Bath Observables with HOPS

Energy Flow in Strongly Coupled Open Quantum Systems

Valentin Boettcher, Richard Hartmann, Konstantin Beyer, Walter Strunz

Institute for Theoretical Physics, Dresden, Germany

17.08.2022

TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT DRESDEN

Situation

Consider an open quantum system

$$H = \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{S}}}_{\text{"small"}} + \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{I}}}_{?} + \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{B}}}_{\text{"big", simple}} \tag{1}$$

with $[H_S, H_B] = 0$.

[1] Rivas, "Strong Coupling Thermodynamics of Open Quantum Systems"; Talkner and Hnggi, "Colloquium: Statistical mechanics and thermodynamics at strong coupling: Quantum and classical".

Situation

Consider an open quantum system

$$H = \underbrace{H_\mathrm{S}}_{\text{"small"}} + \underbrace{H_\mathrm{I}}_{?} + \underbrace{H_\mathrm{B}}_{\text{"big", simple}} \tag{1}$$

with $[H_S, H_B] = 0$.

- weak coupling $H_\mathrm{I} \approx 0$ thermodynamics of open systems are somewhat understood[1]

[1] Rivas, "Strong Coupling Thermodynamics of Open Quantum Systems"; Talkner and Hnggi, "Colloquium: Statistical mechanics and thermodynamics at strong coupling: Quantum and classical".

Situation

Consider an open quantum system

$$H = \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{S}}}_{\text{"small"}} + \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{I}}}_{?} + \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{B}}}_{\text{"big", simple}} \tag{1}$$

with $[H_S, H_B] = 0$.

- weak coupling $H_{\mathrm{I}} \approx 0$ thermodynamics of open systems are somewhat understood[1]
- strong coupling: $\langle H_{\mathrm{I}} \rangle \sim \langle H_{\mathrm{S}} \rangle \implies$ we can't neglect the interaction $\implies$ thermodynamics?

[1] Rivas, "Strong Coupling Thermodynamics of Open Quantum Systems"; Talkner and Hnggi, "Colloquium: Statistical mechanics and thermodynamics at strong coupling: Quantum and classical".

Situation

Consider an open quantum system

$$H = \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{S}}}_{\text{"small"}} + \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{I}}}_{?} + \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{B}}}_{\text{"big", simple}} \tag{1}$$

with $[H_S, H_B] = 0$.

- weak coupling $H_{\mathrm{I}} \approx 0$ thermodynamics of open systems are somewhat understood[1]
- strong coupling: $\langle H_{\mathrm{I}} \rangle \sim \langle H_{\mathrm{S}} \rangle \implies$ we can't neglect the interaction $\implies$ thermodynamics?
- but what is clear: *need to get access to exact dynamics of* $H_{\mathrm{I}}, H_{\mathrm{B}}$

[1] Rivas, "Strong Coupling Thermodynamics of Open Quantum Systems"; Talkner and Hnggi, "Colloquium: Statistical mechanics and thermodynamics at strong coupling: Quantum and classical".

Is that possible?

Is that possible? Yes.

Is that possible? Yes.
Using HOPS :)

Is that possible? Yes.
Using HOPS :)

Sneak Peek

We will be able to calculate $\frac{\mathrm{d}\langle H_{\mathrm{B}}\rangle}{\mathrm{d}t}$ (and $\langle H_{\mathrm{I}}\rangle$).

- more general: $O_{\mathrm{S}} \otimes (B^a)^\dagger B^b$ with $B = \sum_\lambda g_\lambda a_\lambda$

Is that possible? Yes. Using HOPS :)

Sneak Peek

We will be able to calculate $\frac{\mathrm{d}\langle H_{\mathrm{B}}\rangle}{\mathrm{d}t}$ (and $\langle H_{\mathrm{I}}\rangle$).

- more general: $O_{\mathrm{S}} \otimes (B^a)^\dagger B^b$ with $B = \sum_\lambda g_\lambda a_\lambda$

- won't call this *heat-flow* because it isn't *the* thermodynamic heat flow

Is that possible? Yes. Using HOPS :)

Sneak Peek

We will be able to calculate $\frac{\mathrm{d}\langle H_{\mathrm{B}}\rangle}{\mathrm{d}t}$ (and $\langle H_{\mathrm{I}}\rangle$).

- more general: $O_{\mathrm{S}} \otimes (B^a)^\dagger B^b$ with $B = \sum_\lambda g_\lambda a_\lambda$

- won't call this *heat-flow* because it isn't *the* thermodynamic heat flow
- nevertheless: may be interesting *qualitative* measure for energy flow

Standard Model of Open Systems

In the following we will work with models of the form[2]

$$H = H_{\mathrm{S}}(t) + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left[H_{\mathrm{B}}^{(n)} + \left(L_n^{\dagger}(t) B_n + \mathrm{h.c.} \right) \right], \tag{2}$$

where

- H_{S} is the System Hamiltonian
- $H_B^{(n)} = \sum_\lambda \omega_\lambda^{(n)} a_\lambda^{(n),\dagger} a_\lambda^{(n)}$
- $B_n = \sum_\lambda g_\lambda^{(n)} a_\lambda^{(n)}$.

[2]Sometimes this is called the "Standard Model of Open Systems".

What remains of the Bath?

