CHAPTER 1

FEATURES OF COMPLEXITY

RONNIE KOSLOFF

Institute of Chemistry and the Fritz Haber Research Center for Molecular Dynamics, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, 91904, Israel

1.1 Abstract

We examine the emergence of complexity in the interface between quantum and classical mechanics. By using the algorithmic complexity of Kolmogorov as our definition we can explore complexity of a quantum compiler generated by coherent control. We find that noise on the controls causes the system to collapse to classical-like generalised coherent states. Thus classical like phenomena emergence due to its resistance to noise. The traditional route from mechanics to thermodynamical behaviour emerges from statistical averaging. Recent development has shown that thermodynamical machines can be constructed from even a small quantum device. This indicated to a quantum origin to the laws of thermodynamics and finite-time-thermodynamics. Specifically we study the emergence of the III-law of thermodynamics in a quantum model of an elementary absorption refrigerator.

Please enter \offprintinfo{(Title, Edition)}{(Author)}
at the beginning of your document.

1.2 Introduction

A complex dynamical system is associated with a description which requires a number of variables comparable to the number of particles. If we accept that quantum mechanics is the basic theory of matter we are faced with the dilemma of the emergence of dynamical complexity. One of the main pillars of quantum mechanics is the superposition principle. As a result the theory is completely linear. Dynamical complexity is typically associated with nonlinear phenomena. Complexity can be quantified as the ratio between the number of variables required to describe the dynamics of the system to the number of degrees of freedom. Chaotic dynamics is such an example where this ratio is close to one [1]. Classical mechanics is generically nonlinear and therefore chaotic dynamics emerges. Typical classical systems of even a few degrees of freedom can become extremely complex. The complexity can be associated with positive Kolmogorov entropy [2]. In contrast, quantum mechanics is regular. Strictly, closed quantum systems have zero Kolmogorov entropy [3]. How do these two fundamental theories which address dynamical phenomena have such striking differences? The issue of the emergence of classical mechanics from quantum theory is therefore a non-resolved issue despite many years of study.



Figure 1.1 The relation between complexity, the number of particles and temperature in the physical world. Complexity is measured by the ratio of the number of variables required to describe the dynamics of a system compared to the number of degrees of freedom.

Thermodynamics is a rule based theory with a very small number of variables. The theory of chaos has been invoked to explain the emergence of simplicity from the underlying complex classical dynamics. Chaotic dynamics leads to rapid loss of the ability to keep track of the systems trajectory. As a result, a coarse grain picture of self averaging reduces the number of variables. Following this viewpoint complexity is created in the singular transition between quantum and classical dynamics. When full chaos dominates thermodynamics takes over.

Quantum thermodynamics is devoted to the study of thermodynamical processes within the context of quantum dynamics. This leads to an alternative direct route linking quantum mechanics and thermodynamics. This link avoids the indirect route to the theory through classical mechanics. The study is based on the thermodynamic tradition of learning by example. In this context it is necessary to establish quantum analogues of heat engines. These studies unravel the intimate connection between the laws of thermodynamics and their quantum origin [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27]. The key point is that thermodynamical phenomena can be identified at the level of an individual small quantum device [28].

1.3 The emergence of classical dynamics from the underlying quantum laws.

1.3.1 Insight from quantum control theory

Quantum Control focuses on guiding quantum systems from initial states to targets governed by time dependent external fields [29, 30]. Two interlinked theoretical problems dominate quantum control: the first is the existence of a solution and the second is how to find the control field. Controllability addresses the issue of the conditions on the quantum system which enable control. The typical control targets are state-tostate transformations or optimising a pre specified observable. A more demanding task is implementing a unitary transformation on a subgroup of states. Such an implementation is the prerequisite for quantum information processing. The unitary transformation connects the initial wavefunction which encodes the computation input to the final wave function which encodes the computation output. Finding a control filed for this task can be termed the quantum compiler problem. The existence of a solution for a unitary transformation is assured by the theorem of complete controllability [31, 32, 33]. In short, a system is completely controllable if the combined Hamiltonians of the control and system span a compact Lie algebra. Moreover complete controllability implies that all possible state-to-state transformations are guarantied.

Finding a control field that implements the task is a complex inversion problem. Given the target unitary transformation $\hat{\mathbf{U}}(T)$ at final time T what is the control field that generates it?

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} \hat{\mathbf{U}} = \hat{\mathbf{H}}(\epsilon) \hat{\mathbf{U}}$$
(1.1)

where $\hat{\mathbf{U}}(0) = \hat{\mathbf{I}}$, and $\epsilon(t)$ is the control field. The methods developed to solve the inversion problem could be classified as global, such as Optimal Control Theory

(OCT) [34, 35, 36], or local, e.g., Local Control [37, 38, 39]. Optimal Control Theory (OCT) casts the inversion task into an optimisation problem which is subsequently solved by an iterative approach. The number of iterations required to converge to a high fidelity solution is a measure of the complexity of the inversion.

How difficult is it to solve for the quantum compiler for a specific unitary transformation? This task scales at least factorially with the size of the transformation. The rational is based on the simultaneous task of generating N - 1 state-to-state transformations which constitute the eigenfunctions of the target unitary transformation. To set the relative phase of these transformations a field that drives a superposition state to the final target time has to be found. All these individual control fields have to be orthogonal to all the other transformations, thus the scaling becomes N! more difficult than finding the field that generates an individual state-to-state transformation [40]. This scaling fits the notion that the general quantum complier computation problem has to be hard in the class of NP problems [41]. If it would be an easy task a unitary transformation could solve in one step all algorithmic problems.

