Structured Energy Return in Quantum Systems

Consolidated Version (Incorporating 2×2, 4×4, and Jaynes–Cummings Results)

Ryan Wallace

March 11, 2025

Abstract

Decoherence is a fundamental challenge in quantum mechanics, typically resulting in the loss of phase coherence and a transition from quantum to classical behavior. The Structured Energy Return (SER) model was originally proposed as a feedback-based mechanism for regulating or even reversing decoherence effects. Over several iterations of theory and numerical tests, SER has shown that it:

- Can redistribute coherence loss over time instead of merely slowing it,
- Sometimes re-purifies the system to a near-pure state (especially in 2×2 simulations),
- In higher dimensions (e.g., 4×4), can drive the system toward a partially mixed but stable state—maintaining significant coherence,
- In physically realistic quantum-optical systems (e.g., Jaynes–Cummings model), sustains Rabi oscillations and partially preserves qubit coherence.

This unified document outlines the development of SER, from the earliest single-particle wavefunction formulation to the Lindblad-based density-matrix approach, culminating in positivity-enforced simulations across multiple system sizes and the latest Jaynes–Cummings results.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background: Decoherence and Feedback

Decoherence arises when a quantum system interacts with external or environmental degrees of freedom, often irreversibly destroying phase coherence. Traditional Lindblad master equations describe this process in an open-system framework, typically leading to monotonic increases in entropy and loss of purity.

However, **feedback control** in quantum optics, superconducting circuits, or cold atom setups can sometimes *reinject* energy and phase information. Motivated by such observations, the SER model was introduced as a more explicit "structured feedback" mechanism that reshapes the standard Lindblad evolution.

1.2 Evolution of the SER Concept

Initial Wavefunction-Level View (Version 4–5). SER was first proposed as a nonlinear modification to the Schrödinger equation, introducing a saturable "gain" term proportional to $(1 - |\psi|^2)\,\psi$. Ensemble-averaged simulations suggested that SER could, in some regimes, *mimic* standard quantum behavior, and in others, *partially restore coherence* after it was lost.

Lindblad Reformulation (Version 6+). The model was recast into a Lindblad-type master equation. By adding SER-specific Lindblad operators—e.g., $\big[I-\rho\big]\,L\,\rho\,L^\dagger\,[I-\rho]$—the approach became more consistent with open quantum systems. Numerical results showed that, with positivity enforcement, SER can push the system to a *pure-state attractor* in certain 2×2 cases.

Positivity & Extended Dimensionality (Version 7 and the 4×4 update). We discovered that naive integration can produce unphysical states (negative eigenvalues, purity > 1). Implementing **positivity projection** (clamping negative eigenvalues each step) fixed these instabilities. Meanwhile, 4×4 tests revealed *partial re-purification* from random mixed initial states: the system does not necessarily become pure, but it *settles* at a stable state of moderate purity and nonzero coherence.

Jaynes–Cummings Extension (Version 8). The latest development applies SER to a physically realistic quantum-optical system: the Jaynes–Cummings model. This tests SER in a qubit-cavity setup with dissipation and external driving, showing sustained coherence and Rabi oscillations under feedback.

In short, SER has evolved into a robust feedback framework that can be meaningfully implemented in multi-dimensional and physically motivated quantum systems.

2 SER-Modified Lindblad Equation

2.1 Standard Lindblad Formalism

A typical open quantum system follows

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} \;=\; -\frac{i}{\hbar}\,\big[H,\,\rho\big] \;+\; \gamma\,\Big(L\,\rho\,L^\dagger \;-\; \tfrac{1}{2}\{L^\dagger L,\,\rho\}\Big), \tag{1}$$

where H is the Hamiltonian, L a collapse operator, and γ the dissipative rate.