Bath Correlation Function

$$\alpha(t-s) = \langle B(t)B(s)\rangle \left(\overset{T=0}{=} \sum_\lambda |g_\lambda|^2 \, \mathrm{e}^{-i\omega_\lambda (t-s)}\right) = \frac{1}{\pi}\int J(\omega)\mathrm{e}^{-i\omega t}\,\mathrm{d}\omega$$

What remains of the Bath?

Bath Correlation Function

$$\alpha(t-s) = \langle B(t)B(s)\rangle \left(\overset{T=0}{=} \sum_\lambda |g_\lambda|^2 \, \mathrm{e}^{-i\omega_\lambda(t-s)} \right) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int J(\omega) \mathrm{e}^{-i\omega t} \, \mathrm{d}\omega$$

Spectral Density

$$J(\omega) = \pi \sum_\lambda |g_\lambda|^2 \delta(\omega - \omega_\lambda)$$

- in thermodynamic limit $\rightarrow$ smooth function
- here usually: Ohmic SD $J(\omega) = \eta\omega \mathrm{e}^{-\omega/\omega_c}$ (think phonons)

NMQSD (Zero Temperature)

Open system dynamics formulated as a *stochastic* differential equation:

$$\partial_t \psi_t(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^*) = -iH(t)\psi_t(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^*) + \mathbf{L}\cdot\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^*\psi_t(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^*) - \sum_{n=1}^{N} L_n^\dagger(t)\int_0^t \mathrm{d}s\,\alpha_n(t-s)\frac{\delta\psi_t(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^*)}{\delta\eta_n^*(s)}, \tag{3}$$

with

$$\mathcal{M}(\eta_n(t)) = 0, \quad \mathcal{M}(\eta_n(t)\eta_m(s)) = 0, \quad \mathcal{M}(\eta_n(t)\eta_m(s)^*) = \delta_{nm}\alpha_n(t-s), \tag{4}$$

by projecting on coherent bath states.[3]

[3] For details see: Disi, Gisin, and W. T. Strunz, "Non-Markovian quantum state diffusion"

HOPS

Using $\alpha_n(\tau) = \sum_\mu^{M_n} G_\mu^{(n)} \mathrm{e}^{-W_\mu^{(n)}\tau}$ we define

$$D_\mu^{(n)}(t) \equiv \int_0^t \mathrm{d}s\, G_\mu^{(n)} \mathrm{e}^{-W_\mu^{(n)}(t-s)} \frac{\delta}{\delta\eta_n^*(s)} \tag{5}$$

and $D^{\underline{\mathbf{k}}} \equiv \prod_{n=1}^N \prod_{\mu=1}^{M_n} \sqrt{\frac{\underline{\mathbf{k}}_{n,\mu}!}{\left(G_\mu^{(n)}\right)^{\underline{\mathbf{k}}_{n,\mu}}}} \frac{1}{i^{\underline{\mathbf{k}}_{n,\mu}}} \left(D_\mu^{(n)}\right)^{\underline{\mathbf{k}}_{n,\mu}}$, $\psi_t^{\underline{\mathbf{k}}} \equiv D^{\underline{\mathbf{k}}}\psi_t$ we find

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\psi}_t^{\underline{\mathbf{k}}} = &\left[-iH_\mathrm{S}(t) + \mathbf{L}(t)\cdot\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^* - \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{\mu=1}^{M_n} \underline{\mathbf{k}}_{n,\mu} W_\mu^{(n)}\right]\psi_t^{\underline{\mathbf{k}}} \\ &+ i\sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{\mu=1}^{M_n} \sqrt{G_\mu^{(n)}} \left[\sqrt{\underline{\mathbf{k}}_{n,\mu}} L_n(t) \psi_t^{\underline{\mathbf{k}}-\underline{\mathbf{e}}_{n,\mu}} + \sqrt{\left(\underline{\mathbf{k}}_{n,\mu}+1\right)} L_n^\dagger(t) \psi_t^{\underline{\mathbf{k}}+\underline{\mathbf{e}}_{n,\mu}}\right].\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Zero Temperature, One Bath, Linear NMQSD

We want to calculate

$$J = -\frac{\mathrm{d}\left\langle H_{\mathrm{B}}\right\rangle}{\mathrm{d}t} = \left\langle L^\dagger \partial_t B(t) + L \partial_t B^\dagger(t)\right\rangle_{\mathrm{I}}. \tag{7}$$

Zero Temperature, One Bath, Linear NMQSD

We want to calculate

$$J = -\frac{\mathrm{d}\left\langle H_{\mathrm{B}}\right\rangle}{\mathrm{d}t} = \left\langle L^\dagger \partial_t B(t) + L \partial_t B^\dagger(t)\right\rangle_{\mathrm{I}}. \tag{7}$$

...some manipulations ...

Zero Temperature, One Bath, Linear NMQSD

We want to calculate

$$J = -\frac{\mathrm{d}\langle H_{\mathrm{B}}\rangle}{\mathrm{d}t} = \left\langle L^\dagger \partial_t B(t) + L \partial_t B^\dagger(t) \right\rangle_{\mathrm{I}} . \tag{7}$$

...some manipulations ...

Result (NMQSD)

$$J(t) = -i \mathcal{M}_{\eta^*} \langle \psi(\eta, t)| \, L^\dagger \dot{D}_t \, |\psi(\eta^*, t)\rangle + \mathrm{c.c.} \tag{8}$$

with $\dot{D}_t = \int_0^t \mathrm{d}s \, \dot{\alpha}(t-s) \frac{\delta}{\delta \eta_s^*}$.

