

## Damped harmonic oscillators in the holomorphic representation

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.

2000 J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 33 8139

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/0305-4470/33/45/310>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 171.66.16.123

The article was downloaded on 02/06/2010 at 08:35

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

## Damped harmonic oscillators in the holomorphic representation

F Benatti<sup>†‡</sup> and R Floreanini<sup>‡</sup>

<sup>†</sup> Dipartimento di Fisica Teorica, Università di Trieste, Strada Costiera 11, 34014 Trieste, Italy

<sup>‡</sup> Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Trieste, Dipartimento di Fisica Teorica, Università di Trieste, Strada Costiera 11, 34014 Trieste, Italy

Received 8 August 2000

**Abstract.** Quantum dynamical semigroups are applied to the study of the time evolution of harmonic oscillators, both bosonic and fermionic. Explicit expressions for the density matrices describing the states of these systems are derived using the holomorphic representation. Bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom are then put together to form a supersymmetric oscillator; the conditions that ensure supersymmetry invariance of the corresponding dynamical equations are derived explicitly.

### 1. Introduction

The dynamics of a small system  $\mathcal{S}$  interacting with a large environment  $\mathcal{E}$  is, in general, very complex and cannot be described in terms of evolution equations that are local in time. Possible initial correlations and the continuous exchange of energy as well as entropy between  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  produce irreversibility and dissipation phenomena.

Nevertheless, there are instances for which a simple and mathematically precise description of the subdynamics can actually be given. When the typical time scale in the evolution of the subsystem  $\mathcal{S}$  is much larger than the characteristic time correlations in the environment, one expects (and actually proves) the disappearance of memory and nonlinear phenomena, although quantum coherence is usually lost [1–5].

In such cases, the states of  $\mathcal{S}$ , conveniently described by a density matrix  $\rho$ , are seen to evolve in time by means of a family of linear maps that obey very basic physical requirements, such as forward in time composition (semigroup property) and complete positivity. They form a so-called quantum dynamical semigroup [1–3].

This description of the time evolution of open quantum systems is actually very general; it is applicable to all physical situations for which the interaction between  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  can be considered to be weak and for times for which nonlinear disturbances due to possible initial correlations have disappeared. In particular, quantum dynamical semigroups have been used to model laser dynamics in quantum optics [6–8], to study the evolution of various statistical systems [1–3] and to analyse the interaction of a microsystem with a macroscopic apparatus [9–11].

Recently, they have been used to describe effects leading to irreversibility and dissipation in elementary particle physics phenomena. Non-standard low-energy effects accompanied by loss of quantum coherence are, in fact, expected to appear as a consequence of gravitational quantum fluctuations at the Planck scale [12]. A detailed analysis of these effects has been

performed for the system of neutral mesons [13–16], in neutron interferometry [17], neutrino oscillations [18] and in the propagation of polarized photons [19, 20]; the outcome of these investigations is that present and future elementary particle experiments will probably put stringent bounds on these non-standard dissipative phenomena.

These studies, in particular those dealing with correlated neutral mesons [14, 21], have also further clarified the importance of the condition of complete positivity in the description of open quantum systems. In many investigations complete positivity is often replaced by the milder condition of simple positivity; this guarantees the positivity of the eigenvalues of the density matrix of the subsystem  $\mathcal{S}$ , but not that of a more general system obtained by trivially coupling  $\mathcal{S}$  with an arbitrary  $n$ -level system. Lack of imposing this more stringent requirement could lead to unacceptable physical consequences, such as the appearance of negative probabilities [21].

To further analyse the properties of the quantum dynamical semigroup description of open systems, we shall apply this general framework to the analysis of the evolution of one-dimensional oscillators, both bosonic and fermionic (for earlier investigations on the bosonic case, see [22–25] and references therein). We shall adopt the holomorphic representation [26, 27, 23] since it allows an explicit description of the relevant density matrices in terms of complex and Grassmannian (anticommuting) variables; in the simplest situations, the general form of these density matrices turns out to be Gaussian. This allows the explicit evaluation of the corresponding (von Neumann) entropy and analysis of its time evolution. Finally, we shall combine bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom to form a supersymmetric oscillator. We shall then derive the conditions that guarantee the supersymmetric invariance of the dynamical equations and discuss how these affect the time evolution of the total density matrix.

## 2. The bosonic oscillator

As explained in the introductory remarks, we shall study the dynamics of a single oscillator interacting with a large environment. The states of the system will be represented by a density matrix  $\rho_B$ , i.e. by a positive Hermitian operator, with constant trace, acting on the bosonic Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_B$ . Our analysis is based on the assumption that its time evolution is given by a quantum dynamical semigroup; this is a completely positive, trace-preserving, one-parameter (i.e. time) family of linear maps, acting on the set  $\{\rho\}$  of bosonic density matrices. These maps are generated by equations of the following general form [1–3]:

$$\frac{\partial \rho(t)}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}[\rho(t)] \equiv -i[H, \rho(t)] + L[\rho(t)]. \quad (2.1)$$

The first term in  $\mathcal{L}$  is the standard quantum mechanical one, which contains the system Hamiltonian  $H$ , driving the time evolution in the absence of an environment. In the case of the bosonic oscillator, it can be taken to have the most general quadratic form in the bosonic creation  $a^\dagger$  and annihilation  $a$  operators:

$$H_B = \frac{1}{2}[\omega_B(a^\dagger a + a a^\dagger) + \mu a^2 + \mu^* a^{\dagger 2}] \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\omega_B \geq 0$  and  $\mu$  is a complex parameter (the star denotes complex conjugation). The second part  $L[\rho]$  takes into account the interaction with the environment; it is a linear map, whose form is fully determined by the requirement of complete positivity and trace conservation:

$$L[\rho] = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_k (L_k^\dagger L_k \rho + \rho L_k^\dagger L_k) + \sum_k L_k \rho L_k^\dagger. \quad (2.3)$$

The operators  $L_k$  should be chosen such that the expression in (2.3) is well defined. In the absence of the term  $L[\rho]$ , pure states would be transformed into pure states. Instead, in general, the additional part (2.3) produces dissipation and loss of quantum coherence.

The choice of the operators  $L_k$  is largely arbitrary. However, since the Hamiltonian  $H_B$  is quadratic in  $a^\dagger$  and  $a$ , one is led to also assume the same property for the additional term  $L[\rho]$ . This implies a linear expression for the operators  $L_k$ :

$$L_k = r_k a + s_k a^\dagger \tag{2.4}$$

with  $r_k$  and  $s_k$  complex parameters; this requirement further guarantees the exact solvability of the equation in (2.1). Note that the operators (2.4) are not bounded; nevertheless, by adapting the arguments presented in [22] to the present case, one can show that the exponential map generated by (2.1) is well defined.

This description of the damped bosonic oscillator can be further simplified by means of a suitable canonical transformation. First, note that not all values of the oscillator frequency  $\omega_B$  and the complex parameter  $\mu$  are physically allowed. Indeed, the spectrum of the Hamiltonian in (2.2) is bounded from below only for

$$\omega_B^2 - |\mu|^2 \geq 0. \tag{2.5}$$

This is a consequence of the fact that  $H$  is an element of the Lie algebra  $su(1, 1)$ , whose generators in the so-called metaplectic representation take the form

$$K_0 = \frac{1}{4}(a^\dagger a + a a^\dagger) \quad (K_+)^{\dagger} = K_- = \frac{1}{2}a^2. \tag{2.6}$$

The condition (2.5) guarantees that  $H$  can be unitarily ‘rotated’ to an element of the Cartan algebra with the spectrum being bounded from below [23].