The typical control Hamiltonian can be divided into an uncontrolled part $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_0$ the drift Hamiltonian and a control Hamiltonian composed from an operator sub-algebra:

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}} = \hat{\mathbf{H}}_0 + \sum_j \alpha_j(t) \hat{\mathbf{A}}_j \tag{1.2}$$

where $\alpha_j(t)$ is the control field for the operator $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_j$ and the set of operators $\{\hat{\mathbf{A}}\}\$ form a closed small Lie sub-algebra. This model includes molecular systems controlled by a dipole coupling to the electromagnetic field. Complete controllability requires that the commutators of $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_j$ and $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_0$ span the complete algebra $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{N})$ where $N = n^2 - 1$ and n is the size of the Hilbert space of the system. If $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_0$ is part of the control algebra, the system is not completely controllable, i.e. there are state-to-state transitions which cannot be accomplished. In the typical quantum control scenarios the size of the control sub-algebra is constant but the size of control space increases. For example, in coherent control of molecules by a light field the three components of the dipole operator compose the control algebra. These operators are sufficient to completely control a vast number of degrees of freedom of the molecule.

Are systems still completely controllable in the more messy and complex real world? This task is associated with the control of an open quantum system where the controlled system is in contact with the environment. The theorems of controllability do not cover open quantum systems which remains an open problem. Coherent control which is based on interfering pathways is typically degraded by environmental noise or decoherence. Significant effort has been devoted to overcome this issue, mostly in the context of implementing gates for quantum computers. The remedy which is known as dynamical decoupling employs vert fast control fields to reset the system on track [42, 43, 44].

We argue that there is a fundamental flaw in these remedies. Although the noise from the environment can be suppressed the fast controls introduce a new source of noise originating from the controllers. The controller which generates the control field has to be fast in the timescale of the controlled system. This means that the noise introduced by the controller can be modelled as a delta correlated Gaussian noise. For the control algebra of Eq. (1.2) we obtain:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}} = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[\hat{\mathbf{H}}_0, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}] + \sum_j \alpha_j(t)[\hat{\mathbf{A}}_j, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}] + \sum_j \xi_j(t)[\hat{\mathbf{A}}_j, [\hat{\mathbf{A}}_j, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}]]$$
(1.3)

where ξ is determined by the noise in the controls [45].

Eq. (1.3) can have a different interpretation. It describes a system subject to simultaneous weak quantum measurement of the set of operators $\{\hat{\mathbf{A}}\}$. Quantum measurement causes the collapse of the system to an eigenstate of the measured operator. A weak measurement is a small step in this direction. It achieves only a small amount of information on the system and induces only partial collapse. Eq. (1.3)describes a continuous process of a series of infinitely weak quantum measurements in time. A weak quantum measurement can be applied simultaneously to a set of non commuting operators $\{\hat{A}\}$. In this case the system collapses to a generalised coherent state associated with this control sub-algebra [46]. Generallized coherent states are states that have minimum uncertainty with respect to the operators of the algebra i.e. they are classical states.

When the size of the quantum system increases keeping the same control algebra the noise from the control dominates. As a result the system will collapse to a classical-like state. Superpositions of generalised coherent states will collapse to mixtures. The rate of collapse is proportional to the distance between the states in the superposition. This means that cat states which are superpositions of macroscopically distinguished state have a very short lifetime. The consequence is that their generation by coherent control becomes impossible.

For large quantum systems noise on the control means that complete state-tostate control is lost [45]. This implies also that complete unitary control becomes impossible. Does this imply that quantum computers cannot be scaled up? The present analysis is sufficient only for a control model where the number of controls is restricted while the size of Hilbert space is increased. This applies to molecular quantum computers controlled by NMR or by light fields generated by pulse shaping techniques. The general problem of complete controllability of unitary operators subject to control noise where the number of controls is increased with the system size is still open.

Additional studies with the control Hamiltonian of Eq. (1.2) have shown that state-to-state control tasks from one generalised coherent state to another are relatively easy. A control field found for a small system size can be employed when the number of states increases with small adjustments. These can be classified as classical control tasks. For example we could find a field that translates in space a coherent state in a nonlinear Morse oscillator. When we decreased \hbar and increased the number of states maintaining the same field a high fidelity solution of the control task was obtained. This simple picture completely changed when the control task was to generate a superposition of generalised coherent states from a single initial state [47, 48]. In this case the control field was not invariant to an increase in system size. We can conclude by stating that classical control tasks are simply robust

5

and scalable while quantum control tasks are delicate requiring a high algorithmic complexity to generate. A noisy environment may be the cause of the emergence of classical-like dynamics from the underlying quantum foundation.

1.4 The emergence of thermodynamical phenomena

Thermodynamics developed as a phenomenological theory, with the fundamental postulates based on experimental evidence. The theory was initiated by an analysis of a heat engine by Carnot [49]. The well-established part of the theory concerns quasistatic macroscopic processes near thermal equilibrium. Quantum theory, on the other hand, addresses the dynamical behaviour of systems at atomic and smaller length scales. The two disciplines rely upon different sets of axioms. However, one of the first developments, namely Plancks law, which led to the basics of quantum theory, was achieved thanks to consistency with thermodynamics. Einstein, following the ideas of Planck on blackbody radiation, quantised the electromagnetic field [50].