Zero Temperature, One Bath, Linear NMQSD

We want to calculate

$$J = -\frac{\mathrm{d}\langle H_\mathrm{B}\rangle}{\mathrm{d}t} = \left\langle L^\dagger \partial_t B(t) + L\partial_t B^\dagger(t)\right\rangle_\mathrm{I}. \tag{7}$$

...some manipulations ...

Result (NMQSD)

$$J(t) = -i\mathcal{M}_{\eta^*} \langle\psi(\eta,t)|\, L^\dagger \dot{D}_t \,|\psi(\eta^*,t)\rangle + \mathrm{c.c.} \tag{8}$$

with $\dot{D}_t = \int_0^t \mathrm{d}s\, \dot{\alpha}(t-s)\frac{\delta}{\delta\eta^*_s}$.

Result (HOPS)

$$J(t) = -\sum_\mu \sqrt{G_\mu} W_\mu \mathcal{M}_{\eta^*} \left\langle\psi^{(0)}(\eta,t)\right|\, L^\dagger \,\left|\psi^{\mathbf{e}_\mu}(\eta^*,t)\right\rangle + \mathrm{c.c.} \tag{9}$$

Generalizations

Finite Temperature

$$J(t) = J_0(t) + \left[\langle L^\dagger \partial_t \xi(t)\rangle + \text{c.c.}\right] \tag{10}$$

with $\mathcal{M}(\xi(t)) = 0 = \mathcal{M}(\xi(t)\xi(s))$, $\mathcal{M}\left(\xi(t)\xi^*(s)\right) = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}\omega \bar{n}(\beta\omega) J(\omega) e^{-\mathrm{i}\omega(t-s)}$ and $J(\omega) = \pi \sum_\lambda |g_\lambda|^2 \delta(w - \omega_\lambda)$.[4]

- nonlinear NMQSD/HOPS
- multiple baths straight forward
- interaction energy: "removing the dot"...
- general "collective" bath observables $O_\mathrm{S} \otimes (B^a)^\dagger B^b$ with $B = \sum_\lambda g_\lambda a_\lambda$

[4] $\partial_t \xi(t)$ exists if correlation function is smooth

Is this any good?

Model

$$H = \frac{\Omega}{4}(p^2 + q^2) + \frac{1}{2} q \sum_{\lambda} \left(g_{\lambda}^{*} b_{\lambda} + g_{\lambda} b_{\lambda}^{\dagger} \right) + \sum_{\lambda} \omega_{\lambda} b_{\lambda}^{\dagger} b_{\lambda}, \tag{11}$$

Model

$$H = \frac{\Omega}{4}(p^2 + q^2) + \frac{1}{2} q \sum_\lambda \left(g_\lambda^* b_\lambda + g_\lambda b_\lambda^\dagger \right) + \sum_\lambda \omega_\lambda b_\lambda^\dagger b_\lambda, \tag{11}$$

...leading to ...

$$\dot{q} = \Omega p \tag{12}$$

$$\dot{p} = -\Omega q - \int_0^t \Im[\alpha_0(t-s)] q(s)\, \mathrm{d}s + W(t) \tag{13}$$

$$\dot{b}_\lambda = -i g_\lambda \frac{q}{2} - i\omega_\lambda b_\lambda \tag{14}$$

with the operator noise $W(t) = -\sum_\lambda \left(g_\lambda^* b_\lambda(0) \mathrm{e}^{-i\omega_\lambda t} + g_\lambda b_\lambda^\dagger(0) \mathrm{e}^{i\omega_\lambda t} \right)$, $\langle W(t) W(s) \rangle = \alpha(t-s)$ and $\alpha_0 \equiv \alpha\big|_{T=0}$.

Solution through a matrix $G(t)$ with $G(0) = \mathbb{1}$ and

$$\dot{G}(t) = AG(t) - \int_0^t K(t-s)G(s)\,\mathrm{d}s\,, \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Omega \\ -\Omega & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad K(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \Im[\alpha_0(t)] & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{15}$$

Solution through a matrix $G(t)$ with $G(0) = \mathbb{1}$ and

$$\dot{G}(t) = AG(t) - \int_0^t K(t-s)G(s)\,\mathrm{d}s\,, \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Omega \\ -\Omega & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad K(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \Im[\alpha_0(t)] & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{15}$$

Then

$$\begin{pmatrix} q(t) \\ p(t) \end{pmatrix} = G(t)\begin{pmatrix} q(0) \\ p(0) \end{pmatrix} + \int_0^t G(t-s)\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ W(s) \end{pmatrix} \mathrm{d}s\,. \tag{16}$$

- “exact” solution via laplace transform and BCF expansion + residue theorem

Result

Solution

$$G(t) = \sum_{l=1}^{N+1} \left[R_l \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{z}_l & \Omega \\ \frac{\tilde{z}_l^2}{\Omega} & \tilde{z}_l \end{pmatrix} \mathrm{e}^{\tilde{z}_l \cdot t} + \text{c.c.} \right] \tag{17}$$

with $R_l = f_0(\tilde{z}_l)/p'(\tilde{z}_l)$, f_0, p polynomials, $\tilde{z}_l$ roots of p.