In other terms, by means of a unitary canonical transformation, one can now pass to new operators [26, 28]:

$$\tilde{a} = \Phi a + \Psi a^\dagger \quad \tilde{a}^\dagger = \Psi^* a + \Phi^* a^\dagger \tag{2.7}$$

with

$$\Phi = \sqrt{\frac{\omega_B + \Omega_B}{2\Omega_B}} \quad \Psi = \frac{\mu^*}{\sqrt{2\Omega_B(\omega_B + \Omega_B)}} \quad \Omega_B = \sqrt{\omega_B^2 - |\mu|^2} \tag{2.8}$$

such that the Hamiltonian takes the simplified form

$$H_B = \frac{1}{2}\Omega_B\{\tilde{a}^\dagger, \tilde{a}\}. \tag{2.9}$$

The operators  $L_k$  in (2.3) are still linear in the new variables  $\tilde{a}^\dagger$  and  $\tilde{a}$ , although with redefined coefficients.

This discussion shows explicitly that, without loss of generality, one can set  $\mu = 0$  in (2.2); a non-vanishing  $\mu$  can always be reinstated at the end by undoing the transformation (2.7). With this choice, the evolution equation (2.1) for the bosonic oscillator becomes

$$\frac{\partial \rho_B(t)}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}_B[\rho_B(t)] \equiv -i\omega_B[a^\dagger a, \rho_B(t)] + L_B[\rho_B(t)] \tag{2.10}$$

where, by inserting (2.4) into (2.3), one has

$$L_B[\rho] = \eta_B([a\rho, a^\dagger] + [a, \rho a^\dagger]) + \sigma_B([a^\dagger \rho, a] + [a^\dagger, \rho a]) - \lambda_B^*[a, [a, \rho]] - \lambda_B[a^\dagger, [a^\dagger, \rho]] \tag{2.11}$$

with

$$\eta_B = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k |r_k|^2 \quad \sigma_B = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k |s_k|^2 \quad \lambda_B = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k r_k^* s_k. \quad (2.12)$$

Note that from these expressions one deduces that

$$\eta_B \geq 0 \quad \sigma_B \geq 0 \quad |\lambda_B|^2 \leq \eta_B \sigma_B \quad (2.13)$$

the last relation being a consequence of the Schwartz inequality; let us remark that these are precisely the conditions that ensure complete positivity of the time evolution generated by the operator  $L_B$  in (2.11).

In order to study the solutions of equation (2.10), we shall work in the holomorphic representation [26–28, 23]; it allows one to derive explicit expressions for the density matrix  $\rho_B(t)$  so that its behaviour in various regimes can be more easily discussed. In this formulation, the elements  $|\psi\rangle$  of the bosonic Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_B$  are represented by holomorphic functions  $\psi(\bar{z})$  of the complex variable  $\bar{z}$ , with the inner product<sup>†</sup>

$$\langle \phi | \psi \rangle = \int \psi^*(z) \phi(\bar{z}) e^{-\bar{z}z} d\bar{z} dz. \quad (2.14)$$

To every operator  $\mathcal{O}$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}_B$  there corresponds a kernel  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{z}, z)$  of two independent complex variables  $\bar{z}$  and  $z$ , such that for the state  $|\phi\rangle = \mathcal{O}|\psi\rangle$  one finds the representation

$$\phi(\bar{z}) = \int \mathcal{O}(\bar{z}, w) \psi(\bar{w}) e^{-\bar{w}w} d\bar{w} dw. \quad (2.15)$$

In particular, the creation and annihilation operators, when acting on a state  $|\psi\rangle$ , are realized by multiplication and differentiation by the variable  $\bar{z}$ :

$$a^\dagger |\psi\rangle \rightarrow \bar{z} \psi(\bar{z}) \quad a |\psi\rangle \rightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} \psi(\bar{z}) \quad (2.16)$$

while the identity operator is represented by  $e^{\bar{z}z}$ .

Since the term  $\mathcal{L}_B$  in (2.10) is at most quadratic in  $a^\dagger$  and  $a$ , the kernel  $\rho_B(\bar{z}, z; t)$  representing the solution of (2.10) can be taken to be of a generic Gaussian form:

$$\rho_B(\bar{z}, z; t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N(t)}} \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2N(t)} [2y(t)\bar{z}z - \bar{x}(t)z^2 - x(t)\bar{z}^2] + \bar{z}z \right]. \quad (2.17)$$

Trace conservation for all times,

$$\text{Tr}[\rho_B(t)] = \int \rho_B(\bar{z}, z; t) e^{-\bar{z}z} d\bar{z} dz = 1 \quad (2.18)$$

readily implies:

$$N(t) = y^2(t) - |x(t)|^2 \quad (2.19)$$

while using (2.16) one finds that the unknown functions  $x(t)$ ,  $\bar{x}(t) = [x(t)]^*$  and  $y(t)$  have the following physical meaning:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle a^2 \rangle(t) &\equiv \text{Tr}[a^2 \rho_B(t)] = \int \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \bar{z}^2} [\rho_B(\bar{z}, z; t)] e^{-\bar{z}z} d\bar{z} dz = x(t) \\ \langle a^{\dagger 2} \rangle(t) &\equiv \text{Tr}[a^{\dagger 2} \rho_B(t)] = \int \bar{z}^2 \rho_B(\bar{z}, z; t) e^{-\bar{z}z} d\bar{z} dz = \bar{x}(t) \\ \langle aa^\dagger \rangle(t) &\equiv \text{Tr}[aa^\dagger \rho_B(t)] = \int \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} [\bar{z} \rho_B(\bar{z}, z; t)] e^{-\bar{z}z} d\bar{z} dz = y(t). \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

<sup>†</sup> Here and in the following we use the conventions of [26].

For simplicity, in writing (2.17) we have assumed  $\langle a^\dagger \rangle(t) = \langle a \rangle(t) = 0$  for all times. As shown in the appendix, this condition can be easily realized starting with a more general ansatz for  $\rho_B(\bar{z}, z; t)$ ; it will not be needed for the considerations that follow.

Inserting (2.17) in the evolution equation (2.10), with the help of the relations (2.16) one finds that the unknown functions  $x(t)$  and  $y(t)$  satisfy the following linear equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= -2(\eta_B - \sigma_B + i\omega_B)x(t) - 2\lambda_B \\ \dot{y}(t) &= -2(\eta_B - \sigma_B)y(t) + 2\eta_B. \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

General solutions can be easily obtained. For initial values  $x_0 \equiv x(0)$ ,  $y_0 \equiv y(0)$  and  $\eta_B \neq \sigma_B$ , one finds

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= E(t) e^{-2i\omega_B t} (x_0 - x_\infty) + x_\infty \\ y(t) &= E(t)(y_0 - y_\infty) + y_\infty \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

where

$$E(t) = e^{-2(\eta_B - \sigma_B)t} \quad x_\infty = \frac{\lambda_B(\sigma_B - \eta_B + i\omega_B)}{(\eta_B - \sigma_B)^2 + \omega_B^2} \quad y_\infty = \frac{\eta_B}{\eta_B - \sigma_B} \tag{2.23}$$

while in the particular case  $\eta_B = \sigma_B$ :

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= e^{-2i\omega_B t} (x_0 - x_c) + x_c \quad x_c = i \frac{\lambda_B}{\omega_B} \\ y(t) &= 2\eta_B t + y_0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

The large-time behaviour of these solutions depends on the relative magnitude of the two positive parameters  $\eta_B$  and  $\sigma_B$ . Only when  $\eta_B > \sigma_B$ , do the functions  $x(t)$  and  $y(t)$  have a well defined limit. In this case, independently from the initial conditions, the density matrix  $\rho_B(t)$  approaches the equilibrium state  $\rho_B^\infty$  for large  $t$ , which is obtained by substituting in (2.17) the asymptotic values  $x_\infty$  and  $y_\infty$  for  $x(t)$  and  $y(t)$ . Indeed,  $\rho_B^\infty$  is clearly a fixed point of the evolution equation (2.10), for any value of  $\eta_B$  and  $\sigma_B$ .

