We introduce a universal scheme to divide the power output of a periodically driven quantum heat engine into a classical contribution and one stemming solely from quantum coherence. Specializing to Lindblad-dynamics and small driving amplitudes, we derive general upper bounds on both, the coherent and the total power. These constraints imply that, in the linear-response regime, coherence inevitably leads to power losses. To illustrate our general analysis, we explicitly work out the experimentally relevant example of a single-qubit engine.

Heat engines are devices that convert thermal energy into useful work. A Stirling motor, for example, uses the varying pressure of a periodically heated gas to produce mechanical motion, Fig. 1a. Used by macroscopic engines for two centuries, this elementary operation principle has now been implemented on ever-smaller scales. Over the last decade, a series of experiments has shown that the working fluid of Stirling-type engines can be reduced to tiny objects such as a micrometer-seized silicon spring [1] or a single colloidal particle [2–5]. These efforts recently culminated in the realization of a single-atom heat engine [6, 7]. Thus, the dimensions of the working fluid were further decreased by four orders of magnitude within only a few years. In light of this remarkable development, the challenge of even smaller engines operating on time and energy scales comparable to Planck’s constant appears realistic for future experiments.

Such quantum engines would have access to a non-classical mechanism of energy conversion that relies on the creation of coherent superpositions between the energy levels of the working fluid [8], Fig. 1b. How does this additional freedom affect performance figures like power and efficiency? Having triggered substantial research efforts in recent years, this question constitutes one of the central problems in the emerging field of quantum thermodynamics, see for example [9–18]. However, the available results are so far inconclusive. In fact, current evidence suggests that, depending on the specific setup and benchmark parameters, coherence can, in principle, be both conducive [8, 11, 19–27] and detrimental [28–32] to the performance of thermal devices.

In this article, we universally characterize the role of coherence for the power output of cyclic heat engines in linear response. Our analysis builds on the well-established theory of open quantum systems [33, 34] and a recently developed thermodynamic framework describing periodically driven systems [30, 35], which has already proven very useful in the classical realm [36–39]. For a quantum engine, we model the working fluid as an \( N \)-level system with bare Hamiltonian \( H \), which is embedded in a large reservoir with base temperature \( T \) [30, 40]. For simplicity, we assume that \( N \) is finite. A heat source injects thermal energy into the system by periodically heating its local environment. Hence, the working fluid effectively feels the time-dependent temperature

\[
T_t \equiv T + f_t^n, \tag{1}
\]
where \( f_t^q \geq 0 \). For work extraction, a periodic driving field \( f_t^w \) is applied, which couples linearly to the degree of freedom \( G_w \) of the system. The Hamiltonian thus acquires the time-dependence

\[
H_t = H + f_t^w G_w^\dagger. \tag{2}
\]

For uniqueness, we assume that the field \( f_t^w \) is dimensionless and that its average over one period \( T \) vanishes.

This engine delivers the mean power output

\[
P = -\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T dt \text{tr}\{H_t \dot{\varrho}_t\}, \tag{3}
\]

where \( \varrho_t \) denotes the periodic state of the system \([33]\). Using the spectral decomposition

\[
H_t \equiv \sum_n E_n^t |n_t\rangle \langle n_t| \tag{4}
\]

of the time-dependent Hamiltonian, \( P \) can be divided into two contributions corresponding to the different mechanisms of work extraction illustrated in Fig. 1. First, the classical power

\[
P^c \equiv P - P^d = -\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T dt \sum_n \dot{E}_n^t |n_t\rangle \langle n_t| \tag{5}
\]

is generated by changing the energy levels of the working fluid, i.e., the diagonal elements of its Hamiltonian with respect to the unperturbed energy eigenstates. Second, the coherent power

\[
P^c \equiv \langle H_t, \dot{\varrho}_t \rangle - \text{tr}\{H_t \dot{\varrho}_t\} \tag{6}
\]

arises from creating superpositions between the instantaneous energy eigenstates \([41]\). Accordingly, \( P^c \) vanishes when \( \dot{\varrho}_t \) commutes with \( H_t \) throughout one operation cycle. This condition is met, for example, in the adiabatic limit, where the state of the system follows the instantaneous Boltzmann distribution.