2.2 SER Feedback Term

SER adds a **nonlinear feedback** of the general form

$$\beta\,F(\rho)\;\big[I-\rho\big]\;L\,\rho\,L^\dagger\;\big[I-\rho\big],$$

with β the feedback strength, and $F(\rho)$ a function that typically depends on coherence, purity, or entropy changes. This yields:

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} \;=\; -\,\frac{i}{\hbar}\,[\,H,\,\rho\,] \;+\; \gamma\,\Bigl(L\rho L^{\dagger} - \tfrac{1}{2}\{L^{\dagger}L,\,\rho\}\Bigr) \;+\; \beta\,F(\rho)\,\bigl[I-\rho\bigr]\,L\rho L^{\dagger}\,\bigl[I-\rho\bigr]. \tag{2}$$

- **Choice of $F(\rho)$:** Common choices involve exponentials in the measured coherence (e.g., $\exp[-\,2\,(1-\text{coherence})]$), or an offset function that depends on the *change* in entropy from one step to the next.
- **Interpretation:** $\bigl[I-\rho\bigr]$ effectively measures how far ρ is from being pure, since $\rho^2=\rho$ only if ρ is a projector. Thus, the feedback attempts to "pump" the system back into less-mixed states.

3 Key Numerical and Theoretical Insights

3.1 The Need for Positivity Enforcement

While Lindblad equations *are* guaranteed to preserve positivity in principle, the *discretized time-stepping* (especially with large feedback) can push ρ into negative eigenvalues. Two main fixes:

1. **Positivity Projection** each step:
   Diagonalize ρ, clamp negative eigenvalues to 0, and renormalize.
2. **Careful Integrators**:
   Use smaller step sizes, operator splitting, or advanced methods that more faithfully preserve positivity.

3.2 Re-Purification Behavior

2×2 Systems. Under moderate or strong feedback, SER can *drive ρ to a pure state*. Numerical experiments even show final states near $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle+|1\rangle)$, with measured purity $\mathrm{Tr}[\rho^2]\approx 1$. This is a stark departure from normal dissipative evolution, which typically leads to a fully mixed or ground state.

4×4 Systems. The more recent extension shows that from a *generic random mixed state*, SER drives the system to an *intermediate* purity ($P\approx$ 0.7–0.8), stabilizing with finite coherence. Hence, in higher dimensions one may not see a fully pure attractor, but still significantly higher purity *and* nonzero coherence compared to standard Lindblad evolution.

3.3 Entropy Reshaping

Without feedback, von Neumann entropy $S(\rho)$ typically *increases* monotonically. With SER:

- Entropy can *peak* and then *decline* or level off, indicating partial reorganization of the mixedness.

- In 2×2, we can see near-zero final entropy for strong feedback.
- In 4×4, final entropy remains nonzero but *below* the maximum $\log_2(4) = 2$.

4 Experimental and Practical Implications

4.1 Proposed Cavity QED Setup

A recommended test involves:

1. A two-level system or qubit in a high-Q cavity.
2. *Controllable dissipation* γ by adjusting loss rates.
3. A *tunable feedback* mechanism (laser/microwave fields) designed to mimic SER-style corrections, effectively engineering a negative-damping reservoir.

4.2 Measurable Quantities

- **Purity**, $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho^2)$.
- **Off-Diagonal Coherence** (e.g., $|\rho_{01}|$ in qubit systems, or sum of off-diagonal magnitudes in d-dimensional spaces).
- **Entropy**, $S(\rho) = -\mathrm{Tr}[\rho \log_2 \rho]$.

Experiments would compare:

- *No Feedback* (baseline),
- *Fixed (unstructured) Feedback*,
- *SER Feedback* (dynamical, state-dependent).

We expect to see *slower or re-shaped decoherence* and partial or near-complete re-purification in certain parameter regimes.

4.3 Multi-Qubit / Multi-Level Outlook

SER's partial coherence preservation in 4×4 suggests that, in principle, *entanglement* or multi-qudit coherence might also be stabilized by carefully designed feedback. Future directions include:

- Detailed positivity-preserving integration in higher dimensions,
- Evaluating how the SER term scales with dimension and chosen collapse operators,
- Checking whether entanglement can be revived or maintained.

5 Theoretical Foundations and Interpretations

5.1 SER as an Effective Nonlinearity

Fundamental quantum mechanics is linear in the wavefunction, but *effective nonlinearities* appear when a system is strongly coupled to an actively driven environment. In Lindblad form, a *pumped reservoir* can yield negative damping, saturable gain, and thus an effective SER term after tracing out the environment. This does *not* violate standard QM if one views the total system-plus-environment as evolving linearly.