Result

Solution

$$G(t) = \sum_{l=1}^{N+1} \left[R_l \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{z}_l & \Omega \\ \frac{\tilde{z}_l^2}{\Omega} & \tilde{z}_l \end{pmatrix} \mathrm{e}^{\tilde{z}_l \cdot t} + \text{c.c.} \right] \tag{17}$$

with $R_l = f_0(\tilde{z}_l)/p'(\tilde{z}_l)$, f_0, p polynomials, $\tilde{z}_l$ roots of p.

- note: G doesn't depend on temperature
- solution very sensitive to precision of the fits and roots

Bath Energy Derivative

$$
\begin{aligned}
\langle \dot{H}_B \rangle &= \sum_\lambda \omega_\lambda \Big(\Big\langle b_\lambda^\dagger \dot{b}_\lambda \Big\rangle + \text{c.c.} \Big) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \Im \Bigg[\int_0^t \mathrm{d}s \, \langle q(t) q(s) \rangle \, \dot{\alpha}_0(t-s) \Bigg] \\
&\qquad + \frac{1}{2} G_{12}(t) [\alpha(t) - \alpha_0(t)] - \frac{\Omega}{2} \int_0^t \mathrm{d}s \, G_{11}(s) [\alpha(s) - \alpha_0(s)]
\end{aligned}
\tag{18}
$$

- becomes huge sum of exponentials (thanks Mathematica)

One Bath, Finite Temperature

Parameters

$\Omega = 1$, Ohmic BCF $\frac{\eta}{\pi}(\omega_c/(1 + i\omega_c\tau))^2$ with $(\alpha(0) = 0.64, \omega_c = 2)$, $N = 10^5$ samples, 15 Hilbert space dimensions, $|\psi(0)\rangle_S = |1\rangle_S$, $T = 1$



Two Baths, Finite Temperature (Gradient)

Parameters

$\Omega = \Lambda = 1$, symmetric Ohmic BCFs with ($\alpha(0) = 0.25$, $\omega_c = 2$), $N = 10^4$ samples, 9 Hilbert space dimensions, $|\psi(0)\rangle_S = |0, 0\rangle_S$, $T = 0.6$, $\gamma = 0.5$





One Bath, Zero Temperature

Model: Spin-Boson

$$H = \frac{1}{2}\sigma_z + \frac{1}{2}\sum_\lambda \left(g_\lambda \sigma_x^\dagger a_\lambda + g_\lambda^* \sigma_x a_\lambda^\dagger\right) + \sum_\lambda \omega_\lambda a_\lambda^\dagger a_\lambda,\ |\psi_0\rangle_{\mathrm{S}} = |\uparrow\rangle \tag{19}$$

- how do we check convergence:

One Bath, Zero Temperature

Model: Spin-Boson

$$H = \frac{1}{2}\sigma_z + \frac{1}{2}\sum_\lambda \left(g_\lambda \sigma_x^\dagger a_\lambda + g_\lambda^* \sigma_x a_\lambda^\dagger\right) + \sum_\lambda \omega_\lambda a_\lambda^\dagger a_\lambda,\ |\psi_0\rangle_{\mathrm{S}} = |\uparrow\rangle \tag{19}$$

- how do we check convergence:

One Bath, Zero Temperature

Model: Spin-Boson

$$H = \frac{1}{2}\sigma_z + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\lambda}\left(g_\lambda \sigma_x^\dagger a_\lambda + g_\lambda^* \sigma_x a_\lambda^\dagger\right) + \sum_{\lambda}\omega_\lambda a_\lambda^\dagger a_\lambda,\ |\psi_0\rangle_S = |\uparrow\rangle \tag{19}$$

- how do we check convergence:
  - old: difference of results to some “good” configuration

One Bath, Zero Temperature

Model: Spin-Boson

$$H = \frac{1}{2}\sigma_z + \frac{1}{2}\sum_\lambda \left(g_\lambda \sigma_x^\dagger a_\lambda + g_\lambda^* \sigma_x a_\lambda^\dagger\right) + \sum_\lambda \omega_\lambda a_\lambda^\dagger a_\lambda,\ |\psi_0\rangle_{\mathrm{S}} = |\uparrow\rangle \quad (19)$$

- how do we check convergence:
  - old: difference of results to some "good" configuration
  - new: consistency with energy conservation

Example: Dependence of the Interaction Energy on Stochastic Process Sampling



- $\alpha(0) = 1.6$ and $\omega_c = 4 \implies$ stress HOPS through fast decaying BCF
- "perfect" results only with very high accuracy[5] ς
- good qualitative results for less extreme configurations (common theme)

[5]smaller ς is better

Various Cutoff Frequencies



Non-Markovian Dynamics



- interaction strengths chosen for approx. same interaction energy

Non-Markovian Dynamics



- interaction strengths chosen for approx. same interaction energy
- timing important for energy transfer "performance"

Beware :)

The following is WIP and has not been written up properly yet.

Extracting Energy from One Bath

- same model as above eq. (19), but with $L(\tau) = \sin^2(\frac{\Delta}{2}\tau)\sigma_x$
- how much energy can be *unitarily* extracted? $\implies \Delta E_{\max} = \frac{1}{\beta} S\left(\rho_S \,\middle\|\, \rho_S^\beta\right)$



Extracting Energy from One Bath

- same model as above eq. (19), but with $L(\tau) = \sin^2(\frac{\Delta}{2}\tau)\sigma_x$
- how much energy can be *unitarily* extracted? $\implies \Delta E_{\max} = \frac{1}{\beta} S\left(\rho_{\mathrm{S}} \,\middle\|\, \rho_{\mathrm{S}}^{\beta}\right)$



Otto Cycle (proof of concept)

Model

Spin-Boson model with compression of H_S and modulation of L.