Note that  $\rho_B^\infty$  does not correspond, in general, to a thermal equilibrium state; to obtain an asymptotic Gibbs distribution, one has to set  $\lambda_B = 0$  and introduce the inverse temperature  $\beta$  via the condition  $y_\infty = [\coth(\beta\omega_B/2) + 1]/2$  (compare with (2.27) and (2.28) below), or equivalently  $e^{\beta\omega_B} = \eta_B/\sigma_B$ .

On the other hand, when  $\eta_B < \sigma_B$ , the exponential term  $E(t)$  in (2.22) blows up for large times, while in the special case  $\eta_B = \sigma_B$ ,  $y(t)$  grows linearly in time and  $x(t)$  has an oscillatory behaviour. In both cases, for generic initial conditions, the normalization factor  $N(t)$  in (2.19) grows unbounded, so that the functional  $\rho_B(\bar{z}, z; t)$  becomes vanishingly small, while retaining its normalization,  $\text{Tr}[\rho_B(t)] = 1^\dagger$ .

This peculiar behaviour can also be analysed with the help of the Weyl operators:

$$W[v] = e^{va + \bar{v}a^\dagger}. \tag{2.25}$$

By studying the time evolution of  $W$  induced by (2.10) via the relation  $\text{Tr}[W(t)\rho_B] \equiv \text{Tr}[W\rho_B(t)]$ , one finds that when  $\eta_B > \sigma_B$  all Weyl operators remain well defined for all  $t$ , approaching the identity for large times; on the other hand, for  $\eta_B \leq \sigma_B$  one discovers that all Weyl operators vanish in the large-time limit, except the identity  $W[0]$ , which is clearly a fixed point of the time evolution.

<sup>†</sup> For  $\eta_B < \sigma_B$ , the exception is given by  $\rho_B(t) \equiv \rho_B^\infty$ , since, as noted before,  $x_\infty$  and  $y_\infty$  are fixed points of (2.21). Note that  $y_\infty$  blows up for  $\eta_B = \sigma_B$ , so that  $\rho_B^\infty$  also becomes vanishingly small in this limit. Consequently, the infinite temperature limit is singular.

As mentioned in the introduction, the entropy of an open system usually varies with time, due to the interaction with the environment. In many physical instances, a monotonic increase of the von Neumann entropy,

$$S[\rho] \equiv -\text{Tr}[\rho \ln \rho] = -\langle \ln \rho \rangle \quad (2.26)$$

is a desirable property [1–3, 13–20]. For the damped oscillator described by the evolution equation (2.10), this request cannot be fulfilled, in general, if one insists on the existence of a well behaved large-time equilibrium limit.

The explicit evaluation of  $S_B \equiv S[\rho_B]$  is simplified by noticing that to the representation kernel (2.17) there corresponds the operator ansatz:

$$\rho_B = \left[ \frac{4}{\coth^2(\Omega/2) - 1} \right]^{1/2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}[A(aa^\dagger + a^\dagger a) + Ba^2 + \bar{B}a^{\dagger 2}]} \quad (2.27)$$

where the parameters  $A$  and  $B$  are related to  $x$  and  $y$  of (2.17) through the relations:

$$x = -\frac{B}{2\Omega} \coth \frac{\Omega}{2} \quad y = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{A}{\Omega} \coth \frac{\Omega}{2} + 1 \right] \quad \Omega = (A^2 - |B|^2)^{1/2}. \quad (2.28)$$

Inserting these relations in the definition (2.26), one obtains

$$S_B = -\frac{1}{2} \ln \left[ \frac{4}{\coth^2(\Omega/2) - 1} \right] + \frac{1}{2} [A \langle aa^\dagger + a^\dagger a \rangle + B \langle a^2 \rangle + \bar{B} \langle a^{\dagger 2} \rangle]. \quad (2.29)$$

It is now convenient to introduce the following quantity:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi^2 &\equiv \frac{1}{4} \langle aa^\dagger + a^\dagger a \rangle^2 - \langle a^2 \rangle \langle a^{\dagger 2} \rangle \\ &= (y - \frac{1}{2})^2 - |x|^2 = \frac{1}{4} \coth^2 \frac{\Omega}{2} \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

such that  $\chi \geq \frac{1}{2}$ ; in terms of this variable, one can easily rewrite (2.29) as

$$S_B = (\chi + \frac{1}{2}) \ln(\chi + \frac{1}{2}) - (\chi - \frac{1}{2}) \ln(\chi - \frac{1}{2}). \quad (2.31)$$

The entropy  $S_B$  always grows with  $\chi$ , starting at the minimum  $S_B = 0$  for  $\chi = \frac{1}{2}$  and increasing as  $\ln \chi$  for large  $\chi$ . Recalling the explicit time dependence of  $x$  and  $y$  in (2.22) and (2.24), one realizes that, in general, for  $\eta_B \neq \sigma_B$  the variable  $\chi$  does not grow monotonically with  $t$ , so that the condition  $\dot{S}_B \geq 0$  cannot be satisfied for all times. In particular, when  $\eta_B > \sigma_B$  the equilibrium state  $\rho_B^\infty$  is reached, in general, at the expense of some negative entropy exchange with the environment.

The case  $\eta_B = \sigma_B$  is again special; in fact, the operators  $L_k$  in (2.4) are now Hermitian and therefore the condition  $\dot{S}_B \geq 0$  is guaranteed. Indeed, in this case  $\chi$  approaches infinity for large times, and therefore so does  $S_B$ . Alternatively, using (2.3) in the definition (2.26), one can show directly that [29]

$$\dot{S}_B \geq \left\langle \sum_k [L_k, L_k^\dagger] \right\rangle = 2(\sigma_B - \eta_B). \quad (2.32)$$

Note, however, that  $L_k = L_k^\dagger$  is only a sufficient condition for entropy increase. Indeed, for  $\eta_B > \sigma_B$  take  $x_0 = x_\infty$  and  $y_0 \leq y_\infty$ ; in this case  $\chi$  grows with time since  $\dot{y}(t)$  is always positive, and therefore  $S_B$  also never decreases.

### 3. The fermionic oscillator

We shall now extend the analysis of the previous section to the case of a fermionic oscillator. The corresponding creation  $\alpha^\dagger$  and annihilation  $\alpha$  operators now obey the following algebra:

$$\{\alpha, \alpha^\dagger\} = 1 \quad \alpha^2 = \alpha^{\dagger 2} = 0. \quad (3.1)$$

As in the bosonic case, we shall assume the system to be interacting with a large environment, and describe its time evolution by means of a quantum dynamical semigroup.