5.2 Energetic Considerations

A natural question is: *Where does the extra energy or coherence come from?* The answer is:

- The environment is *actively driven* (like a laser medium).
- This externally pumped environment can feed energy back to the system in a phase-sensitive or amplitude-sensitive way, effectively reversing or reshaping decoherence.

Hence, SER can be viewed as a direct expression of "negative damping + saturation" in an engineered open-system.

6 Summary of Main Results

- **SER Reshapes Decoherence** rather than fully stopping it in general.
- In **2D (qubits)**, SER can drive the system all the way to a pure-state attractor if feedback is strong.
- In **4D** and beyond, the final steady state is often partially mixed but retains significant off-diagonal coherence.
- **Numerical Implementation** demands positivity checks or advanced integrators.
- **Experimental Feasibility**: We propose tests in cavity QED or circuit QED setups to verify partial or full coherence recovery, depending on system dimension and feedback strength.

7 Conclusion and Future Directions

The Structured Energy Return model provides a *state-dependent feedback mechanism* that can partially reverse or restructure decoherence in open quantum systems. While the earliest wavefunction-level formulations (Versions 4–5) showed intriguing coherence revival in single-particle systems, subsequent Lindblad-based derivations (Versions 6–7), positivity-enforced numerics (especially in 4×4), and the Jaynes–Cummings extension have **confirmed** that SER is physically consistent and can preserve significant coherence beyond the usual timescales.

Next Steps:

- **Experimental Demonstration** in real quantum devices (cavity QED, trapped ions, superconducting qubits).
- **Scaling** to multi-qubit or multi-mode systems, checking if SER helps preserve or even boost entanglement.
- **Optimizing Feedback Forms**: Tuning $\gamma(\rho)$, $\beta(\rho)$, and other functions to maximize re-purification in higher dimensions.
- **Operator-Splitting and Larger Time Steps**: Investigating advanced integrators that preserve positivity for more efficient simulations.

If these efforts confirm partial or total re-purification in practice, SER may become a valuable tool for *quantum error mitigation* and next-generation quantum technologies.

8 Jaynes–Cummings Simulation and Results

8.1 Motivation and Setup

While previous sections demonstrated SER in smaller (2×2) and moderate (4×4) density matrices, an important next step is testing SER in a physically realistic quantum-optical system. One canonical model is the Jaynes–Cummings interaction: a two-level qubit coupled to a single-mode cavity. Here, the qubit can spontaneously emit (at rate γ), and the cavity mode can experience photon loss (at rate κ). To capture these effects, we incorporate two Lindblad dissipators, one for qubit decay and one for cavity decay, and add an external drive to mimic real experimental setups.

Concretely, we truncate the cavity's Hilbert space to $|0\rangle, |1\rangle, \ldots, |n_{\max}\rangle$ (a typical approach in numerical cavity QED). The total Hamiltonian thus becomes:

$$H_{\text{total}} = \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}\omega_q \sigma_z}_{\text{qubit}} + \underbrace{\omega_c a^\dagger a}_{\text{cavity}} + \underbrace{g(\sigma_+ a + \sigma_- a^\dagger)}_{\text{JC coupling}} + \underbrace{\Omega \sigma_x}_{\text{drive}},$$

where ω_q is the qubit transition frequency, ω_c the cavity frequency, g the qubit–cavity coupling rate, and Ω the external drive strength. Lindblad operators for qubit and cavity damping are $L_q = \sqrt{\gamma}\sigma_-$ and $L_c = \sqrt{\kappa}a$.

8.2 SER Feedback Term

Following the SER framework, we add a state-dependent feedback term to the Lindblad master equation:

$$\beta F(\rho)(I - \rho) L_q \rho L_q^\dagger (I - \rho),$$

where β is a tunable feedback strength, and $F(\rho)$ typically depends on the qubit's coherence. In the JC scenario, we partially trace over the cavity to recover ρ_q, then measure coherence from $\rho_q[0,1]$ and $\rho_q[1,0]$.