- classical toy model of the quantum heat engine community[6]



[6] Geva and Kosloff, "A quantum-mechanical heat engine operating in finite time. A model consisting of spin-1/2 systems as the working fluid".



1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
−0.5
−1.0
−1.5
−2.0
−2.5
Energy
0
25
50
75
100
125
150
175
200
τ
System
Bath 1
Interaction 1
Bath 2
Interaction 2
Total



1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
−0.5
−1.0
−1.5
−2.0
−2.5
Energy
System
Bath 1
Interaction 1
Bath 2
Interaction 2
Total
0
25
50
75
100
125
150
175
200
τ



- $\bar{P} = 1.98 \cdot 10^{-3} \pm 2.3 \cdot 10^{-5}$, $\eta \approx 20\%$, $T_c = 1$, $T_h = 20$
- no tuning of parameters, except for resonant coupling
- long bath memory $\omega_c = 1$, but weak-ish coupling

Questions (for the future)

- better performance through "overlapping" phases?
- strong coupling any good?
- non-Markovianity + strong coupling any good?
- what is the optimal efficiency and power? (probably no advantage here)

Anti-Zeno Engine

Question

Is there a use for non-Markovianity in quantum heat engines?

- Mukherjee, Kofman, and Kurizki, "Anti-Zeno quantum advantage in fast-driven heat machines" claims that one can exploit the time-energy uncertainty for quantum advantage[7]

Model

Qubit coupled to two baths of different temperatures (T_c, T_h)

$$H_{\mathrm{S}} = \frac{1}{2}[\omega_0 + \gamma\Delta \sin(\Delta t)]\sigma_z,\ L_{c,h} = \frac{1}{2}\sigma_x \tag{20}$$

[7] I'd be careful to call this quantum advantage.



- couple for n modulation periods slightly of resonance
- for smaller n the $\sin((\omega - (\omega_0 \pm \Delta))\tau)/((\omega - (\omega_0 \pm \Delta))\tau)$ has a greater overlap $\Longrightarrow$ controls power output





a) $P = -0.058 \pm 0.014$

b) $P = -0.068 \pm 0.010$

Parameters

$\Delta = 11$, $\gamma = 0.5$, $\alpha(0) = 1.0$, $\omega_0 = 20$, $T_c = 8$, $T_h = 40$

- this is not properly converged yet → newer results: no advantage at these temperatures / coupling strengths
- new simulations with temperatures from paper ($\beta_{h(c)} = 0.0005(0.005)$) are promising
  - interesting → no good steady state power in this case (insufficient samples?)

On the "To Do" List

- verify/falsify weak coupling results in the literature (engines)
- three-level systems: there is an experimental paper ;)
- parameter scan of two qubit model
- filter modes
- ...

Lessons Learned

- careful convergence checks pay off
- surveying literature is important
- properly documenting observations is a great help and should be done as early as possible
- applications should be carefully chosen to answer interesting questions
- numerics are helpful, but physical insights are important
- comparison with some experiments would have been nice

References I

- Bera, Mohit Lal, Sergi Juli-Farr, et al. "Quantum Heat Engines with Carnot Efficiency at Maximum Power". In: *arXiv* (June 2021). eprint: 2106.01193. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.01193v1.
- Bera, Mohit Lal, Maciej Lewenstein, and Manabendra Nath Bera. "Attaining Carnot efficiency with quantum and nanoscale heat engines - npj Quantum Information". In: *npj Quantum Inf.* 7.31 (Feb. 2021), pp. 1–7. ISSN: 2056-6387. DOI: 10.1038/s41534-021-00366-6.
- Disi, L., N. Gisin, and W. T. Strunz. "Non-Markovian quantum state diffusion". In: *Phys. Rev. A* 58.3 (Sept. 1998), pp. 1699–1712. ISSN: 2469-9934. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevA.58.1699.
- Esposito, Massimiliano, Maicol A. Ochoa, and Michael Galperin. "Nature of heat in strongly coupled open quantum systems". In: *Phys. Rev. B* 92.23 (Dec. 2015), p. 235440. ISSN: 2469-9969. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevB.92.235440.
- Gao, Xing et al. "Non-Markovian Stochastic Schr\"odinger Equation: Matrix Product State Approach to the Hierarchy of Pure States". In: *arXiv* (Sept. 2021). eprint: 2109.06393. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.06393v3.

References II

Geva, Eitan and Ronnie Kosloff. "A quantum-mechanical heat engine operating in finite time. A model consisting of spin-1/2 systems as the working fluid". In: *J. Chem. Phys.* 96.4 (Feb. 1992), pp. 3054–3067. ISSN: 0021-9606. DOI: 10.1063/1.461951.

Kato, Akihito and Yoshitaka Tanimura. "Quantum heat current under non-perturbative and non-Markovian conditions: Applications to heat machines". In: *J. Chem. Phys.* 145.22 (Dec. 2016), p. 224105. ISSN: 0021-9606. DOI: 10.1063/1.4971370.

— ."Quantum heat transport of a two-qubit system: Interplay between system-bath coherence and qubit-qubit coherence". In: *J. Chem. Phys.* 143.6 (Aug. 2015), p. 064107. ISSN: 0021-9606. DOI: 10.1063/1.4928192.