Cars, refrigerators, air-conditioners, lasers and power plants are all examples of heat engines. We are so accustomed to these devices that we take their operation for granted. Rarely a second thought is devoted to the unifying features governing their performance. Practically all such devices operate far from the ideal maximum efficiency conditions set by Carnot [49]. To maximise the power output efficiency is sacrificed. This tradeoff between efficiency and power is the focus of "finite time thermodynamics". The field was initiated by the seminal paper by Curzon and Ahlboron [51]. From everyday experience the irreversible phenomena that limits the optimal performance of engines [52] can be identified as losses due to friction, heat leaks and heat transport. Is there a unifying fundamental explanation for these losses? Is it possible to trace the origin of these phenomena to quantum mechanics?

Gedanken heat engines are an integral part of thermodynamical theory. Carnot in 1824 set the stage by analysing an ideal engine [49]. Carnot's analysis preceded the systematic formulation that led to the first and second laws of thermodynamics. Amazingly, thermodynamics was able keep its independent status despite the development of parallel theories dealing with the same subject matter. Quantum mechanics overlaps thermodynamics in that it describes the state of matter. But in addition, quantum mechanics includes a comprehensive description of dynamics. This suggests that quantum mechanics can generate a concrete interpretation of the word *dynamics* in thermodynamics leading to a fundamental basis for finite time thermodynamics [5, 53, 54, 6, 55, 56].

The following questions come to mind:

- How do the laws of thermodynamics emerge from quantum mechanics?
- What are the quantum origins of irreversible phenomena involving friction and heat transport?
- What is the relation between the quasistatic thermodynamical process and the quantum adiabatic theorem?

Heat engines can be roughly classified as reciprocating cycles such as the Otto or Carnot cycle or continuous resembling turbines. Each class has its advantages in connecting to quantum theory. We will demonstrate this connection with the quantum version of the Otto cycle for a reciprocating model and the quantum tricycle as the generic model of a continuous heat engine.

1.4.1 The quantum Otto cycle

Nicolaus August Otto invented a reciprocating four stroke engine in 1861 [57]. The basic components of the engine include hot and cold reservoirs, a working medium, and a mechanical output device. The cycle of the engine is defined by four branches:

- 1. The hot *isochore*: heat is transferred from the hot bath to the working medium without change in the external control.
- 2. The power *adiabat*: the working medium expands by changing the external control producing work while isolated from the hot and cold reservoirs.
- 3. The cold *isochore*: heat is transferred from the working medium to the cold bath without control change.
- 4. The compression *adiabat*: the working medium is compressed by changing the external control consuming power while isolated from the hot and cold reservoirs.



Figure 1.2 The quantum Otto refrigeration cycle. The cycle can operate at the level of a single quantum harmonic oscillator shuffling heat from a cold to hot reservoir while adjusting its frequency. The performance characteristics are equivalent to macroscopic Otto refrigerators.

The external control could be a change of volume. In the quantum version the control is a change of the frequency of the confining potential of a trap [56] or the external magnetic field [58] in a magnetisation/demagnetisation device. The efficiency η of the cycle is limited to $\eta_o \leq 1 - \frac{\omega_c}{\omega_h}$ where $\omega_{h/c}$ is the frequency at the hot and cold extremes. As expected, the Otto efficiency is always smaller than the efficiency of the Carnot cycle $\eta_o \leq \eta_c = 1 - \frac{T_c}{T_h}$.

1.4.2 Quantum dynamics of the working medium

The quantum analogue of the Otto cycle requires a dynamical description of the working medium, the power output and the heat transport mechanism. The dynamics on the state $\hat{\rho}$ during the adiabatic branches is unitary and is the solution of the Liouville von Neumann equation [59]:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(t) = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[\hat{\mathbf{H}}(t), \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(t)] \quad , \tag{1.4}$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{H}} = \hat{\mathbf{H}}_0 + \hat{\mathbf{H}}_c(\omega(t))$ is time dependent during the evolution. Notice that generically $[\hat{\mathbf{H}}(t), \hat{\mathbf{H}}(t')] \neq 0$ since the drift Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_0$ does not commute with the control $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_c$.

The dynamics on the hot and cold *isochores* is an equilibration process of the working medium with a bath at temperature T_h or T_c . This is the dynamics of an open quantum system where the working medium is described explicitly and the influence of the bath implicitly:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(t) = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[\hat{\mathbf{H}},\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}] + \mathcal{L}_D(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) , \qquad (1.5)$$

where \mathcal{L}_D is the dissipative superoperator responsible for driving the working medium to thermal equilibrium, while the Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathbf{H}} = \hat{\mathbf{H}}(\omega)$ is static. The equilibration is not complete since only a finite time τ_h or τ_c is allocated to the hot or cold *isochores*. The dissipative superoperator \mathcal{L}_D is cast into the semigroup form [60].

To summarise, the quantum model of the Otto cycle contains equations of motion for each of the branches. It differs from the thermodynamical model in that a finite time period is allocated to each of these branches. Solving these equations for different operating conditions allows to obtain the quantum thermodynamical observables. Can a simple thermodynamical picture emerge even for driven systems far from equilibrium dynamics?