For deriving constraints on the coherent power \( P^c \), we have to specify the dissipative dynamics of the working fluid. To this end, we invoke the standard condition of weak coupling between system and reservoir. In equilibrium, i.e., for \( f_t^q = f_t^w = 0 \), the state \( \dot{\varrho}_t \) evolves according to the Markovian master equation \([34]\)

\[
\partial_t \dot{\varrho}_t = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [H, \dot{\varrho}_t] + D \dot{\varrho}_t, \tag{7}
\]

where the dissipation

\[
DX \equiv \sum_{\sigma} \frac{\gamma_{\sigma}}{2} \left( [V_{\sigma}^\dagger X, V_{\sigma}] + [V_{\sigma} X V_{\sigma}^\dagger] \right) \tag{8}
\]

accounts for the influence of the thermal environment \([42]\). Furthermore, \( \hbar \) denotes Planck’s constant and \( \{\gamma_{\sigma}\} \) is a set of positive rates with corresponding Lindblad operators \( \{V_{\sigma}\} \). Due to microreversibility, these quantities are constrained by the quantum detailed balance relation, which can be expressed compactly in terms of the formal identity \([42, 43]\)

\[
De^{-\beta H} = e^{-\beta H} D^\dagger. \tag{9}
\]

Here, \( \beta = 1/(k_B T) \), \( k_B \) denotes Boltzmann’s constant and the adjoint dissipator is given by

\[
D^\dagger X \equiv \sum_{\sigma} \frac{\gamma_{\sigma}}{2} \left( [V_{\sigma}^\dagger X, V_{\sigma}] + [V_{\sigma} X V_{\sigma}^\dagger] \right). \tag{10}
\]

Provided that the cycle period \( T \) is large compared to the relaxation time of the reservoir, finite driving can be included in this framework by allowing the rates and Lindblad operators to be time-dependent and replacing \( H \) and \( T \) with \( H_t \) and \( T_t \) respectively in (7)-(10). Solving the master equation (7) by treating \( f_t^q \) and \( f_t^w \) as first-order perturbations then yields the explicit expressions \([44]\)

\[
P^c = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T dt \int_0^\infty d\tau \dot{f}_t^w \left( C_{\tau \tau}^w f_t^w + C_{\tau \tau}^q f_t^q \right) \tag{11}
\]

for the classical and the coherent power, respectively \([45]\), in the following notation. We abbreviate with \( C_{t_a b}^c \) the Kubo correlation function \([46]\)

\[
C_{t_a b}^c = \langle \dot{G}_{t_a}^c G_{t_b}^c \rangle = \int_0^\beta d\lambda \left( \langle \dot{G}_{t_a}^c e^{-\lambda H} G_{t_b}^c e^{\lambda H} \rangle - \langle \dot{G}_{t_a}^c \rangle \langle G_{t_b}^c \rangle \right), \tag{12}
\]

where \( t \geq 0, a, b = d, c, q \). Hats indicate Heisenberg-picture operators satisfying the adjoint master equation

\[
\partial_t \dot{X}_t = \frac{i}{\hbar} [H, \dot{X}_t] + D^\dagger \dot{X}_t \tag{13}
\]

with initial condition \( \dot{X}_0 = X \). The angular brackets in (12) denote the thermal average, i.e.,

\[
\langle X \rangle = \text{tr}\{Xe^{-\beta H}\} / \text{tr}\{e^{-\beta H}\}. \tag{14}
\]