Klauder, JR and ECG Sudarshan. "Fundamentals of Quantum Optics Benjamin". In: *Inc., New York* (1968).

Motz, T. et al. "Rectification of heat currents across nonlinear quantum chains: a versatile approach beyond weak thermal contact". In: *New J. Phys.* 20.11 (Nov. 2018), p. 113020. ISSN: 1367-2630. DOI: 10.1088/1367-2630/aaea90.

Mukherjee, Victor, Abraham G. Kofman, and Gershon Kurizki. "Anti-Zeno quantum advantage in fast-driven heat machines". In: *Commun. Phys.* 3.8 (Jan. 2020), pp. 1–12. ISSN: 2399-3650. DOI: 10.1038/s42005-019-0272-z.

References III

- Rivas, ngel. “Strong Coupling Thermodynamics of Open Quantum Systems”. In: *arXiv* (Oct. 2019). DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.160601. eprint: 1910.01246.
- Senior, Jorden et al. “Heat rectification via a superconducting artificial atom - Communications Physics”. In: *Commun. Phys.* 3.40 (Feb. 2020), pp. 1–5. ISSN: 2399-3650. DOI: 10.1038/s42005-020-0307-5.
- Strasberg, Philipp and Andreas Winter. “First and Second Law of Quantum Thermodynamics: A Consistent Derivation Based on a Microscopic Definition of Entropy”. In: *PRX Quantum* 2.3 (Aug. 2021), p. 030202. ISSN: 2691-3399. DOI: 10.1103/PRXQuantum.2.030202.
- Strunz, Walter T. “Stochastic Schrödinger equation approach to the dynamics of non-Markovian open quantum systems”. Fachbereich Physik der Universität Essen, 2001.
- Talkner, Peter and Peter Hnggi. “Colloquium: Statistical mechanics and thermodynamics at strong coupling: Quantum and classical”. In: *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 92.4 (Oct. 2020), p. 041002. ISSN: 1539-0756. DOI: 10.1103/RevModPhys.92.041002.
- — .“Open system trajectories specify fluctuating work but not heat”. In: *Phys. Rev. E* 94.2 (Aug. 2016), p. 022143. ISSN: 2470-0053. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevE.94.022143.

References IV

Wiedmann, M., J. T. Stockburger, and J. Ankerhold. "Non-Markovian dynamics of a quantum heat engine: out-of-equilibrium operation and thermal coupling control". In: *New J. Phys.* 22.3 (Mar. 2020), p. 033007. ISSN: 1367-2630. DOI: 10.1088/1367-2630/ab725a.

Situation (Longer)

Consider an open quantum system

$$H = \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{S}}}_{\text{"small"}} + \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{I}}}_{?} + \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{B}}}_{\text{"big", simple}} \tag{21}$$

with $[H_S, H_B] = 0$.

[8] even in strong coupling equilibrium...

[9] Rivas, "Strong Coupling Thermodynamics of Open Quantum Systems"; Talkner and Hnggi, "Colloquium: Statistical mechanics and thermodynamics at strong coupling: Quantum and classical".

Situation (Longer)

Consider an open quantum system

$$H = \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{S}}}_{\text{"small"}} + \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{I}}}_{?} + \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{B}}}_{\text{"big", simple}} \tag{21}$$

with $[H_S, H_B] = 0$.

- weak coupling $H_{\mathrm{I}} \approx 0$ thermodynamics[8] of open systems are somewhat understood[9]

---

[8] even in strong coupling equilibrium...

[9] Rivas, "Strong Coupling Thermodynamics of Open Quantum Systems"; Talkner and Hnggi, "Colloquium: Statistical mechanics and thermodynamics at strong coupling: Quantum and classical".

Situation (Longer)

Consider an open quantum system

$$H = \underbrace{H_\mathrm{S}}_{\text{"small"}} + \underbrace{H_\mathrm{I}}_{?} + \underbrace{H_\mathrm{B}}_{\text{"big", simple}} \tag{21}$$

with $[H_S, H_B] = 0$.

- weak coupling $H_\mathrm{I} \approx 0$ thermodynamics[8] of open systems are somewhat understood[9]
- strong coupling: $\langle H_\mathrm{I}\rangle \sim \langle H_\mathrm{S}\rangle \implies$ we can't neglect the interaction $\implies$ thermodynamics?

[8] even in strong coupling equilibrium...

[9] Rivas, "Strong Coupling Thermodynamics of Open Quantum Systems"; Talkner and Hnggi, "Colloquium: Statistical mechanics and thermodynamics at strong coupling: Quantum and classical".

Situation (Longer)

Consider an open quantum system

$$H = \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{S}}}_{\text{"small"}} + \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{I}}}_{?} + \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{B}}}_{\text{"big", simple}} \tag{21}$$

with $[H_S, H_B] = 0$.

- weak coupling $H_{\mathrm{I}} \approx 0$ thermodynamics[8] of open systems are somewhat understood[9]
- strong coupling: $\langle H_{\mathrm{I}} \rangle \sim \langle H_{\mathrm{S}} \rangle \implies$ we can't neglect the interaction $\implies$ thermodynamics?
- we do quantum mechanics $\implies$ can't separate bath and system

[8] even in strong coupling equilibrium...

[9] Rivas, "Strong Coupling Thermodynamics of Open Quantum Systems"; Talkner and Hnggi, "Colloquium: Statistical mechanics and thermodynamics at strong coupling: Quantum and classical".

