markovianity.

Different measures are made use of to quantify the impact and the memory effects of non-Markovian quantum systems. Quantum speed limit time is one among them. Quantum speed limit as a measure of non-Markovianity, and its connection with the hierarchy of quantum correlations of composite quantum system [28, 29] are discussed in [30, 31]. Even though quantum speed limit time seems to identify the information backflow due to the non-Markovianity, in [30] it is shown that there exists no simple connection between non-Markovianity and speed limit time. This raises the question of whether there is a quantum concept of memory that is better indicated by the quantum speed limit. In this context, here we consider the quantification of memory as a deviation from 'temporal self-similarity' [32], which roughly refers to the idea of the form of the intermediate

\* paulsonkgeorg@gmail.com

† subhashish@iitj.ac.in

‡ srik@poornaprajna.org

map being independent of the initial time. It is known to be equivalent to the dynamical semigroup, and thus provides a concept of non-Markovianity weaker than non-divisibility and information backflow.

In this work, we consider the effect of non-Markovianity of single-qubit channels on the evolution of quantum states. We use both unital and non-unital maps and show that quantum speed limit time is inversely proportional to the measure of quantum memory. The quantum speed limit calculations based on relative purity, quantum Fisher information, and geometrical distance are made, and the dependence on quantum memory is established.

The present work is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we discuss the quantification of non-Markovianity as a deviation from the temporal self-similarity and quantum speed limit time based on relative purity. Sec. III discusses the effect of quantum non-Markovianity on speed limit time, and the cases of both dissipative and dephasing channels are considered. Quantum speed limit as a function of quantum Fisher information is estimated, and its behavior is discussed. A tighter bound on quantum speed limit time based on Bures angle is defined, and the effect of memory on it is given in Sec. IV. In Sec. V, we consider the speed limit time for mixed initial states, followed by the concluding remarks in Sec. VI.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

Here we briefly discuss the time-local master equation which would be used to generate the non-Markovian channels. We also lay down the recently developed measure of non-Markovianity based on temporal self-similarity.

### A. Time Local Master Equation

The master equation local in time for a  $d$ -dimensional quantum system can be canonically written in the form,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\rho} = \mathcal{L}(\rho_t) = & \frac{-i}{\hbar} [H(t), \rho_t] \\ & + \sum_{\mu=1}^{d^2-1} \gamma_{\mu}(t) \left[ L_{\mu}(t) \rho_t L_{\mu}^{\dagger}(t) - \frac{1}{2} \{ L_{\mu}^{\dagger}(t) L_{\mu}(t), \rho_t \} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where  $\{L_{\mu}(t)\}$  forms an orthonormal basis set of traceless operators, i.e.,  $Tr[L_{\mu}(t)] = 0$ ,  $Tr[L_m^{\dagger}(t)L_n(t)] = \delta_{mn}$ , and  $H(t)$  is a Hermitian operator. Also,  $\gamma_{\mu}(t)$  and  $L_{\mu}(t)$  are the time dependant decoherence rates and decoherence operators, respectively. The decoherence rate  $\gamma_{\mu}$  is uniquely defined and invariant under unitary transformations. The value of  $\gamma_{\mu}(t)$  determines the nature of

the interaction of a system with its environment. If the decoherence rate is positive, the quantum channel is divisible. On the other hand, if  $\gamma_{\mu}(t)$  is negative, then the evolution would be CP-indivisible.

The memoryless master equation of Linblad form under Born-Markov and rotation wave approximations is,

$$\dot{\rho} = \frac{-i}{\hbar} [H, \rho] + \sum_{\mu=1}^{d^2-1} \gamma_{\mu} \left[ L_{\mu} \rho L_{\mu}^{\dagger} - \frac{1}{2} \{ L_{\mu}^{\dagger} L_{\mu}, \rho \} \right].$$

### B. Measure of non-Markovianity

In [32] a measure of non-Markovianity as a deviation from temporal self-similarity was defined as,

$$\zeta = \min_{\mathcal{L}^*} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \|\mathcal{L}(t) - \mathcal{L}^*\| dt, \quad (2)$$

where,  $\|A\| = Tr\sqrt{AA^{\dagger}}$  is the trace norm of the operator,  $\mathcal{L}(t)$  and  $\mathcal{L}^*$  are the generators at non-Markovian and Markovian evolutions, respectively.  $\zeta = 0$  iff the channel is a quantum dynamical semigroup (QDS) and is greater than zero for a deviation from QDS.