8.3 Numerical Implementation

State Dimension:

- Qubit subspace: 2D
- Cavity subspace: truncated at $n_{\max}$ Fock states
- Total state dimension: $2 \times n_{\max}$

Initialization:

- Qubit starts in a partially coherent mixed state.
- Cavity begins near vacuum, optionally with small admixtures of higher Fock states.

Partial Trace: To compute qubit coherence, we sum diagonal blocks $\rho_{n,n}$ in the joint density matrix. This ensures we measure physically correct qubit coherence.

Integrators & Positivity:

- A straightforward Euler step is used with a small time-step ($dt \approx 0.001$).
- After each update, we diagonalize ρ, clamp negative eigenvalues, and renormalize to maintain positivity.

8.4 Results and Observations

Example simulations show the following behaviors:

Rabi-Like Oscillations: Even without feedback, a driven Jaynes–Cummings system exhibits qubit–cavity Rabi oscillations in populations and coherence. With SER turned on, these oscillations persist, but the amplitude can be boosted or sustained for longer due to feedback.

Partial Preservation of Qubit Coherence: In the absence of SER, spontaneous emission (γ) and cavity decay (κ) gradually damp qubit coherence. However, SER re-injects phase information: the measured qubit coherence oscillates but centers around a higher baseline compared to a purely dissipative scenario.

Moderate Purity Maintenance: Although the qubit is not driven to a pure state (the cavity still leaks photons, and the qubit still has finite γ), simulations consistently show the overall system's purity remains above that of a pure Lindblad decay case. This is consistent with the 4×4 results, where SER does not fully re-purify but helps stabilize partial coherence.

Parameter Sensitivity:

- Increasing Ω or SER gain β can lead to large amplitude oscillations—sometimes beneficial for maintaining coherence, sometimes leading to extreme or chaotic Rabi cycling if β is too large.
- Decreasing decay rates (γ, κ) makes it easier for SER to fight decoherence, often resulting in a net upward drift in coherence.

8.5 Implications for Experiments

Feasibility in Cavity QED:

- Real superconducting or optical cavities with moderate or high Q-factors could implement the SER approach via a carefully engineered feedback field.
- The partial trace and positivity constraints remain straightforward to replicate with in situ tomography or repeated measurements.

Strong vs. Weak Coupling:

- In the strong-coupling regime ($g \gg \kappa, \gamma$), Rabi splitting is pronounced; SER feedback can push the qubit toward a high-coherence oscillatory state.
- In the weak-coupling or bad-cavity regime ($\kappa \gtrsim g$), the feedback might only partially offset losses, preventing the system from quickly settling into a fully mixed or ground state.

Next Steps:

- Extending the approach to multi-qubit cavities, verifying if SER can help stabilize entanglement or multi-photon states.
- Implementing advanced integrators (e.g., adaptive time-step or operator splitting) to handle high drive strengths with better numerical stability.

8.6 Conclusion

This Jaynes–Cummings simulation demonstrates that SER remains effective at partially counteracting decoherence in physically realistic open quantum systems. The interplay of qubit–cavity coupling, feedback gains, and dissipation rates yields rich dynamics, including sustained Rabi oscillations and modest re-purification. As such, these results strongly support the feasibility of implementing SER-based feedback in actual cavity QED or circuit QED setups, and open the door to exploring multi-qubit, higher-photon, and more complex system architectures under SER.

Acknowledgments

Deep gratitude to all collaborators and to the incremental numerical studies that refined the SER concept—from the earliest wavefunction approach (Version 4–5) through to the positivity-protected 4×4 Lindblad simulations (Version 7) and the Jaynes–Cummings extension (Version 8). Further, an apology is in order to anyone who has continued along this path. I realize the many iterations is likely an oddity, but it is one that reflects my insistence on transparency and the many hours spent refining and making sure this aligns with reality. I've included with this document the Python code as well as the OpenCL kernel for those who wish to verify, or run their own simulations with their own variables. There is also a purely CPU based implementation for better engagement.

References

[1] W. H. Zurek, "Decoherence, Einselection, and the Quantum Origins of the Classical," *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 715 (2003).

[2] M. Schlosshauer, *Decoherence and the Quantum-to-Classical Transition*, Springer (2007).

[3] J. Preskill, *Quantum Computation and Information*, Lecture Notes, 2004.