Situation (Longer)

Consider an open quantum system

$$H = \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{S}}}_{\text{"small"}} + \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{I}}}_{?} + \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{B}}}_{\text{"big", simple}} \tag{21}$$

with $[H_S, H_B] = 0$.

- weak coupling $H_{\mathrm{I}} \approx 0$ thermodynamics[8] of open systems are somewhat understood[9]
- strong coupling: $\langle H_{\mathrm{I}} \rangle \sim \langle H_{\mathrm{S}} \rangle \implies$ we can't neglect the interaction $\implies$ thermodynamics?
- we do quantum mechanics $\implies$ can't separate bath and system, especially not dynamics!

[8] even in strong coupling equilibrium...

[9] Rivas, "Strong Coupling Thermodynamics of Open Quantum Systems"; Talkner and Hnggi, "Colloquium: Statistical mechanics and thermodynamics at strong coupling: Quantum and classical".

Situation (Longer)

Consider an open quantum system

$$H = \underbrace{H_\mathrm{S}}_{\text{"small"}} + \underbrace{H_\mathrm{I}}_{?} + \underbrace{H_\mathrm{B}}_{\text{"big", simple}} \tag{21}$$

with $[H_S, H_B] = 0$.

- weak coupling $H_\mathrm{I} \approx 0$ thermodynamics[8] of open systems are somewhat understood[9]
- strong coupling: $\langle H_\mathrm{I} \rangle \sim \langle H_\mathrm{S} \rangle \implies$ we can't neglect the interaction $\implies$ thermodynamics?
- we do quantum mechanics $\implies$ can't separate bath and system, especially not dynamics!
- no consensus about strong coupling thermodynamics:

[8] even in strong coupling equilibrium...

[9] Rivas, "Strong Coupling Thermodynamics of Open Quantum Systems"; Talkner and Hnggi, "Colloquium: Statistical mechanics and thermodynamics at strong coupling: Quantum and classical".

Situation (Longer)

Consider an open quantum system

$$H = \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{S}}}_{\text{"small"}} + \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{I}}}_{?} + \underbrace{H_{\mathrm{B}}}_{\text{"big", simple}} \tag{21}$$

with $[H_S, H_B] = 0$.

- weak coupling $H_{\mathrm{I}} \approx 0$ thermodynamics[8] of open systems are somewhat understood[9]
- strong coupling: $\langle H_{\mathrm{I}} \rangle \sim \langle H_{\mathrm{S}} \rangle \implies$ we can't neglect the interaction $\implies$ thermodynamics?
- we do quantum mechanics $\implies$ can't separate bath and system, especially not dynamics!
- no consensus about strong coupling thermodynamics:
- but what is clear: *need to get access to exact dynamics of* $H_{\mathrm{I}}, H_{\mathrm{B}}$

[8] even in strong coupling equilibrium...

[9] Rivas, "Strong Coupling Thermodynamics of Open Quantum Systems"; Talkner and Hnggi, "Colloquium: Statistical mechanics and thermodynamics at strong coupling: Quantum and classical".

More Papers on Thermo

M. L. Bera, Juli-Farr, et al., “Quantum Heat Engines with Carnot Efficiency at Maximum Power”; M. L. Bera, Lewenstein, and M. N. Bera, “Attaining Carnot efficiency with quantum and nanoscale heat engines - npj Quantum Information”; Esposito, Ochoa, and Galperin, “Nature of heat in strongly coupled open quantum systems”; Kato and Tanimura, “Quantum heat current under non-perturbative and non-Markovian conditions: Applications to heat machines”, “Quantum heat transport of a two-qubit system: Interplay between system-bath coherence and qubit-qubit coherence”; Motz et al., “Rectification of heat currents across nonlinear quantum chains: a versatile approach beyond weak thermal contact”; Rivas, “Strong Coupling Thermodynamics of Open Quantum Systems”; Senior et al., “Heat rectification via a superconducting artificial atom - Communications Physics”; Strasberg and Winter, “First and Second Law of Quantum Thermodynamics: A Consistent Derivation Based on a Microscopic Definition of Entropy”; Talkner and Hnggi, “Colloquium: Statistical mechanics and thermodynamics at strong coupling: Quantum and classical”, “Open system trajectories specify fluctuating work but not heat”; Wiedmann, Stockburger, and Ankerhold, “Non-Markovian dynamics of a quantum heat engine: out-of-equilibrium operation and thermal coupling control”

Ohmic SD BCF



$J = \eta e^{-\omega/\omega_c}\omega^s$
$\omega_c = 2, s = 1$
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
0
10
20
30
40
50
ω



$J = \eta\Gamma(s+1)/(1+i\omega_c\tau)^{s+1}$
$\omega_c = 2, s = 1$
real part
imag part
1.0
0.5
0.0
−0.5
0
1
2
3
4
τ

NMQSD (Zero Temperature)

Expanding in a Bargmann (unnormalized) coherent state basis Klauder and Sudarshan, "Fundamentals of Quantum Optics Benjamin" $\left\{\left|\mathbf{z}^{(1)}, \mathbf{z}^{(2)}, \ldots\right\rangle = |\underline{\mathbf{z}}\rangle\right\}$