### C. Quantum Speed Limit

Quantum speed limit time defines a bound on the minimum time required for a quantum system to evolve between two states. This is estimated in the case of open quantum system using different distance measures for quantum states. Thus, for example, there is the bound analogous to the MT bound based on the relative purity [24] for open quantum systems. Another MT type bound, in which speed limit is derived in terms of variance of the generator, was obtained as a function of quantum Fisher information for non-unitary evolution [23]. MT and ML type bounds on speed limit time based on a geometrical distance between the initial and final states, which is a tighter bound, was developed in [22]. We study quantum speed limit time as a function of memory for pure as well as mixed initial states.

## III. IMPACT OF QUANTUM MEMORY ON QUANTUM SPEED LIMIT TIME

Here we examine the effect of memory on the speed of quantum evolution for various quantum processes. Dephasing [33] and dissipative processes are taken into consideration. We consider divisible and indivisible non-Markovian quantum maps [34], and connections between memory and quantum speed limit time are established. To this end, initially, the case of the CP divisible model is considered. We begin with the MT bound based on relative purity. A bound analogous to the MT bound

based on the relative purity [24] for open quantum system in which reference is made to the initial state and the dynamical map is,

$$\tau_{QSL} \geq \frac{|\cos\theta - 1| \text{tr}\rho_0^2}{\text{tr}[(\mathcal{L}^\dagger \rho_0)^2]} \geq \frac{4\theta^2 \text{tr}\rho_0^2}{\pi^2 \sqrt{\text{tr}[(\mathcal{L}^\dagger \rho_0)^2]}}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\theta = \cos^{-1}[\mathcal{P}(t)]$  with  $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$ ,  $\mathcal{P}(t) = \text{tr}(\rho_t \rho_0) / \text{tr}(\rho_0^2)$  is the relative purity of initial and final states. Here,  $v = \sqrt{\text{tr}[(\mathcal{L}^\dagger \rho_0)^2]}$  gives an upper bound to the speed of the evolution. The generalization of time-dependent  $\mathcal{L}(t)$  is

$$\tau_{QSL} \geq \frac{4\theta^2 \text{tr}\rho_0^2}{\pi^2 \sqrt{\text{tr}[(\mathcal{L}^\dagger \rho_0)^2]}}. \quad (4)$$

Here  $\bar{X} = \tau_{QSL}^{-1} \int_0^{\tau_{QSL}} X dt$ .

Interestingly, in some recent works [35, 36], a thermodynamic interpretation was provided for the terms which arise in the QSL equation in a scenario where quantum systems are governed by time-local master equations.

### A. Dephasing quantum channels

The dynamics of a quantum system under a dephasing process is given by,

$$\dot{\rho}_t = \gamma(t)(\sigma_z \rho_t \sigma_z - \rho_t). \quad (5)$$

The initial state

$$\rho_0 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 - r_z & r_x - ir_y \\ r_x + ir_y & 1 + r_z \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

where  $r = (r_x, r_y, r_z)$ ,  $r \in \mathcal{R}^3$ , and  $\|r\| \leq 1$  evolves to

$$\rho_t = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 - r_z & (r_x - ir_y)p_t \\ (r_x + ir_y)p_t & 1 + r_z \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

where  $p_t = e^{-\Lambda t}$ ,  $\Lambda_t = \int_0^t \gamma(t) dt$ , decoherence rate  $\gamma(t) = -\frac{\dot{p}_t}{p_t}$ , and  $p_t$  is the decoherence function. In order to make use of the measure of non-Markovianity  $\zeta$  (eq. 2), we note that for the dephasing process, Eq. (5),  $\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{L}^* = (\gamma^* - \gamma)(|\phi^+\rangle\langle\phi^+| - |\phi^-\rangle\langle\phi^-|)$ , with  $|\phi^\pm\rangle$  being the Bell diagonal states.