1.4.3 Quantum thermodynamics

Thermodynamics is notorious in its ability to describe a process employing an extremely small number of variables. For a heat engine, the energy E and the entropy S seem obvious choices. A minimal set of quantum expectations $\langle \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n \rangle$ constitutes the analogue description where $\langle \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n \rangle = Tr\{\hat{\mathbf{X}}_n\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}\}$. The dynamics of this set is generated by the Heisenberg equations of motion:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \frac{\partial\hat{\mathbf{X}}}{\partial t} + \frac{i}{\hbar}[\hat{\mathbf{H}},\hat{\mathbf{X}}] + \mathcal{L}_D^*(\hat{\mathbf{X}}) \quad , \tag{1.6}$$

where the first term addresses an explicitly time dependent set of operators, $\hat{\mathbf{X}}(t)$.

The energy expectation E is obtained when $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \hat{\mathbf{H}}$, i.e. $E = \langle \hat{\mathbf{H}} \rangle$. The quantum analogue of the first law of thermodynamics [61, 5]: dE = dW + dQ is obtained by inserting $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$ into Eq. (1.6):

$$\frac{d}{dt}\hat{\mathbf{E}} = \dot{\mathcal{W}} + \dot{\mathcal{Q}} = \langle \frac{\partial \hat{\mathbf{H}}}{\partial t} \rangle + \langle \mathcal{L}_D^*(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) \rangle .$$
(1.7)

The power is identified as $\mathcal{P} = \dot{\mathcal{W}} = \langle \frac{\partial \hat{\mathbf{H}}}{\partial t} \rangle$. The heat exchange rate becomes $\dot{\mathcal{Q}} = \langle \mathcal{L}_D^*(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) \rangle$. The Otto cycle contains the simplification that power is produced or consumed only on the *adiabats* and heat transfer takes place only on the *isochores*.

The thermodynamic state of the system is fully determined by the thermodynamical variables. Statistical thermodynamics adds the prescription that the state is determined by the maximum entropy condition subject to the constraints set by the thermodynamical observables [62, 63, 64].

The state of the working medium of all power producing engines is not in thermal equilibrium. In order to generalize the canonical form additional variables are required to define the state of the system. The maximum entropy state subject to this set of observables $\langle \hat{\mathbf{X}}_j \rangle = tr\{\hat{\mathbf{X}}_j \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}\}$ becomes:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}} = \frac{1}{Z} \exp\left(\sum_{j} \beta_{j} \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{j}\right) , \qquad (1.8)$$

where β_j are Lagrange multipliers. The generalized canonical form of Eq. (1.8) is meaningful only if the state can be cast in the canonical form during the complete cycle of the engine leading to $\beta = \beta(t)$. This requirement is called canonical invariance [65]. A necessary condition for canonical invariance is that the set of operators $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ in Eq. (1.8) is closed under the dynamics generated by the equation of motion. By knowing the initial values of the observables $\langle \hat{\mathbf{X}}_j \rangle(0)$, the Heisenberg equations of motion for the cycle can be solved. This leads to the values of the thermodynamical observables at any time $\langle \hat{\mathbf{X}}_j \rangle(t)$. If this condition is also sufficient for canonical invariance, then the state of the system can be reconstructed from a small number of quantum thermodynamical observables $\langle \hat{\mathbf{X}}_j \rangle(t)$.

The condition for canonical invariance on the unitary part of the evolution taking place on the *adiabats* is as follows: If the Hamiltonian is a linear combination of the operators in the set $\hat{\mathbf{H}}(t) = \sum_{m} h_m \hat{\mathbf{X}}_m$ ($h_m(t)$ are expansion coefficients), and the set forms a closed Lie algebra $[\hat{\mathbf{X}}_j, \hat{\mathbf{X}}_k] = \sum_l C_l^{jk} \hat{\mathbf{X}}_l$, (where C_l^{jk} is the structure factor of the Lie algebra), then the set $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ is closed under the evolution [66]. In addition canonical invariance prevails [67].

As an example for the Otto cycle with a working medium composed from a harmonic oscillator:

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}} = \frac{\hat{\mathbf{P}}^2}{2m} + \frac{m\omega(t)^2}{2}\hat{\mathbf{Q}}^2$$

the set of the operators $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^2$, $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}^2$ and $\hat{\mathbf{D}} = (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}\hat{\mathbf{P}} + \hat{\mathbf{P}}\hat{\mathbf{Q}})$ form a closed Lie algebra. The Hamiltonian can be decomposed into the two first operators of the set $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^2$ and $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}^2$. Therefore canonical invariance will result on the adiabatic branches. On the *iso-chores* this set is also closed to the operation of \mathcal{L}_D . This means that the conditions of canonical invariance are fulfilled for this case [56]. Only two additional variables to the energy are able to completely describe the system even for conditions which are very far from thermal equilibrium.

The significance of canonical invariance is that all thermodynamical quantities become functions of a very limited set of quantum observables $\langle \hat{\mathbf{X}}_j \rangle$. The choice of operators $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_j$ should reflect the most characteristic thermodynamical variables. This is an example of simplicity emerging from complexity.

1.4.4 The quantum tricykle

The minimum requirement for a continuous quantum thermodynamical device is a system connected simultaneously to three reservoirs [68]. These baths are termed hot, cold and work reservoir, as described in Fig. 1.1. A crucial point is that this



Figure 1.3 The quantum tricykle: A quantum heat pump designated by the Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_s$ coupled to a work reservoir with temperature T_w , a hot reservoir with temperature T_h and a cold reservoir with temperature T_c . The heat and work currents are indicated. In steady state $\mathcal{J}_h + \mathcal{J}_c + \mathcal{P} = 0$.

device is nonlinear, combining three currents. A linear device cannot function as a heat engine or a refrigerator [69].