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \int \prod_{n=1}^{N} \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{z}^{(n)}}{\pi^{N_n}} \mathrm{e}^{-|\mathbf{z}|^2} \right) |\psi(t, \underline{\mathbf{z}}^*)\rangle \, |\underline{\mathbf{z}}\rangle \,, \tag{22}$$

we obtain

$$\partial_t \psi_t(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^*) = -iH\psi_t(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^*) + \mathbf{L} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_t^* \psi_t(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^*) - \sum_{n=1}^{N} L_n^\dagger \int_0^t \mathrm{d}s \, \alpha_n(t-s) \frac{\delta \psi_t(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^*)}{\delta \eta_n^*(s)}, \tag{23}$$

with

$$\mathcal{M}(\eta_n^*(t)) = 0, \quad \mathcal{M}(\eta_n(t)\eta_m(s)) = 0, \quad \mathcal{M}(\eta_n(t)\eta_m(s)^*) = \delta_{nm}\alpha_n(t-s), \tag{24}$$

where $\alpha_n(t-s) = \sum_\lambda \left|g_\lambda^{(n)}\right|^2 \mathrm{e}^{-i\omega_\lambda^{(n)}(t-s)} = \langle B(t)B(s)\rangle_{I,\rho(0)}$ Walter T. Strunz, "Stochastic Schrödinger equation approach to the dynamics of non-Markovian open quantum systems" (fourier transf. of spectral density $J(\omega) = \pi \sum_\lambda |g_\lambda|^2 \delta(\omega - \omega_\lambda)$).

Fock-Space Embedding

As in Gao et al., “Non-Markovian Stochastic Schr\”odinger Equation: Matrix Product State Approach to the Hierarchy of Pure States” we can define

$$\left|\Psi\right\rangle = \sum_{\underline{\mathbf{k}}} \left|\psi^{\underline{\mathbf{k}}}\right\rangle \otimes \left|\underline{\mathbf{k}}\right\rangle \tag{25}$$

where $\left|\underline{\mathbf{k}}\right\rangle = \bigotimes_{n=1}^{N} \bigotimes_{\mu=1}^{N_n} \left|\underline{\mathbf{k}}_{n,\mu}\right\rangle$ are bosonic Fock-states.
Now eq. (6) becomes

$$\partial_t \left|\Psi\right\rangle = \left[-iH_{\mathrm{S}} + \mathbf{L}\cdot\boldsymbol{\eta}^* - \sum_{n=1}^{N}\sum_{\mu=1}^{M_n} b_{n,\mu}^\dagger b_{n,\mu} W_\mu^{(n)} + i\sum_{n=1}^{N}\sum_{\mu=1}^{M_n}\sqrt{G_{n,\mu}}\left(b_{n,\mu}^\dagger L_n + b_{n,\mu} L_n^\dagger\right)\right]\left|\Psi\right\rangle . \tag{26}$$

Fock-Space Embedding

As in Gao et al., “Non-Markovian Stochastic Schr\”odinger Equation: Matrix Product State Approach to the Hierarchy of Pure States” we can define

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{\underline{\mathbf{k}}} \left|\psi^{\underline{\mathbf{k}}}\right\rangle \otimes |\underline{\mathbf{k}}\rangle \tag{25}$$

where $|\underline{\mathbf{k}}\rangle = \bigotimes_{n=1}^{N} \bigotimes_{\mu=1}^{N_n} \left|\underline{\mathbf{k}}_{n,\mu}\right\rangle$ are bosonic Fock-states.
Now eq. (6) becomes

$$\partial_t |\Psi\rangle = \left[-iH_{\mathrm{S}} + \mathbf{L}\cdot\boldsymbol{\eta}^* - \sum_{n=1}^{N}\sum_{\mu=1}^{M_n} b_{n,\mu}^\dagger b_{n,\mu} W_\mu^{(n)} + i\sum_{n=1}^{N}\sum_{\mu=1}^{M_n} \sqrt{G_{n,\mu}}\left(b_{n,\mu}^\dagger L_n + b_{n,\mu} L_n^\dagger\right)\right] |\Psi\rangle\,. \tag{26}$$

$\implies$ possible to derive an upper bound for the norm of $\left|\psi^{\underline{\mathbf{k}}}\right\rangle$

Fock-Space Embedding

As in Gao et al., "Non-Markovian Stochastic Schr\"odinger Equation: Matrix Product State Approach to the Hierarchy of Pure States" we can define

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{\underline{\mathbf{k}}} \left|\psi^{\underline{\mathbf{k}}}\right\rangle \otimes |\underline{\mathbf{k}}\rangle \tag{25}$$

where $|\underline{\mathbf{k}}\rangle = \bigotimes_{n=1}^{N} \bigotimes_{\mu=1}^{N_n} \left|\underline{\mathbf{k}}_{n,\mu}\right\rangle$ are bosonic Fock-states.
Now eq. (6) becomes

$$\partial_t |\Psi\rangle = \left[-iH_{\mathrm{S}} + \mathbf{L}\cdot\boldsymbol{\eta}^* - \sum_{n=1}^{N}\sum_{\mu=1}^{M_n} b_{n,\mu}^\dagger b_{n,\mu} W_\mu^{(n)} + i\sum_{n=1}^{N}\sum_{\mu=1}^{M_n}\sqrt{G_{n,\mu}}\left(b_{n,\mu}^\dagger L_n + b_{n,\mu} L_n^\dagger\right)\right]|\Psi\rangle\,. \tag{26}$$

$\implies$ possible to derive an upper bound for the norm of $\left|\psi^{\underline{\mathbf{k}}}\right\rangle$ $\implies$ new truncation scheme