Quantum speed limit in this case is,

$$\tau_{QSL} = \frac{4\sqrt{2} \cos^{-1}(\mathcal{P})^2 \text{tr}\rho_0^2}{\pi^2 / \tau \int_0^\tau \left| \frac{\dot{p}_t}{p_t} \sqrt{r_x^2 + r_y^2} \right| dt}. \quad (8)$$

Here  $\mathcal{P}(t) = (1 + p_t(r_x^2 + r_y^2) + r_z^2) / (1 + r_x^2 + r_y^2 + r_z^2)$  is the relative purity and we have  $2\text{tr}\rho_0^2 = 1 + r_x^2 + r_y^2 + r_z^2$ . Non-Markovianity and speed limit are calculated for different decoherence functions corresponding to CP-divisible and indivisible quantum channels. Their details are given below.

#### 1. CP-divisible phase damping channel; Ornstein-Uhlenbeck noise (OUN)

OUN noisy channel even though Markovian from the perspective of the CP-divisibility criteria, is non-Markovian [32, 37]. The decoherence function of OUN is [38],

$$p_t = e^{-\frac{\mu}{2}\{t + \frac{1}{\Gamma}(e^{-\Gamma t} - 1)\}}, \quad (9)$$

while the decoherence rate is,

$$\gamma(t) = \frac{\mu(1 - e^{-\Gamma t})}{4}. \quad (10)$$

This channel is not CP-indivisible,  $\gamma(t)$  is positive for all values of  $t$ . Nevertheless, it is non-Markovian, according to the measure eq. 2, by virtue of its deviation from the QDS. The Markovian regime is achieved in the limit  $\frac{1}{\Gamma} \rightarrow \infty$ , with the corresponding decoherence function being  $p^*(t) = e^{-\mu t/2}$ . The quantum speed limit time, as a function of non-Markovianity, is calculated for the initial state  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$ , and is depicted in Fig. 1.

#### 2. P-indivisible phase damping; Random Telegraph noise (RTN)

RTN channel [39], is non-Markovian according to the information backflow and CP-divisibility criteria. The decoherence function in this case [38] has the form  $p_t =$

$$e^{-\mu t} \left[ \cos \left( \sqrt{[(\frac{2a}{\mu})^2 - 1] \mu t} \right) + \frac{\sin \left( \sqrt{[(\frac{2a}{\mu})^2 - 1] \mu t} \right)}{\sqrt{(\frac{2a}{\mu})^2 - 1}} \right].$$

The parameters  $a$  and  $\mu$  correspond to the strength of the system-environment coupling and the fluctuation rate of the RTN, respectively. There are two regimes of the system dynamics. For  $\frac{a}{\mu} < 0.5$ , the channel corresponds to the purely damping regime of Markovian dynamics, and damped oscillations for  $\frac{a}{\mu} > 0.5$  correspond to the non-Markovian evolution. Figure 1 depicts that quantum speed limit time decreases as memory increases, indicated by increase in the value of  $\zeta$ , for an initial pure state, as indicated in the figure caption.

### B. Amplitude damping channel

After the two unital channels discussed above, we now consider a non-unital channel comprising of the Jaynes-Cummings model for a two-level system resonantly coupled to a leaky single-mode cavity. The non-unitary generator of the reduced dynamics of the system is

$$\dot{\rho} = \gamma_i \left( \sigma_- \rho_t \sigma_+ - \frac{1}{2} \sigma_+ \sigma_- \rho_t - \frac{1}{2} \rho_t \sigma_+ \sigma_- \right), \quad (11)$$




FIG. 1. Quantum speed limit time  $\tau_{QSL}$  is plotted as a function of measure of non-Markovianity  $\zeta$  for the case OUN, RTN and NMAD channels. Quantum speed limit time  $\tau_{QSL}$  is estimated for the initial states  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|0\rangle + |1\rangle]$  for OUN and RTN channels, respectively and  $|1\rangle\langle 1|$  for NMAD. The channel parameter  $\Gamma = 0.1\gamma$  (NMAD, OUN),  $\frac{\alpha}{\gamma} = 0.6$  (RTN), and actual driving time  $\tau = 1$ .

where  $\sigma_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_x \mp i\sigma_y)$ .