Finally, we have defined the operator \( G^q \equiv -H/T \) and split the control variable \( G^w \) into a diagonal, quasi-classical, and a coherent part,

\[
G^q \equiv \sum_n |n\rangle \langle n| G^w |n\rangle \langle n| \quad \text{and} \quad G^c \equiv G^w - G^q, \tag{15}
\]

where the vectors \( |n\rangle \) correspond to the eigenstates of the unperturbed Hamiltonian \( H \). As a first key-observation, we note that the expression (11) for \( P^c \) is independent of the temperature profile \( f_t^q \). Thus, under linear-response conditions, it is impossible to convert thermal energy provided by the heat source into positive power output via quantum coherence; rather coherent power can only be injected into the
system through mechanical driving. This constraint is captured quantitatively by the bound

$$P^c \leq -\frac{\tilde{L}_j^2 \Omega^2}{\Omega^2 + L_j^2/L_1^2} F^w \leq 0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

which is saturated in the two limits \(\Omega \to 0\) and \(\Omega \to \infty\), for the proof see [47]. Besides the cycle frequency \(\Omega \equiv 2\pi/T\), the bound (16) involves the mean square amplitude

$$F^w \equiv \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T dt \left( f_{i}^w \right)^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

of the driving field, and the Green-Kubo type coefficients

$$L_j^2 \equiv \int_0^\infty dt \langle \hat{G}^{c(j)}, \hat{G}^{c(j)} \rangle \geq 0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)

where the index \(j\) in brackets means a time-derivative of respective order.

The bound (16) can be understood intuitively by identifying the parameter \(L_j^2/L_1^2\) as an estimator for the decoherence strength of the reservoir, i.e., the square of the mean rate, at which its influence destroys coherent superpositions between the energy levels of the working fluid. In the incoherent limit \(L_j^2/L_1^2 \gg \Omega^2\), the coherent power can approach zero due to frequent interactions with the environment constantly forcing the system into a state that is diagonal in the instantaneous energy eigenbasis. This behavior resembles the quantum Zeno effect with the role of the observer played by the thermal reservoir [34]. If \(L_j^2/L_1^2 \ll \Omega^2\), the bath-induced decoherence is slow compared to the external driving. In this limit, coherences can be fully established such that maximal coherent power is injected into the system. Accordingly, the upper bound (16) reduces to \(P^c \leq -L_1^2 F^w\), its minimum with respect to \(\Omega\).

The coefficients (18) vanish if and only if \(G^c = 0\), which means that the control variable \(G^c\) commutes with the unperturbed Hamiltonian \(H\). Thus, according to (16), any non-classical driving will inevitably reduce the net output \(P = \tilde{L}_j^2 + P^c\) of the engine. In fact, \(P\) is subject to the upper bound

$$P \leq \frac{L_1^2 F^q}{4(1 + \psi_\Omega)}, \text{ where } \psi_\Omega \equiv \frac{(L_1^2/L_j^2) \Omega^2}{\Omega^2 + L_j^2/L_1^2} \geq 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

provides a measure for the relative strength of coherent and classical driving and

$$F^q \equiv \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T dt \left( \tilde{f}^q - \bar{f}^q \right)^2 \text{ with } \bar{f}^q \equiv \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T dt f_i^q$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)

corresponds to the mean square magnitude of the local temperature variation induced by the heat source. This bound is proven in [47]. As the bound (16), it involves a set of protocol-independent parameters \(L_j^2\), which are reminiscent of linear transport coefficients. For \(a = d\) and \(a = q\), these quantities are defined analogously to (18) with \(G^c\) replaced by \(G^d\) and \(G^q\), respectively.

In the special case of purely coherent driving, \(G^d = 0\), the coefficient \(L_j^2\) vanishes. The coherence parameter \(\psi_\Omega\) then diverges and (19) reduces to \(P \leq 0\). Consequently in line with our analysis above, no cyclic engine relying only on coherent work extraction can properly operate in the linear-response regime. For \(G^c = 0\), i.e., quasi-classical driving, \(\psi_\Omega\) vanishes and the constraint (19) assumes its weakest form

$$P \leq L_1^2 F^q/4.$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

This bound can be saturated if and only if

$$G^w = -\mu H/T \text{ and } \hat{D}^\dagger H = -\lambda (H - \langle H \rangle)$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

for some real scalars \(\mu\) and \(\lambda > 0\), see [47]. Thus, the control field \(f_i^w\) has to couple directly to the free Hamiltonian \(H\), and the energy correlation function must decay exponentially with rate \(\lambda\), i.e.,

$$\langle \hat{H}_t, \hat{H}_0 \rangle = e^{-\lambda t} \langle \hat{H}_0, \hat{H}_0 \rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