The states of the system will be described by an appropriate density matrix  $\rho_F$ , acting on the elements of the fermionic Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_F$ . This operator obeys an evolution equation of the form (2.1), where now the Hamiltonian can be taken to be

$$H_F = \frac{1}{2}\omega_F[\alpha^\dagger, \alpha] \quad \omega_F \geq 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Since  $\alpha^\dagger$  and  $\alpha$  are now nilpotent, the additional piece  $L[\rho]$  in (2.3) turns out to be at most quadratic in these variables, and the operators  $L_k$  assume the generic form

$$L_k = r'_k \alpha + s'_k \alpha^\dagger. \quad (3.3)$$

Inserting this in (2.3), one explicitly finds

$$\begin{aligned} L_F[\rho] = & \eta_F(2\alpha\rho\alpha^\dagger - \alpha^\dagger\alpha\rho - \rho\alpha^\dagger\alpha) + \sigma_F(2\alpha^\dagger\rho\alpha - \alpha\alpha^\dagger\rho - \rho\alpha\alpha^\dagger) \\ & + 2(\lambda_F^*\alpha\rho\alpha + \lambda_F\alpha^\dagger\rho\alpha^\dagger) \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where the parameters  $\eta_F$ ,  $\sigma_F$  and  $\lambda_F$  are as in (2.12) with the coefficients  $r_k$  and  $s_k$  replaced by the primed ones. Then, the complete evolution equation for the density matrix  $\rho_F$  takes the form

$$\frac{\partial\rho_F(t)}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}_F[\rho_F(t)] \equiv -i\omega_F[\alpha^\dagger\alpha, \rho_F(t)] + L_F[\rho_F(t)]. \quad (3.5)$$

The study of the solutions of this equation in the holomorphic representation requires the introduction of Grassmann variables  $\theta, \xi, \dots$ , that anticommute with the operators  $\alpha^\dagger$  and  $\alpha$ , and such that

$$\theta\xi = -\xi\theta \quad \theta^2 = \xi^2 = 0. \quad (3.6)$$

The elements  $|\psi\rangle$  of the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_F$  are now holomorphic functions  $\psi(\bar{\theta})$  of the variable  $\bar{\theta}$ . However, since  $\bar{\theta}^2 = 0$ , their Taylor expansion contains only two terms:  $\psi(\bar{\theta}) = \psi_0 + \psi_1\bar{\theta}$ , with  $\psi_0$  and  $\psi_1$  complex parameters; they clearly represent the components of  $|\psi\rangle$  along the vacuum and one-fermion states<sup>†</sup>.

The inner product of two states  $|\phi\rangle$  and  $|\psi\rangle$  involves the integration over anticommuting variables (Berezin integral), defined by the conditions  $\int \theta d\theta = 1$  and  $\int d\theta = 0$  [26]:

$$\langle\phi|\psi\rangle = \int \psi^*(\theta)\phi(\bar{\theta}) e^{-\bar{\theta}\theta} d\bar{\theta} d\theta \quad (3.7)$$

where  $\psi^*(\theta) = \psi_0^* + \theta\psi_1^*$  is by definition the adjoint of  $\psi(\bar{\theta})$ .

Similarly, to an operator  $\mathcal{O}$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}_F$  there corresponds a kernel  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\theta}, \theta)$ ; the result of its action on the vector  $|\psi\rangle$  is given by

$$\phi(\bar{\theta}) = \int \mathcal{O}(\bar{\theta}, \xi)\psi(\bar{\xi}) e^{-\bar{\xi}\xi} d\bar{\xi} d\xi. \quad (3.8)$$

<sup>†</sup> Since the fermionic oscillator is a two-level system, a simple correspondence between the holomorphic and the standard matrix representation can easily be established; however, working with the holomorphic representation is, in general, more convenient, since explicit, closed expressions for  $\rho_F$  can always be given, even in presence of  $n$  degrees of freedom. See also the discussion in section 5.



Note that the identity operator is represented by the kernel  $e^{\bar{\theta}\theta}$ . Furthermore, within this framework the fermionic creation and annihilation operators are realized by left multiplication and differentiation with respect to  $\bar{\theta}$ :

$$\alpha^\dagger \rightarrow \bar{\theta} \quad \alpha \rightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}} \quad (3.9)$$

so that  $\alpha^\dagger$  is indeed the adjoint of  $\alpha$  with respect to the inner product in (3.7).

As in the bosonic case, since  $\mathcal{L}_F$  in (3.5) is quadratic in the operators (3.9), the kernel  $\rho_F(\bar{\theta}, \theta; t)$  representing the state  $\rho_F$  of the system can be taken to be of Gaussian form:

$$\rho_F(\bar{\theta}, \theta; t) = \gamma(t) e^{-\bar{\theta}\Gamma(t)\theta}. \quad (3.10)$$

For simplicity, in this case we also assume  $\langle \alpha^\dagger \rangle = \langle \alpha \rangle = 0$  for all times, so that terms linear in  $\bar{\theta}$  and  $\theta$  are absent in (3.10). A more general ansatz for  $\rho_F(\bar{\theta}, \theta; t)$  is discussed in the appendix. The normalization condition

$$\text{Tr}[\rho_F(t)] = \int \rho_F(\bar{\theta}, \theta; t) e^{\bar{\theta}\theta} d\theta d\bar{\theta} = 1 \quad (3.11)$$

readily implies  $\gamma(t) = [1 - \Gamma(t)]^{-1}$ , so that the kernel  $\rho_F$  in (3.10) contains only one independent unknown function. It can be conveniently rewritten in the following form:

$$\rho_F(\bar{\theta}, \theta; t) = \gamma(t) + [1 - \gamma(t)]\bar{\theta}\theta \quad (3.12)$$

showing explicitly that  $\gamma$  and  $1 - \gamma$  represent the two eigenvalues of  $\rho_F^\dagger$ . Finally, the physical meaning of  $\gamma(t)$  can easily be derived:

$$\langle \alpha\alpha^\dagger \rangle(t) \equiv \text{Tr}[\alpha\alpha^\dagger \rho_F(t)] = \int \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}} [\bar{\theta} \rho_F(\bar{\theta}, \theta; t)] e^{\bar{\theta}\theta} d\theta d\bar{\theta} = \gamma(t). \quad (3.13)$$

Insertion of (3.12) in the evolution equation (3.5) allows one to derive the equation satisfied by the unknown function  $\gamma(t)$ :

$$\dot{\gamma}(t) = -2(\eta_F + \sigma_F)\gamma(t) + 2\eta_F \quad (3.14)$$

whose general solution is simply

$$\gamma(t) = e^{-2(\eta_F + \sigma_F)t} (\gamma_0 - \gamma_\infty) + \gamma_\infty \quad (3.15)$$

where  $\gamma_0 = \gamma(0)$  is the initial condition, while

$$\gamma_\infty = \frac{\eta_F}{\eta_F + \sigma_F}. \quad (3.16)$$

Since  $\eta_F$  and  $\sigma_F$  are positive constants, both  $\gamma(t)$  and  $1 - \gamma(t)$  are non-negative, so that  $0 \leq \gamma(t) \leq 1$ . Furthermore, independently from the initial condition, for large times the density matrix  $\rho_F$  describing the state of the fermionic oscillator always approaches the equilibrium configuration:  $\rho_F^\infty = \gamma_\infty + (1 - \gamma_\infty)\bar{\theta}\theta$ ; this is a thermal state, provided the inverse temperature  $\beta$  is introduced via the relation  $e^{\beta\omega_F} = \eta_F/\sigma_F$ , with  $\eta_F \geq \sigma_F$ .