For the initial state, Eq. 6, the time evolved reduced density matrix becomes,

$$\rho_t = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 2 - (1+r_z)|p_t|^2 & (r_x - ir_y)p_t \\ (r_x + ir_y)p_t & (1+r_z)|p_t|^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

where  $p_t = e^{-\Lambda_t/2}$ ,  $\Lambda_t = \int_0^t \gamma(t)dt$ . Also,  $\gamma(t) = -\frac{2\dot{p}_t}{p_t}$ , and  $p_t = e^{-\Gamma t/2}(\sinh(dt/2)d \cosh(dt/2) + \Gamma \sinh(dt/2))$  with the time dependent decoherence rate,

$$\gamma(t) = \frac{2\mu\Gamma \sinh(dt/2)}{d \cosh(dt/2) + \Gamma \sinh(dt/2)}. \quad (13)$$

Here  $d = \sqrt{\Gamma^2 - 2\mu\Gamma}$ ,  $\Gamma$  is the spectral width of the reservoir, and  $\mu$  is the coupling strength between the qubit and the cavity field.

The measure of non-markovianity  $\zeta = \min_{\gamma^*} \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau |\gamma(t) - \gamma^*|(1 + \sqrt{2})dt$ . For this scenario, the quantum speed limit is calculated as,

$$\tau_{QSL} = \frac{4\sqrt{2} \cos^{-1}(\mathcal{P})^2 \text{tr} \rho_0^2}{\pi^2/\tau \int_0^\tau \left| \frac{\dot{p}_t}{p_t} \sqrt{r_x^2 + r_y^2 + 4(1+r_z^2)} \right| dt}. \quad (14)$$

The relative purity is  $\mathcal{P}(t) = (1 - r_z + p_t(r_x^2 + r_y^2 + p_t r_z(1 + r_z)))/(1 + r_x^2 + r_y^2 + r_z^2)$ . The behavior of quantum speed limit with memory, for the present case, is depicted in fig. 1.

#### IV. QUANTUM FISHER INFORMATION AND SPEED LIMIT

A MT type bound, in which speed limit is derived in terms of variance of the generator, was obtained




FIG. 2. Quantum speed limit  $V_{QSL}$  is plotted as a function of the measure of non-Markovianity  $\zeta$  for OUN, RTN and NMAD channels. Quantum speed limit  $V_{QSL}$  is estimated for the initial states  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|0\rangle + |1\rangle]$  for OUN and RTN channels, and  $|1\rangle\langle 1|$  for NMAD. The channel parameters are  $\Gamma = 0.1\gamma$  (NMAD, OUN), and  $\frac{\alpha}{\gamma} = 0.6$  (RTN).

as a function of quantum Fisher information for non-unitary evolution [23]. The Bures angle  $\mathcal{B}(\rho_0, \rho_\tau) = \arccos \sqrt{\mathcal{F}(\rho_0, \rho_\tau)}$ , where the Bures fidelity  $\mathcal{F}(\rho_0, \rho_\tau)$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho_0, \rho_\tau) = \left[ \text{tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\rho_0} \rho_\tau \sqrt{\rho_0}} \right] \right]^2. \quad (15)$$

A bound on  $\mathcal{B}(\rho_0, \rho_\tau)$  can be obtained in terms of the integral of the quantum Fisher information  $F_Q(t)$  along the evolution path. The Bures fidelity  $\mathcal{F}$  is connected to the quantum Fisher information  $F_Q(t)$  [23],

$$\mathcal{F}(t, t + dt) = 1 - (dt)^2 F_Q(t)/4 + \mathcal{O}(dt)^3. \quad (16)$$

Quantum Fisher information is defined by  $F_Q(t) = \text{Tr}[\rho(t)L^2(t)]$ . Here, the Hermitian operator  $\hat{L}(t)$  is known as the symmetric logarithmic derivative (SLD) operator. It is defined as  $d\hat{\rho}(t)/dt = (\hat{\rho}(t)\hat{L}(t) + \hat{L}(t)\hat{\rho}(t))/2$ . The instantaneous speed of evolution between two time intervals is proportional to the square root of quantum Fisher information. The upper bound on Bures angle is,

$$\mathcal{B}(\rho_0, \rho_\tau) = \arccos(\sqrt{\mathcal{F}(\rho_0, \rho_\tau)}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\tau \sqrt{F_Q(t)} dt, \quad (17)$$

and the quantum speed limit can be identified as,

$$V_{QSL} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{F_Q(t)}. \quad (18)$$

This bound is attained only if the evolution occurs on a geodesic, a condition for the MT bound for unitary evolution under a time-independent Hamiltonian.