A quantum description requires a representation of the dynamics working medium and the three heat reservoirs. A reduced description is employed in which the dynamics of the working medium is described by the Heisenberg equation for the operator \hat{O} for open systems [60, 70]:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\hat{\mathbf{O}} = \frac{i}{\hbar}[\hat{\mathbf{H}}_s, \hat{\mathbf{O}}] + \frac{\partial\hat{\mathbf{O}}}{\partial t} + \mathcal{L}_h(\hat{\mathbf{O}}) + \mathcal{L}_c(\hat{\mathbf{O}}) + \mathcal{L}_w(\hat{\mathbf{O}}), \qquad (1.9)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_s$ is the system Hamiltonian and \mathcal{L}_g are the dissipative completely positive superoperators for each bath (g = h, c, w). A minimal Hamiltonian describing the essence of the quantum refrigerator is composed of three interacting oscillators:

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{s} = \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{0} + \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{int}
 \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{0} = \hbar\omega_{h}\hat{\mathbf{a}}^{\dagger}\hat{\mathbf{a}} + \hbar\omega_{c}\hat{\mathbf{b}}^{\dagger}\hat{\mathbf{b}} + \hbar\omega_{w}\hat{\mathbf{c}}^{\dagger}\hat{\mathbf{c}}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{int} = \hbar\omega_{int} \left(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^{\dagger}\hat{\mathbf{b}}\hat{\mathbf{c}} + \hat{\mathbf{a}}\hat{\mathbf{b}}^{\dagger}\hat{\mathbf{c}}^{\dagger} \right) .$$

$$(1.10)$$

 $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{int}$ represents an annihilation of excitations on the work and cold bath simultaneous with creating an excitation in the hot bath. $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{int}$ is non linear in contrast to the linear $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_0$. In an open quantum system the superoperators \mathcal{L}_g represent a thermodynamic isothermal partition allowing heat flow from the bath to the system. Such a partition is equivalent to the weak coupling limit between the system and bath where $\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}_s \otimes \hat{\rho}_B$ at all times [6]. The superoperators \mathcal{L}_g are derived from the Hamiltonian:

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}} = \hat{\mathbf{H}}_s + \hat{\mathbf{H}}_h + \hat{\mathbf{H}}_c + \hat{\mathbf{H}}_w + \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{sh} + \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{sc} + \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{sw} , \qquad (1.11)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_g$ are bath Hamiltonians and $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{sg}$ represent system bath coupling. Each of the oscillators is linearly coupled to a heat reservoir for example for the hot bath: $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{sh} = \lambda_{sh}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}\hat{\mathbf{A}}_h^{\dagger} + \hat{\mathbf{a}}^{\dagger}\hat{\mathbf{A}}_h)$. Each reservoir individually equilibrates the working medium to thermal equilibrium with the reservoir temperature. In general, the derivation of a thermodynamically consistent master equation is technically very difficult [71]. Typical problems are approximations that violate the laws of thermodynamics. We therefore require that the master equations fulfil the thermodynamical laws. Under steady state conditions of operation they become:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}_h + \mathcal{J}_c + \mathcal{P} &= 0 \\
-\frac{\mathcal{J}_h}{T_h} - \frac{\mathcal{J}_c}{T_c} - \frac{\mathcal{P}}{T_w} &\geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$
(1.12)

where $\mathcal{J}_k = \langle \mathcal{L}_k(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) \rangle$. The first equality represents conservation of energy (first law) [72, 73], and the second inequality represents positive entropy production in the universe $\Sigma_u \ge 0$ (second law). For refrigeration $T_w \ge T_h \ge T_c$. From the second law the scaling exponent $\alpha \ge 1$ [7].

1.4.5 The III-law of thermodynamics

There exist two seemingly independent formulations of the third law of thermodynamics, both originally stated by Nernst [74, 75, 76]. The first is a purely static (equi-

librium) one, also known as the Nernst heat theorem, and can simply be phrased as follows:

• (a) The entropy of any pure substance in thermodynamic equilibrium approaches zero as the temperature approaches zero.

The second is a dynamical one, known as the unattainability principle:

• (b) It is impossible by any procedure, no matter how idealized, to reduce any assembly to absolute zero temperature in a finite number of operations.

Different studies investigating the relation between the two formulations have led to different answers regarding which of these formulations implies the other, or if neither do.

A more concrete version of the dynamical third law can be expressed as follows:

• No refrigerator can cool a system to absolute zero temperature at finite time.