The evolution towards equilibrium is not, in general, associated with a monotonic increase of the von Neumann entropy  $S[\rho_F] \equiv S_F$ . Its explicit expression can be computed using the definition (2.26):

$$S_F(t) = -\gamma(t) \ln \gamma(t) - [1 - \gamma(t)] \ln [1 - \gamma(t)] \quad (3.17)$$

† Note that this simple rewriting of the Gaussian ansatz is possible only in one dimension; in the presence of  $n$  degrees of freedom, the covariance  $\Gamma$  would be an  $n \times n$  Hermitian matrix and the Taylor expansion of (3.10) would be much more involved.

while its time derivative reads as  $\dot{S}_F = \dot{\gamma}[\ln(1 - \gamma) - \ln \gamma]$ ; one can easily check using (3.14) and (3.15) that  $\dot{S}_F$  is always negative when  $\gamma$  lies between  $\frac{1}{2}$  and  $\gamma_\infty$ , while it is positive outside this interval.

More precisely, as a function of  $\gamma$ ,  $S_F$  grows from its minimum value  $S_F = 0$  at  $\gamma = 0$  up to its maximum  $S_F = \ln 2$  reached for  $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$ , and then decreases, becoming zero again at  $\gamma = 1$ . Therefore,  $S_F$  grows monotonically only when  $\gamma(t)$  increases in the interval  $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$ , or decreases in the interval  $[\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ . For  $\eta_F < \sigma_F$ , this happens when  $\gamma_0 \leq \gamma_\infty$ ; indeed, this implies  $\gamma(t) \leq \gamma_\infty < \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\dot{\gamma}(t) \geq 0$  for all times. Similar conditions hold when  $\eta_F > \sigma_F$ ; in this case to obtain a monotonic increase of entropy, one has to choose  $\gamma_0 \geq \gamma_\infty$ , so that  $\gamma(t) \geq \gamma_\infty > \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\dot{\gamma}(t) \leq 0$  for all  $t$ .

The case  $\eta_F = \sigma_F$  is somehow special, since now  $\dot{S}_F \geq 0$  independent of the choice of initial state; the density matrix  $\rho_F$  approaches asymptotically the infinite-temperature, totally disordered state  $\rho_F^\infty = e^{\bar{\theta}}/2$ , for which the entropy is maximal,  $S_F = \ln 2$ .

As a final remark, note that in the case of the fermionic oscillator the sufficient condition for entropy increase discussed at the end of the previous section does not lead, in general, to useful constraints. Indeed, the inequality in (2.32) now gives the condition

$$\dot{S}_F(t) \geq 2(\eta_F - \sigma_F)[1 - 2\gamma(t)]. \tag{3.18}$$

Unless  $\eta_F = \sigma_F$ , the right-hand side of this inequality always becomes negative for large enough times, as can be easily realized by substituting for  $\gamma(t)$  its asymptotic value  $\gamma_\infty$ .

#### 4. The supersymmetric oscillator

We shall now discuss the behaviour of an oscillator composed of both bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom interacting with an environment, under the hypothesis that its evolution is described by a quantum dynamical semigroup. The density matrix  $\rho$  representing the state of the system is now an operator on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_B \oplus \mathcal{H}_F$ . Its time evolution is described by an equation of the form (2.1), where both the total Hamiltonian  $H$  and the dissipative part  $L[\rho]$  are expressed in terms of bosonic,  $a^\dagger, a$ , and fermionic,  $\alpha^\dagger, \alpha$ , creation and annihilation operators, obeying

$$[a^\dagger, \alpha^\dagger] = [a^\dagger, \alpha] = [a, \alpha^\dagger] = [a, \alpha] = 0 \tag{4.1}$$

together with the standard commutation, anticommutation relations.

The Hamiltonian  $H = H_B + H_F$ , the sum of the bosonic and fermionic terms of the form (2.9) and (3.2), possesses an additional property when the two frequencies are equal:  $\omega_B = \omega_F = \omega$ . Indeed, the following charges:

$$Q_+ = \omega^{1/2} a \alpha^\dagger \quad Q_- = \omega^{1/2} a^\dagger \alpha \tag{4.2}$$

commute with the Hamiltonian  $H = \omega(a^\dagger a + \alpha^\dagger \alpha)$ , and, furthermore,

$$\{Q_+, Q_-\} = H \quad Q_+^2 = Q_-^2 = 0. \tag{4.3}$$

This is the simplest example of a supersymmetry algebra. The system described by  $H$  is therefore supersymmetric and the conserved supercharges  $Q_+$  and  $Q_-$  exchange bosons and fermions; furthermore, from the algebra (4.3) one deduces that the ground state of  $H$  is a zero-energy singlet and that all excited states form degenerate doublets.

The additional piece  $L[\rho]$  in the evolution equation (2.1) will be taken to be the sum of the bosonic  $L_B[\rho]$  and fermionic  $L_F[\rho]$  linear operators already introduced in the previous sections. This is a natural choice since it ensures integrability of the time evolution ( $L[\rho]$

is again at most quadratic in the creation and annihilation operators), while avoiding mixing between bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom induced by the dissipative term; in other terms,  $L[\rho]$  is thus bosonic in character.

Nevertheless, this simple form of  $L[\rho]$  does not, in general, ensure supersymmetry invariance. In ordinary quantum mechanics, to an invariance of the Hamiltonian there always corresponds a conservation law and vice versa. For time evolution generated by equations of the form (2.1) this is usually not true: charge conservation and invariance (or symmetry) give rise to two different and, in general, unrelated conditions.

To elaborate further on this point, note that to the evolution equation (2.1) for the density matrix  $\rho$  there corresponds an analogous evolution for any operator  $X$  representing an observable of the system

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} X = \mathcal{L}^*[X] \equiv i[H, X] + L^*[X] \quad (4.4)$$

where the linear operator  $L^*$  is the ‘dual’ of  $L$  and it is defined via the following identity:

$$\text{Tr}(L^*[X]\rho) \equiv \text{Tr}(XL[\rho]). \quad (4.5)$$

Consider now a symmetry of the Hamiltonian  $H$  generated by the charge  $G$ , inducing the following transformation on the observables:

$$X \rightarrow X' = U^{-1} X U \quad U = e^{iG}. \quad (4.6)$$

This transformation will be an invariance of the system only when it is compatible with the evolution equation (4.4), i.e.  $\mathcal{L}^*[X'] = U^{-1} \mathcal{L}^*[X] U$ , for any  $X$ ; equivalently, in infinitesimal form:

$$[G, L^*[X]] = L^*[[G, X]]. \quad (4.7)$$

This condition is clearly distinct from the relation that guarantees the time conservation of the mean value  $\langle G \rangle \equiv \text{Tr}[G\rho(t)]$  of the generator  $G$ ; recalling (2.1) and (4.5), from the condition  $d/dt \langle G \rangle = 0$  for any state, one readily derives

$$L^*[G] = 0. \quad (4.8)$$

In the case of the supersymmetric oscillator, the dual map  $L^*[X] = L_B^*[X] + L_F^*[X]$  can be easily deduced from (2.11) and (3.4). Explicitly, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} L_B^*[X] &= \eta_B(2a^\dagger X a - X a^\dagger a - a^\dagger a X) + \sigma_B(2a X a^\dagger - X a a^\dagger - a a^\dagger X) \\ &\quad + \lambda_B(2a^\dagger X a^\dagger - X a^{\dagger 2} - a^{\dagger 2} X) + \lambda_B^*(2a X a - X a^2 - a^2 X) \\ L_F^*[X] &= \eta_F(2\alpha^\dagger X \alpha - X \alpha^\dagger \alpha - \alpha^\dagger \alpha X) + \sigma_F(2\alpha X \alpha^\dagger - X \alpha \alpha^\dagger - \alpha \alpha^\dagger X) \\ &\quad + 2\lambda_F \alpha^\dagger X \alpha^\dagger + 2\lambda_F^* \alpha X \alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