We estimate the quantum speed limit  $V_{QSL}$  in terms of quantum Fisher information for CP-divisible and CP-indivisible maps, for various initial pure states;  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$  for OUN and RTN channels, and  $|1\rangle\langle 1|$  for the non-markovian amplitude damping channel. In fig. 2, the quantum speed limit is seen to increase as non-Markovianity increases for both CP-divisible and indivisible channels. Thus, the evolution of quantum states is seen to increase with the strength of non-Markovianity.

## V. BURES ANGLE AND SPEED LIMIT TIME

Here we use the MT and ML-type bounds on speed limit time based on geometrical distance between the initial and final states. This is a tighter bound [22],

$$\tau_{QSL} = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\Lambda_{\tau}^{op}}, \frac{1}{\Lambda_{\tau}^{tr}}, \frac{1}{\Lambda_{\tau}^{hs}} \right\} \sin^2[\mathcal{B}], \quad (19)$$

where  $\frac{1}{\Lambda_{\tau}^{op}}$ ,  $\frac{1}{\Lambda_{\tau}^{tr}}$ , and  $\frac{1}{\Lambda_{\tau}^{hs}}$  are operator, Hilbert-Schmidt and trace norms, respectively, and

$$\Lambda_{\tau}^{op, tr, hs} = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^{\tau} \|\mathcal{L}(\rho_t)\|_{op, tr, hs}. \quad (20)$$

It is known that the operators satisfy the following inequality  $\|A\|_{op} \leq \|A\|_{hs} \leq \|A\|_{tr}$ . As a result,  $1/\Lambda_{\tau}^{op} \geq 1/\Lambda_{\tau}^{hs} \geq 1/\Lambda_{\tau}^{tr}$ , which shows that quantum speed limit time based on operator norm of the nonunitary generator provides the tighter bound on  $\tau_{QSL}$ . We now discuss the case for amplitude damping channels for the states in Eqn. (6) and (12).

$$\tau_{QSL} = \frac{1 + r_z - p_t(r_x^2 + r_y^2 + p_t r_z(1 + r_z)) - h_1 h_{2t}}{\frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^{\tau} |\dot{p}_t \sqrt{r_x^2 + r_y^2 + 4p_t^2(1 + r_z)^2}| dt}, \quad (21)$$

where we have  $h_1 = \sqrt{1 - (r_x^2 + r_y^2 + r_z^2)}$ , and  $h_{2t} = \sqrt{p_t^2(2 - r_x^2 - r_y^2 + 2r_z - p_t^2(1 + r_z)^2)}$ . For pure states  $\sum r_i^2 = 1$ . Figure 3 depicts  $\tau_{QSL}$  as a function of memory for initial excited state  $(0, 1)^T$  in a dissipative process. It is evident that speed limit time decreases as memory increases.

## VI. SPEED LIMIT TIME FOR MIXED INITIAL STATES

We finally discuss the case for mixed initial states. MT type bound based on relative purity (Eq. 4) for initial mixed states, is shown in fig. 4. As seen for pure initial states (fig. 1), quantum speed limit time decreases as memory increases for mixed initial states as well. The speed limit bounds which have been discussed are not tighter with mixed initial states. In [40] a combined bound on the quantum speed limit time was obtained for




FIG. 3. Quantum speed limit time  $\tau_{QSL}$  is plotted as a function of the measure of non-Markovianity  $\zeta$  for the NMAD channel.  $\tau_{QSL}$  is estimated for the initial state  $|1\rangle\langle 1|$ . The channel parameters are  $\Gamma = 0.1\gamma$  and actual driving time  $\tau = 2\pi$ .