This formulation enables us to quantify the third law, i.e., evaluating the characteristic exponent χ of the cooling process:

$$\frac{d}{dt}T \propto -T^{\xi} \tag{1.13}$$

for $T \to 0$. Namely, for $\xi \ge 1$ the system is cooled to zero temperature at finite time. The cold bath is modelled either by a system of harmonic oscillators (bosonic bath) or the ideal gas at low density, including the possible Bose-Einstein condensation effect. To check under what conditions the third law is valid, we consider a finite cold bath with the heat capacity $cV(T_c)$ cooled down by the refrigerator with the optimised time-dependent parameter. The equation which describes the cooling process reads:

$$cV(T_c)\frac{d}{dt}T_c = -\mathcal{J}_c \ge 0 \tag{1.14}$$

The third law would be violated if the solution $T_c(t)$ reached zero at finite time. The heat current has the universal structure when $T_c \rightarrow 0$:

$$\mathcal{J}_c = \hbar \omega_c \lambda(\omega_c) \tag{1.15}$$

where $\hbar\omega_c$ is the energy quant of transport and $\lambda(\omega_c)$ the heat conductance rate. The optimal cooling rate is obtained when $\omega_c \propto T_c$ [77, 78]. The ration of $\lambda(T_c)/cV(T_c) \propto T^{\frac{1}{2}}$ when $T_c \to 0$ for a Bose/Fermi gas cold bath. For a phonon bath $\lambda(\omega_c)$ depends on the spectral density. An Ohmic bath has the ratio $\lambda(T_c)/cV(T_c) \propto 1$ which could violate the III-law. This is consistent with the observation that for Ohmic spectral density the system and bath have no ground state.

The analysis of the examples of both the discrete and continuous quantum heat engines shows that a thermodynamical description is valid at the level of a single quantum device. Consistency with thermodynamics has always proven to be correct. Apparent violations of the thermodynamical laws could always be attributed to faulty analysis[27]. Although there have been challenges to this rule [79] we still stand by our statement.

PERSPECTIVE 13

1.5 Perspective

The issue of complexity in dynamical systems is still not resolved. We tried to present a unifying framework based on Kolmogorov's idea of algorithmic complexity. We examined the control task which leads to quantum computing: generating a unitary transformation. If this task was easy, many complex algorithmic problems could be solved in parallel. This indicates that the problem of the quantum compiler is complex. Similar approaches could quantify the complexity of other quantum dyanmical encounteres, where much work should be doene. Once noise is introduced for example in the control fields of coherent control calssical like phenomena emerges. In addition this noise on the controls can make the quantum compiler task uscaleable. Similar external noise will also reduces quantum dynamics into classical like localised states, thus pointing to a route of the emergence of classical phenomena from quantum mechanics.

Finite time thermodynamics emerges naturally from quantum dynamics of open systems. Even a small quantum engine, due to inherent statistical fluctuations behaves like a thermodynamical device. A necessary condition for any quantum device is a non-linear charactercombining at least three energy currents. This is the definition of the quantum thermodynamical tricycle. Quantum network composed from tricycles will display complex dynamics due to this nonlinearity. In a simple analysis of the quantum tricycle we could study the emergence of the III-law of thermodynamics.

1.6 Acknowledgments

I want to thank Peter Salamon, David Tannor, Michael Khasin, Shimshon Kallush, Amikam Levi, Yair Rezek and Tova Feldmann for contributing to this study.

REFERENCES

- 1. A. Kolmogorov. On tables of random numbers. Sankhya Ser. A, 25:369, 1963.
- 2. Ya.G. Sinai. On the notion of entropy of a dynamical system. *Doklady of Russian Academy of Sciences*, 124:768, 1959.
- R. Kosloff and S. A. Rice. The Influence of Quantization on the Onset of Chaos in Hamiltonian Systems: The Kolmogorov Entropy Interpretation. J. Chem. Phys., 74:1340–1349, 1980.
- 4. J. Geusic, E. S. du Bois, R. D. Grasse, and H. Scovil. Quantum equivalent of carnot cycle. *Phys. Rev.*, 156:343, 1967.
- R. Kosloff. A Quantum Mechanical Open System as a Model of a Heat Engine. J. Chem. Phys., 80:1625–1631, 1984.
- Eitan Geva and Ronnie Kosloff. The Quantum Heat Engine and Heat Pump: An Irreversible Thermodynamic Analysis of The Three-Level Amplifier. J. Chem. Phys., 104:7681–7698, 1996.