The parameter of a supersymmetry transformation is anticommuting, so that the corresponding generator takes the form  $G = \xi Q_+$ , where  $\xi$  is a Grassmann variable, commuting with bosonic operators, but anticommuting with the fermionic ones. Inserting it in (4.7) and using (4.9), after some algebraic manipulations one obtains the following condition:

$$(\eta_B - \sigma_B - \eta_F + \sigma_F)[X, G] + \lambda_F^* \{X, G^\dagger\} = 0. \quad (4.10)$$

Since this relation must be true for any observable  $X$ , supersymmetry invariance is only compatible with the time evolution when

$$\eta_B - \sigma_B = \eta_F - \sigma_F \quad \lambda_F = 0. \quad (4.11)$$

The holomorphic representation is again particularly useful in order to discuss the behaviour of the state  $\rho(t)$  of the supersymmetric oscillator. The elements of the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  will now be represented by holomorphic functions of the complex variable  $\bar{z}$  and of the Grassmann symbol  $\bar{\theta}$ , while creation and annihilation operators will act on them following the rules in (2.16) and (3.9). The density matrix  $\rho$  will now be a kernel  $\rho(\bar{z}, z; \bar{\theta}, \theta)$ , whose explicit expression can be taken to be of Gaussian form<sup>†</sup>. It can be expanded as

$$\rho(\bar{z}, z; \bar{\theta}, \theta) = \rho_0(\bar{z}, z) + \rho_1(\bar{z}, z)\bar{\theta}\theta. \quad (4.12)$$

The normalization condition  $\text{Tr}[\rho] = 1$  now involves both ordinary and Grassmann integrals:

$$\int \rho(\bar{z}, z; \bar{\theta}, \theta) e^{-\bar{z}z} e^{\theta\bar{\theta}} d\bar{z} dz d\theta d\bar{\theta} = \int [\rho_0(\bar{z}, z) + \rho_1(\bar{z}, z)] e^{-\bar{z}z} d\bar{z} dz = 1. \quad (4.13)$$

Inserting the ansatz (4.12) into the evolution equation for  $\rho$  allows one to derive the following conditions on the bosonic kernels  $\rho_0$  and  $\rho_1$ :

$$\dot{\rho}_0(t) = \mathcal{L}_B[\rho_0(t)] + 2[\eta_F \rho_1(t) - \sigma_F \rho_0(t)] \quad (4.14a)$$

$$\dot{\rho}_1(t) = \mathcal{L}_B[\rho_1(t)] - 2[\eta_F \rho_1(t) - \sigma_F \rho_0(t)] \quad (4.14b)$$

where the linear operator  $\mathcal{L}_B[\rho]$  is as in (2.10). It follows that the combination  $\rho_0 + \rho_1$  satisfies the same evolution equation discussed in section 2 for the case of a single bosonic oscillator. The Gaussian ansatz  $\rho_B(\bar{z}, z)$  in (2.17) can equally well be adopted here for  $\rho_0 + \rho_1$ , since performing the Grassmann integrations, one consistently finds (compare with (2.20)):

$$\begin{aligned} \langle a^2 \rangle(t) &\equiv \text{Tr}[a^2 \rho(t)] = \int \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \bar{z}^2} [\rho_0(\bar{z}, z; t) + \rho_1(\bar{z}, z; t)] e^{-\bar{z}z} d\bar{z} dz = x(t) \\ \langle a^{\dagger 2} \rangle(t) &\equiv \text{Tr}[a^{\dagger 2} \rho(t)] = \int \bar{z}^2 [\rho_0(\bar{z}, z; t) + \rho_1(\bar{z}, z; t)] e^{-\bar{z}z} d\bar{z} dz = \bar{x}(t) \\ \langle a a^\dagger \rangle(t) &\equiv \text{Tr}[a a^\dagger \rho(t)] = \int \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} \bar{z} [\rho_0(\bar{z}, z; t) + \rho_1(\bar{z}, z; t)] e^{-\bar{z}z} d\bar{z} dz = y(t). \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

Consequently, the time evolution of these quantities is that given in (2.22) and (2.24).

Inserting this result back into (4.14a), one obtains

$$\dot{\rho}_0(t) = \mathcal{L}_B[\rho_0(t)] - 2(\eta_F + \sigma_F)\rho_0(t) + 2\eta_F \rho_B(t). \quad (4.16)$$

The form of this equation suggests one should look for a solution in which  $\rho_0(t)$  differs from  $\rho_B(t)$  by an unknown multiplicative function  $\gamma_F(t)$ . It can be identified with the function  $\gamma(t)$  studied in the previous section, since it satisfies the same equation (3.14) and has the same physical meaning:

$$\langle \alpha \alpha^\dagger \rangle(t) \equiv \text{Tr}[\alpha \alpha^\dagger \rho(t)] = \int \rho_0(\bar{z}, z; t) e^{-\bar{z}z} dz d\bar{z} = \gamma_F(t). \quad (4.17)$$

Consequently,  $\rho_1 = (1 - \gamma_F)\rho_B$ , and therefore one finally finds

$$\rho(\bar{z}, z; \bar{\theta}, \theta) = [\gamma_F + (1 - \gamma_F)\bar{\theta}\theta]\rho_B(\bar{z}, z) \equiv \rho_F(\bar{\theta}, \theta)\rho_B(\bar{z}, z). \quad (4.18)$$

Not surprisingly, the density matrix that solves the evolution equation (2.1) in the case of the supersymmetric oscillator is in factorized form; its behaviour can be deduced from the analysis of the previous sections, provided the conditions (4.11) for supersymmetry invariance are taken into account.

<sup>†</sup> Here again we assume vanishing initial averages  $\langle a^\dagger \rangle$ ,  $\langle a \rangle$ ,  $\langle \alpha^\dagger \rangle$ ,  $\langle \alpha \rangle$ .

In particular,  $\rho$  approaches an equilibrium state for large times only when  $\eta_B > \sigma_B$ , which also implies  $\eta_F > \sigma_F$ . This limiting state is thermal, with inverse temperature  $\beta$ , only for  $\lambda_B = 0$  and  $\eta_B/\sigma_B = \eta_F/\sigma_F = e^{\beta\omega}$ , which implies, recalling the condition (4.11):  $\eta_B = \eta_F$  and  $\sigma_B = \sigma_F$  [30].