FIG. 4. Quantum speed limit time  $\tau_{QSL}$  is plotted as a function of  $\zeta$  for OUN, RTN, and NMAD channels, for mixed initial states,  $r_x = \frac{1}{2}, r_y = r_z = 0$  (OUN and RTN) and  $r_x = r_y = 0, r_z = \frac{1}{2}$  (NMAD). The channel parameters are  $\Gamma = 0.1\gamma$  (NMAD, OUN),  $\frac{\alpha}{\gamma} = 0.6$  (RTN), and actual driving time  $\tau = 1$ .

mixed initial states by using a function of relative purity for unitary driven systems. Using the same function of relative purity, a tighter bound for initial mixed state for the open quantum system was subsequently derived in [26],

$$\tau_{QSL} = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\Lambda_{\tau}^{op}}, \frac{1}{\Lambda_{\tau}^{tr}}, \frac{1}{\Lambda_{\tau}^{hs}} \right\} \sin^2[\phi] \text{tr} \rho_0^2. \quad (22)$$

Here,  $\cos \phi$  is defined as the square root of relative purity ( $\cos \phi = \sqrt{\mathcal{P}(t)}$ ). Expression of quantum speed limit




FIG. 5. Quantum speed limit time  $\tau_{QSL}$ , Eq. (23), is plotted as a function of  $\zeta$  for the NMAD channel for mixed initial state ( $r_x = r_y = 0, r_z = \frac{1}{2}$ ). The channel parameters are  $\Gamma = 0.1\gamma$  and actual driving time  $\tau = 2\pi$ .

time for states Eq. (6) and (12) for NMAD channel can be shown to be,

$$\tau_{QSL} = \frac{(1 - p_t)[r_x^2 + r_y^2 + r_z(1 + p_t)(1 + r_z)]}{\frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau |\dot{p}_t \sqrt{r_x^2 + r_y^2 + 4p_t^2(1 + r_z)^2}| dt}. \quad (23)$$

Quantum speed limit time is calculated with the initial mixed state ( $r_z = \frac{1}{2}, r_x = r_y = 0$ ) for non-Markovian amplitude damping channel, and is depicted as a function

of  $\zeta$  in fig. 5. As we have noticed in the previous cases, here also speed limit time decreases as memory increases.

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

We investigated the speed of evolution of open quantum systems with pure and mixed initial states. We considered CP-divisible and indivisible non-Markovian quantum channels and showed the dependence of quantum speed limit as a function of quantum memory, quantified as the deviation from temporal self-similarity of quantum dynamical maps, which provides a weaker concept of non-Markovianity than CP-indivisibility. We estimated both Mandelstamm-Tamm (MT) and Margolous-Levitin (ML) types bound based on various distance measures between the quantum states. In the case of CP-divisible (OUN), CP-indivisible (RTN) dephasing, and dissipative (NM-AD) channels, quantum speed limit time decreases as non-Markovianity increases. These highlight the beneficial impact of memory on the dynamics of the system of interest, exemplified here by the quantum speed limit. Our results for the OUN channel provide an operational meaning to CP-divisible (non-)Markovianity.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

SB and RS acknowledge the support from the Interdisciplinary Cyber-Physical Systems (ICPS) programme of the Department of Science and Technology (DST), India, Grant No.: DST/ICPS/QuST/Theme-1/2019/6 and DST/ICPS/QuST/Theme-1/2019/14, respectively. RS also acknowledges the support of DST, India, Grant No. MTR/2019/001516.