- 7. Ronnie Kosloff, Eitan Geva and Jeffrey M. Gordon. The quantum refrigerator in quest of the absolute zero. *J. Appl. Phys.*, 87:8093–8097, 2000.
- José P. Palao, Ronnie Kosloff, and Jeffrey M. Gordon. Quantum thermodynamic cooling cycle. *Phys. Rev. E*, 64:056130–8, 2001.
- 9. S. Lloyd. Quantum-mechanical maxwells demon. Phys. Rev. A, 56:3374, 1997.
- J. He, J. Chen and B. Hua. Quantum refrigeration cycles using spin-¹/₂ systems as working substance. *Phys. Rev. E*, 65:036145, 2002.
- 11. C. M. Bender, D. c. Brody, B. K. Meister. Entropy and temperature of a quantum carnot engine. *Proc. Roy. soc. London, A*, 458:1519, 2002.
- 12. T. D. Kieu. The second law, maxwell's demon, and work derivable from quantum heat engines. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 93:140403, 2004.
- 13. A. E. Allahverdyan, R. Balian, and Th. M. Nieuwenhuizen. "maximal work extraction from finite quantum systems". *Eur. Phys. Lett.*, 67:565, 2004.
- 14. D. Segal and A. Nitzan. Molecular heat pump. Phys. Rev. E, 73:026109, 2006.
- P. Bushev, D. Rotter, A. Wilson, F. Dubin, C. Becher, J. Eschner, R. Blatt, V. Steixner, P. Rabl and P. Zoller. Feedback cooling of a single trapped ion. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 96:043003, 2006.
- 16. Dominik Janzing. "on the computational power of molecular heat engines". J. of Stat. Phys., 122:531, 2006.
- 17. E. Boukobza and D. J. Tannor. Three-level systems as amplifiers and attenuators: A thermodynamic analysis. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 98:240601, 2007.
- 18. E. Boukobza and D. J. Tannor. Thermodynamic analysis of quantum light purification. *Phys. Rev. A*, 78:013825, 2008.
- 19. J. Birjukov, T. Jahnke, G. Mahler. Quantum thermodynamic processes: a control theory for machine cycles. *Eur. Phys. J. B*, 64:105, 2008.
- 20. T. Jahnke, J. Birjukov and G. Mahler. On the nature of thermodynamic extremum principles: The case of maximum efficiency and maximum work. *Ann.Phys.*, 17:88, 2008.
- 21. A. E. Allahverdyan, R.S. Johal and G. Mahler. Work extremum principle: Structure and function of quantum heat engines. *Phys. Rev. E*, 77:041118, 2008.
- 22. D. Segal. Vibrational relaxation in the kubo oscillator: Stochastic pumping of heat. J. Chem. Phys., 130:134510, 2009.
- 23. H. Wang, SQ Liu, JZ He. Thermal entanglement in two-atom cavity qed and the entangled quantum otto engine. *Phys. Rev. E*, 79:041113, 2009.
- 24. He JiZhou, He Xian and Tang Wei. "the performance characteristics of an irreversible quantum otto harmonic refrigeration cycle". *Science in China Series G-Phys. Mech. & Ast.*, 52:1317, 2009.
- 25. J. Gemmer, M. Michel and G. Mahler. Quantum Thermodynamics. Springer, 2009.
- 26. Amikam Levy and Ronnie Kosloff. Quantum absorption refrigerator. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 108:070604, 2012.
- 27. Amikam Levy, Robert Alicki, and Ronnie Kosloff. Comment on Cooling by Heating: Refrigeration Powered by Photons". *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 109:248901, 2012.

- 28. N. Linden, S. Popescu, P. Skrzypczyk. "how small can thermal machines be? towards the smallest possible refrigerato". *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 105:130401, 2010.
- 29. M Shapiro and P Brumer. Coherent control of molecular dynamics. *Rep. Prog. Phys.*, 66(6):859, JUN 2003.
- 30. S. A. Rice. New Ideas for guiding the evolution of quantum systems. *Science*, 258(5081):412, OCT 16 1992.
- 31. J. Clark and T. Tarn. On the controllability of quantum-mechanical systems. J. Math. Phys., 24:2608, 1983.
- 32. Q. Chi C. Lan, T. Tarn and J. Clark. Analytic controllability of time-dependent quantum controll systems. *J. Math. Phys.*, 46:052102, 2005.
- 33. V. Ramakrishna and H. Rabitz. Relation between quantum computing and quantum controllability. J. Math. Phys., 54:1715, 1996.
- 34. V. Kazakov D. J. Tannor and V. Orlov. Time dependent quantum molecular dynamics. *NATO Advanced Study Institute, Series B: Physics*, 299:768, 1992.
- 35. R. S. Judson and H. Rabitz. . Phys. Rev. Lett., 68(11):1500, 1992.
- 36. Allon Bartana, Ronnie Kosloff and David J. Tannor. Laser Cooling of Internal Degrees of Freedom. II. J. Chem. Phys., 106:1435–1448, 1997.
- Ronnie Kosloff, Audrey Dell Hammerich, and David Tannor. Excitation Without Demolition: Radiative Excitation of Ground-State Vibration by Impulsive Stimulated Raman Scattering with Damage Control. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 69:2172–2175, 1992.
- S. H. Shi, A. Woody, and H. Rabitz. Optimal-Control of Selective Vibrational-Excitation in Harmonic Linear-Chain Molecules. J. Chem. Phys., 88(11):6870, 1988.
- 39. V. Engel C. Meier and D. J. Tannor. Local control theory: Recent application to energy and particle transfer processes in molecules. *Advances in Chemical Physics, (ed S. A. Rice)*, 141:29, 2009.
- 40. José P. Palao and Ronnie Kosloff. Optimal control theory for unitary transformations. *Phys. Rev. A*, 68:062308, 2003.
- 41. A. Sanjeev and B. Barak. *Computational Complexity: A Modern Approach*. Cambridge, ISBN 978-0-521-42426-4, 2007.
- 42. L. Viola and E. Knill. Robust dynamical decoupling of quantum systems with bounded controls. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 90:037901, 2003.
- L. Viola, E. Knilland S. Lloyd. "dynamical decoupling of open quantum systems". *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 82(12):2417, 1999.
- 44. K. Khodjasteh and D. A. Lidar. Performance of deterministic dynamical decoupling schemes: Concatenated and periodic pulse sequences. *Phys. Rev. A*, 75(6), JUN 2007.
- 45. Michael Khasin and Ronnie Kosloff. Noise and controllability: Suppression of controllability in large quantum systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 106:123002, 2011.
- 46. Michael Khasin and Ronnie Kosloff. The globally stable solution of a stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation. J. Phys. A: Math. Gen., 41:365203, 2008.
- 47. S. Kallush and R. Kosloff. Scaling the robustness of the solutions for quantum controllable problems. *Phys. Rev. A*, 83:063412, 2011.
- Shimshon Kallush and Ronnie Kosloff. Mutual influence of locality and chaotic dynamics on quantum controllability. *Phys. Rev. A*, 85:013420, 2012.