Also in the case of the supersymmetric oscillator, the total entropy does not have, in general, a monotonic behaviour during the approach to equilibrium. Since the density matrix  $\rho$  is in factorized form, the total entropy  $S$  will be the sum of the bosonic and fermionic contributions. Using the variable  $\gamma_B = \chi - \frac{1}{2} \geq 0$ , where  $\chi$  is defined as in (2.30), and recalling the results of the previous sections, one has

$$S = (\gamma_B + 1) \ln(\gamma_B + 1) - \gamma_B \ln \gamma_B - (\gamma_F - 1) \ln(\gamma_F - 1) - \gamma_F \ln \gamma_F. \quad (4.19)$$

Its time derivative, that can be expressed as

$$\dot{S} = \dot{\gamma}_B \ln \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\gamma_B} \right) + \dot{\gamma}_F \ln \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma_F} \right) \quad (4.20)$$

does not have, in general, a definite sign, although possible compensation between the bosonic and fermionic contributions can concur to a positive right-hand side for certain time intervals.

As discussed at the end of section 2, a bound on  $\dot{S}$  can be obtained by working directly with the definition (2.26) and equation (2.1). In the present case, this procedure gives

$$\dot{S} \geq 2(\sigma_B - \eta_B) + 2(\sigma_F - \eta_F)[2\gamma_F - 1] \equiv 4(\sigma_F - \eta_F)\gamma_F \quad (4.21)$$

where the identity is a consequence of the condition (4.11). Since  $0 \leq \gamma_F(t) \leq 1$ , the inequality (4.21) ensures  $\dot{S} \geq 0$  for  $\sigma_F \geq \eta_F$ . However, this condition would lead to a rather singular behaviour for the bosonic part of the density matrix in (4.18), and thus for the whole  $\rho$ . In fact,  $\sigma_B$  would also be greater than  $\eta_B$  and, as discussed in section 2, this implies an infinitely growing average occupation number. In conclusion, although inducing a partial compensation between the bosonic and fermionic contributions to  $S$ , the supersymmetry condition (4.11) is, in general, not enough to guarantee a monotonic entropy increase for all times during the evolution of the system.

## 5. Discussion

All the considerations developed in the previous sections for single oscillators can be generalized to the case of  $n$  independent oscillators, both bosonic and fermionic. Their interaction with an external environment can still be consistently described in terms of quantum dynamical semigroups, so that their time evolution can be modelled by means of equations of the form (2.1) and (2.3), with operators  $L_k$  linear in the relevant fundamental variables. However, the coefficients  $r$  and  $s$  of (2.4) now become matrices, and the number of independent constants characterizing the dissipative part  $L[\rho]$  rapidly increase with  $n$ , making the evolution equation (2.1) rather involved.

Nevertheless, various simplifying conditions can be imposed to reduce this arbitrariness, at least in part. Those involving symmetry properties are the most physically interesting. As discussed in the introduction, the interaction between the system and the environment can be considered, in general, to be weak; therefore, in many instances, the presence of the environment should not be able to alter the symmetry properties of the system. In the case of  $n$  isotropic oscillators, the Hamiltonian is invariant under the action of the group  $SU(n)$ ; it is then quite natural to assume the same invariance property to be valid for the full evolution equation. As discussed in section 4, this can be achieved by imposing the condition (4.7) for any element  $G$  of the  $SU(n)$  algebra.

Also in this more general setting, the holomorphic representation appears to be a particularly convenient framework to analyse the behaviour of the solutions of (2.1). It requires the introduction of  $n$  commuting or anticommuting complex symbols, that allow one to realize the corresponding creation and annihilation operators as multiplication and differentiation by these variables. The kernel representing the system density matrix can still be taken to have a generic Gaussian functional expression. However, the various ‘coefficients’ in the exponent, suitable generalizations of the functions  $x$ ,  $\bar{x}$  and  $y$  in the bosonic case and of  $\Gamma$  in the fermionic one, now become  $n \times n$  matrices. They obey quadratic (Riccati-like) time evolution equations, whose solutions can always be obtained, albeit, in general, in terms of implicitly defined functions [31, 32].

Although developed in the analysis of simple open systems, the techniques described in the previous sections are actually very general; they can be used to study the dynamics of more complicated models, for which the operator  $\mathcal{L}$  in (2.1) is not quadratic in the relevant variables. In these cases, complete explicit expressions for the density matrix  $\rho$  as a solution of (2.1) cannot, in general, be given. Nevertheless, approximate expressions for  $\rho$ , typically in Gaussian form, can be obtained via the application of suitable variational procedures.

Indeed, equations of the form (2.1) can be derived by means of a suitable variational principle [33], obtained by generalizing the one yielding the Liouville–von Neumann equation in ordinary quantum mechanics [28, 34]. In the case of isoentropic time evolutions, these variational techniques have allowed detailed discussions of a wide range of physical phenomena, from statistical physics to inflationary cosmology [34, 35]. Their application to the study of quantum dynamical semigroups within the framework presented in the previous sections will surely provide new insights into the behaviour of open quantum systems.

### Appendix

The Gaussian kernels  $\rho_B(\bar{z}, z; t)$  and  $\rho_F(\bar{\theta}, \theta; t)$  representing the density matrices for the bosonic and fermionic oscillators discussed in sections 2 and 3 lead to vanishing averages for the corresponding creation and annihilation operators. This condition can easily be released by introducing a more general ansatz.

In the bosonic case, take

$$\rho_B(\bar{z}, z; t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N(t)}} e^{-\frac{1}{2N(t)} [2y(t)[\bar{z}-\bar{v}(t)][z-v(t)] - \bar{x}(t)[z-v(t)]^2 - x(t)[\bar{z}-\bar{v}(t)]^2] + \bar{z}z} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

that differ from the expression (2.17) because of the presence of the two additional functions  $v(t)$  and  $\bar{v}(t)$ . The trace conservation for all times,  $\text{Tr}[\rho_B(t)] = 1$ , still implies

$$N(t) = y^2(t) - |x(t)|^2 \quad (\text{A.2})$$

while Hermiticity requires  $\bar{v}(t) \equiv [v(t)]^*$ . With this choice for  $\rho_B(\bar{z}, z; t)$ , the averages of  $a^\dagger$  and  $a$  are, in general, non-vanishing:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle a^\dagger \rangle(t) &\equiv \text{Tr}[a^\dagger \rho_B(t)] = \int \bar{z} \rho_B(\bar{z}, z; t) e^{-\bar{z}z} d\bar{z} dz = \bar{v}(t) \\ \langle a \rangle(t) &\equiv \text{Tr}[a \rho_B(t)] = \int \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} [\rho_B(\bar{z}, z; t)] e^{-\bar{z}z} d\bar{z} dz = v(t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

The time evolution equation (2.10) implies the following homogeneous equation for  $v(t)$ :

$$\dot{v}(t) = 2(\eta_B - \sigma_B + i\omega_B)v(t) \quad (\text{A.4})$$

so that  $v(t)$  is non-vanishing only if its initial value  $v(0)$  is different from zero:

$$v(t) = e^{-(\eta_B - \sigma_B + i\omega_B)t} v(0). \tag{A.5}$$

The physical meaning of the remaining functions  $x$ ,  $\bar{x}$  and  $y$  appearing in (A.1) is slightly changed with respect to those studied in section 2; now one finds

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \langle a^2 \rangle - \langle a \rangle^2 \\ \bar{x} &= \langle a^{\dagger 2} \rangle - \langle a^\dagger \rangle^2 \\ y &= \langle a a^\dagger \rangle - \langle a \rangle \langle a^\dagger \rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

Nevertheless, one can check that these functions still obey the evolution equations (2.21), so that the considerations and the discussions of section 2 apply to this more general situation as well.