- 
- [1] H.-P. Breuer, F. Petruccione, *et al.*, *The theory of open quantum systems* (Oxford University Press on Demand, 2002).
- [2] S. Banerjee, *Open Quantum Systems: Dynamics of Non-classical Evolution*, Vol. 20 (Springer, 2018).
- [3] N. P. Kumar, S. Banerjee, and C. Chandrashekar, *Scientific reports* **8**, 1 (2018).
- [4] G. Thomas, N. Siddharth, S. Banerjee, and S. Ghosh, *Physical Review E* **97**, 062108 (2018).
- [5] U. Shrikant, R. Srikanth, and S. Banerjee, *Physical Review A* **98**, 032328 (2018).
- [6] N. P. Kumar, S. Banerjee, R. Srikanth, V. Jagadish, and F. Petruccione, *Open Systems & Information Dynamics* **25**, 1850014 (2018).
- [7] S. Bhattacharya, S. Banerjee, and A. K. Pati, *Quantum Information Processing* **17**, 1 (2018).
- [8] J. Naikoo, S. Dutta, and S. Banerjee, *Physical Review A* **99**, 042128 (2019).
- [9] S. Utagi, R. Srikanth, and S. Banerjee, *Quantum Information Processing* **19**, 1 (2020).
- [10] J. Naikoo, S. Banerjee, and C. Chandrashekar, *Physical Review A* **102**, 062209 (2020).
- [11] A. Rivas, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **77**, 094001 (2014).
- [12] H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, J. Piilo, and B. Vacchini, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **88**, 021002 (2016).
- [13] J. de Vicente, C. Spee, D. Sauerwein, and B. Kraus, *Physical Review A* **95**, 012323 (2017).
- [14] L. Li, M. J. Hall, and H. M. Wiseman, *Physics Reports* **759**, 1 (2018).
- [15] A. Cimmarusti, Z. Yan, B. Patterson, L. Corcos, L. Orozco, and S. Deffner, *Physical review letters* **114**, 233602 (2015).
- [16] L. Mandelstam and I. Tamm, *J. Phys* **9**, 249 (1945).
- [17] N. Margolus and L. B. Levitin, *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* **120**, 188 (1998).
- [18] L. B. Levitin and T. Toffoli, *Physical review letters* **103**, 160502 (2009).
- [19] S. Deffner and S. Campbell, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **50**, 453001 (2017).
- [20] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, *Physical Review A* **67**, 052109 (2003).
- [21] A. Uhlmann, *Physics Letters A* **161**, 329 (1992).
- [22] S. Deffner and E. Lutz, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **46**, 335302 (2013).

- [23] M. M. Taddei, B. M. Escher, L. Davidovich, and R. L. de Matos Filho, *Physical review letters* **110**, 050402 (2013).
- [24] A. del Campo, I. L. Egusquiza, M. B. Plenio, and S. F. Huelga, *Physical review letters* **110**, 050403 (2013).
- [25] S. Deffner and E. Lutz, *Physical review letters* **111**, 010402 (2013).
- [26] S.-x. Wu and C.-s. Yu, *Physical Review A* **98**, 042132 (2018).
- [27] S.-x. Wu and C.-s. Yu, *Scientific reports* **10**, 1 (2020).
- [28] K. G. Paulson and S. V. M. Satyanarayana, *Quant. Inf. Compt.*, **14**, 1227 (2014).
- [29] K. G. Paulson and S. V. M. Satyanarayana, *Physics letters A* **381**, 1134 (2017).
- [30] J. Teittinen, H. Lyyra, and S. Maniscalco, *New Journal of Physics* **21**, 123041 (2019).
- [31] K. G. Paulson, E. Panwar, S. Banerjee, and R. Srikanth, *Quantum Information Processing* **20**, 1 (2021).
- [32] S. Utagi, R. Srikanth, and S. Banerjee, *Scientific Reports* **10**, 15049 (2020).
- [33] S. Banerjee and R. Ghosh, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **40**, 13735 (2007).
- [34] A. Ghosal, D. Das, and S. Banerjee, *Physical Review A* **103**, 052422 (2021).
- [35] K. Funo, N. Shiraishi, and K. Saito, *New Journal of Physics* **21**, 013006 (2019).
- [36] A. Das, A. Bera, S. Chakraborty, and D. Chruściński, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.15083* (2021).
- [37] T. Yu and J. Eberly, *Optics Communications* **283**, 676 (2010).
- [38] N. P. Kumar, S. Banerjee, R. Srikanth, V. Jagadish, and F. Petruccione, *Open Systems & Information Dynamics* **25**, 1850014 (2018).
- [39] L. Mazzola, J. Piilo, and S. Maniscalco, *International Journal of Quantum Information* **9**, 981 (2011).
- [40] F. Campaioli, F. A. Pollock, F. C. Binder, and K. Modi, *Physical review letters* **120**, 060409 (2018).