- 49. S. Carnot. Réflections sur la Puissance Motrice du Feu et sur les Machines propres à Développer cette Puissance. Bachelier, Paris, 1824.
- A. Einstein. "über einen die erzeugung und verwandlung des lichtes betreffenden heuristischen gesichtspunkt (on a heuristic viewpoint concerning the production and transformation of light)". Annalen der Physik, 17:132, 1905.
- 51. F.L. Curzon and B. Ahlborn. Efficiency of a carnot engine at maximum power output. *Am. J. Phys.*, 43:22, 1975.
- 52. P. Salamon, J.D. Nulton, G. Siragusa, T.R. Andersen and A. Limon. Principles of control thermodynamics. *Energy*, 26:307, 2001.
- Eitan Geva and Ronnie Kosloff. A Quantum Mechanical Heat Engine Operating in Finite Time. A Model Consisting of Spin *half* Systems as The Working Fluid. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 96:3054–3067, 1992.
- Tova Feldmann, Eitan Geva, Ronnie Kosloff and Peter Salamon. Heat Engines in Finite Time Governed by Master Equations. *Am. J. Phys.*, 64:485–492, 1996.
- 55. Tova Feldmann and Ronnie Kosloff. The Quantum Four Stroke Heat Engine: Thermodynamic Observables in a Model with Intrinsic Friction. *Phys. Rev. E*, 68:016101, 2003.
- Yair Rezek, Ronnie Kosloff. Irreversible performance of a quantum harmonic heat engine. New J. Phys., 8:83, 2006.
- 57. Nicolaus August Otto. http://www.loreley.de/otto-museum/ Patent No 365,701 Germany, 1887.
- Ronnie Kosloff and Tova Feldmann. A Discrete Four Stroke Quantum Heat Engine Exploring the Origin of Friction. *Phys. Rev. E*, 65:055102 1–4, 2002.
- 59. J. von Neumann. *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*. Princeton U. P., Princeton, 1955.
- 60. G. Lindblad. On the generators of quantum dynamical semigroups. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 48:119, 1976.
- 61. H. Spohn and J.L. Lebowitz. Irreversible thermodynamics for quantum systems weakly coupled to thermal reservoirs. *Adv. Chem. Phys.*, 38:109, 1979.
- 62. E. T. Janes. Information theory and statistical mechanics. Phys. Rev., 106:620, 1957.
- 63. E. T. Janes. Information theory and statistical mechanics. ii. Phys. Rev., 108:171, 1957.
- 64. R. Alicki and K. Lendi. *Quantum Dynamical Semigroups and Applications* . Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
- K. E. Shuler H. C. Andersen, I. Oppenheim and H. H. Weiss. Exact conditions for the preservation of a canonical distribution in markovian relaxation processes. *J. Math. Phys.*, 5:522, 1964.
- 66. J. Wei and E. Norman. On global representations of the solutions of linear differential equations as a product of exponentials. *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.*, 15:327, 1963.
- 67. Y. Alhassid, R.D. Levine. Exact conditions for the preservation of a canonical distribution in markovian relaxation processes. *Phys. Rev. A*, 18:89, 1978.
- 68. Bjarne Andresen, Peter Salamon, and R. Stephen Berry. "thermodynamics in finite time". "*Physics Today*", 37:9:62, 1984.
- 69. E. A. Martinez and J. P. Paz. Dynamics and thermodynamics of linear quantum open systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 10, 2012.

- 70. H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione. Open quantum systems. Oxford university press, 2002.
- 71. D. Lidar R. Alicki and P. Zanardi. Conditions for strictly purity-decreasing quantum markovian dynamics. *Phys. Rev. A*, 73:052311, 2006.
- 72. H. Spohn and J. Lebowitz. Irreversible thermodynamics for quantum systems weakly coupled to thermal reservoirs. *Adv. Chem. Phys.*, 109:38, 1978.
- 73. R. Alicki. Quantum open system as a model of the heat engine. J. Phys A: Math.Gen., 12:L103, 1979.
- 74. W. Nernst. Ueber die Berechnung chemischer Gleichgewichte aus thermischen Messungen. *Nachr. Kgl. Ges. Wiss. Gött.*, 1:40, 1906.
- 75. W. Nernst. The theoretical and experimental bases of the New Heat Theorem Ger., Die theoretischen und experimentellen Grundlagen des neuen Warmesatzes. W. Knapp, Halle, 1918.
- 76. P. T. Landsberg. A comment on nernst's theorem. J. Phys A: Math.Gen., 22:139, 1989.
- 77. Yair Rezek, Peter Salamon, Karl Heinz Hoffmann and Ronnie Kosloff. The quantum refrigerator: The quest for the absolute zero. *Euro. Phys. Lett.*, 85:30008, 2009.
- 78. Amikam Levy, Robert Alicki, and Ronnie Kosloff. Quantum refrigerators and the third law of thermodynamics. *Phys. Rev. E*, 85:061126, 2012.
- 79. Michal Kolar, David Gelbwaser-Klimovsky, Robert Alicki and Gershon Kurizki. Quantum bath refrigeration towards absolute zero: unattainability principle challenged. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 108:090601, 2012.