In the case of the fermionic oscillator, the most general Gaussian ansatz for the kernel  $\rho_F(\bar{\theta}, \theta; t)$  can be written as

$$\rho_F(\bar{\theta}, \theta; t) = \gamma(t) e^{-\frac{1}{\gamma(t)} [\bar{\theta} \Delta(t) \theta - \bar{\varphi}(t) \theta - \varphi(t) \bar{\theta}]}. \tag{A.7}$$

The normalization condition  $\text{Tr}[\rho_F(t)] = 1$  gives  $\Delta(t) = \gamma(t) - 1$ , while Hermiticity implies  $\bar{\varphi}(t) = [\varphi(t)]^*$ .

By performing the integration over the anticommuting variables, one finds that the function  $\gamma(t)$  retains its meaning as  $\langle \alpha \alpha^\dagger \rangle$  also in this more general setting, and therefore still obeys the evolution equation (3.14).

On the other hand, the two additional functions  $\bar{\varphi}(t)$  and  $\varphi(t)$  in (A.7) represent the averages of  $\alpha^\dagger$  and  $\alpha$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \alpha^\dagger \rangle(t) &\equiv \text{Tr}[\alpha^\dagger \rho_F(t)] = \int \bar{\theta} \rho_F(\bar{\theta}, \theta; t) e^{\bar{\theta} \theta} d\theta d\bar{\theta} = \bar{\varphi}(t) \\ \langle \alpha \rangle(t) &\equiv \text{Tr}[\alpha \rho_F(t)] = \int \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}} [\rho_F(\bar{\theta}, \theta; t)] e^{\bar{\theta} \theta} d\theta d\bar{\theta} = \varphi(t) \end{aligned} \tag{A.8}$$

and, due to (3.5), obey the following evolution equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\varphi}(t) &= -2(\eta_F + \sigma_F + i\omega_F)\varphi(t) + 2\lambda_F \bar{\varphi}(t) \\ \dot{\bar{\varphi}}(t) &= -2(\eta_F + \sigma_F - i\omega_F)\bar{\varphi}(t) + 2\lambda_F^* \varphi(t). \end{aligned} \tag{A.9}$$

The general solution is given by

$$\varphi(t) = e^{-(\eta_F + \sigma_F)t} \left\{ \left[ \cos(\Omega_F t) - \frac{i\omega_F}{\Omega_F} \sin(\Omega_F t) \right] \varphi(0) + \frac{2\lambda_F}{\Omega_F} \sin(\Omega_F t) \bar{\varphi}(0) \right\} \tag{A.10}$$

where  $\Omega_F = [\omega_F^2 - 4|\lambda_F|^2]^{1/2}$  for  $\omega_F \geq |\lambda_F|$ . Hyperbolic functions appear in the expression (A.10) when  $\omega_F < |\lambda_F|$ ; however, thanks to the inequality  $|\lambda_F|^2 \leq \eta_F \sigma_F$  (compare with (2.13)),  $\varphi(t)$  always vanishes for large times.

**References**

[1] Alicki R and Lendi K 1987 *Quantum Dynamical Semigroups and Applications (Lecture Notes in Physics vol 286)* (Berlin: Springer)  
 [2] Gorini V, Frigerio A, Verri M, Kossakowski A and Surdarshan E C G 1978 *Rep. Math. Phys.* **13** 149  
 [3] Spohn H 1980 *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **53** 569  
 [4] Royer A 1996 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77** 3272  
 [5] Benatti F and Floreanini R 1999 *Ann. Phys., NY* **273** 58

- [6] Louisell W H 1973 *Quantum Statistical Properties of Radiation* (New York: Wiley)
- [7] Scully M O and Zubairy M S 1997 *Quantum Optics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- [8] Gardiner C W and Zoller P 2000 *Quantum Noise* 2nd edn (Berlin: Springer)
- [9] Fonda L, Ghirardi G C and Rimini A 1978 *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **41** 587
- [10] Nakazato H, Namiki M and Pascazio S 1996 *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **10** 247
- [11] Benatti F and Floreanini R 1998 *Phys. Lett. B* **428** 149
- [12] Hawking S 1983 *Commun. Math. Phys.* **87** 395  
Hawking S 1988 *Phys. Rev. D* **37** 904  
Hawking S 1996 *Phys. Rev. D* **53** 3099  
Ellis J, Hagelin J S, Nanopoulos D V and Srednicki M 1984 *Nucl. Phys. B* **241** 381
- [13] Benatti F and Floreanini R 1997 *Nucl. Phys. B* **488** 335
- [14] Benatti F and Floreanini R 1998 *Nucl. Phys. B* **511** 550
- [15] Benatti F and Floreanini R 1999 *Phys. Lett. B* **465** 260
- [16] Benatti F and Floreanini R 1999 CPT, dissipation and all that *Proc. 3rd Int. Workshop on Physics and Detectors for DaΦne (Frascati, November 1999)* ed S Bianco *et al* (Frascati: INFN) p 307  
(Benatti F and Floreanini R 1999 *Preprint hep-ph/9912426*)
- [17] Benatti F and Floreanini R 1999 *Phys. Lett. B* **451** 422
- [18] Benatti F and Floreanini R 2000 *J. High Energy Phys.* JHEP02(2000)032
- [19] Benatti F and Floreanini R 2000 Effective dissipative dynamics for polarized photons *Preprint hep-ph/0009283* (*Phys. Rev. D* at press)
- [20] Benatti F, Floreanini R and Lapel A 2000 Open quantum systems and complete positivity *Trieste Preprint*
- [21] Benatti F and Floreanini R 1997 *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **12** 1465  
Benatti F and Floreanini R 1998 *Banach Center Publications* **43** 71  
Benatti F and Floreanini R 1999 *Phys. Lett. B* **468** 287  
Benatti F and Floreanini R 2000 On the weak-coupling limit and complete positivity *Chaos Solitons Fractals* to appear
- [22] Lindblad G 1976 *Rep. Math. Phys.* **10** 393
- [23] Perelomov A 1986 *Generalized Coherent States and Their Applications* (Berlin: Springer)
- [24] Sandulescu A and Scutaru H 1987 *Ann. Phys., NY* **173** 277
- [25] Isar A 1999 *Fortschr. Phys.* **47** 855
- [26] Berezin F A 1966 *The Method of Second Quantization* (Orlando, FL: Academic)
- [27] Faddeev L D 1976 Introduction to functional methods *Methods in Field Theory* ed R Balian and J Zinn-Justin (Amsterdam: North-Holland)
- [28] Blaizot J-P and Ripka G 1986 *Quantum Theory of Finite Systems* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press)
- [29] Benatti F and Narnhofer H 1988 *Lett. Math. Phys.* **15** 325
- [30] Van Hove L 1982 *Nucl. Phys. B* **207** 15
- [31] Floreanini R 1987 *Ann. Phys., NY* **178** 227
- [32] Floreanini R and Jackiw R 1988 *Phys. Rev. D* **37** 2206
- [33] Rajagopal A K 1997 *Phys. Lett. A* **228** 66
- [34] Eboli O, Jackiw R and Pi S-Y 1988 *Phys. Rev. D* **37** 3557
- [35] Eboli O, Pi S-Y and Samiullah M 1989 *Ann. Phys., NY* **193** 102