If these two requirements are fulfilled, as we show in [47], the protocol for optimal power extraction is determined by the condition

$$2\tilde{f}^w = \lambda f_i^q/\mu - \bar{f}^q/\mu,$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)

which leads to \(P = L_1^2 F^q/4\) for any temperature profile \(f_i^q\) and sufficiently short operation cycles [48]. Furthermore, using relation (23), the upper bound (21) can be expressed in a physically transparent way. Specifically, we obtain

$$\frac{L_1^2 F^q}{4} = \lambda \frac{\langle H^2 \rangle - \langle H \rangle^2}{4k_B T^3} F^q$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)

by evaluating (18). Hence, the strength and the decay rate of the energy fluctuations in equilibrium essentially determine the maximum power output of a cyclic \(N\)-level engine in the linear-response regime. A similar result was obtained only recently for classical machines obeying Fokker-Planck type dynamics [35, 37].

We will now explore the quality of our general bounds under practical conditions. To this end, we consider a two-level engine with time-dependent Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_t = \frac{\hbar \omega}{2} \sigma_z + \frac{\hbar \omega \tilde{f}^w}{2} (r \sigma_z + (1 - r) \sigma_x).$$  \hspace{1cm} (26)

Here, \(\sigma_{x,y,z}\) are the usual Pauli matrices and the dimensionless parameter \(0 \leq r \leq 1\) determines the relative weight of the classical and the coherent parts, \(G^d = r(h\omega/2)\sigma_z\) and \(G^c = (1 - r)(h\omega/2)\sigma_x\), of the control variable \(G^w\). The corresponding equilibrium dissipator (8) involves two Lindblad operators, \(\hat{V}_z = (\sigma_z \pm i \sigma_y)/2\), acting at the rates \(\gamma_{\perp} \equiv \gamma e^{\pm \kappa}\), respectively, where \(\kappa \equiv \hbar \beta/2\). This setup lies within the range of forthcoming experiments using a superconducting qubit to realize the system and ultra fast electron thermometers for calorimetric
For a perspective beyond linear response, we stress that our key expressions (5) and (6) are valid for arbitrarily strong driving and any thermodynamically consistent time-evolution of the working fluid. The coherent power (6) thus constitutes a universal indicator for the impact of quantum effects on thermal power generation. It can therefore be used as a unifying performance benchmark across various different types of cyclic quantum machines.

In particular, it would be applicable to rapidly driven [25, 52–56] and strongly coupled [57–61] engines, which are currently subject to active investigations. Furthermore, the general framework introduced in this article could lead to a new perspective on a phenomenon earlier interpreted as a quantum analogue of classical friction, which was observed in models describing the working fluid as an interacting spin system [28, 29, 62–64].

As one of the earliest quantum heat engines, the three-level maser relies solely on non-classical work extraction [65, 66]. This example, which does not admit a linear-response description [30], shows that the coherent power can indeed become positive if the driving is strong. Coupled to two reservoirs with time-independent temperature, the three-level maser works in a steady state with respect to a rotating basis of its Hilbert space. This operation principle is similar to the one used by thermoelectric nano devices, where a spatial temperature gradient drives an electric current [67]. Extending the concept of coherent power to this second class of quantum engines, which has recently attracted remarkable interest [68–79] represents a challenge promising to reveal rich and interesting physics. Eventually, our approach could lead to a comprehensive understanding of the role of quantum effects for one of the most fundamental thermodynamic operations: the conversion of heat into power.
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[41] To make these definitions unique, we understand that the time-dependent energy eigenvalues are arranged in increasing order, i.e., $E^t_0 \leq E^t_1 \leq \cdots \leq E^t_i$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, we note that the expressions (5) and (6) are unaltered if the instantaneous energy eigenstates are multiplied with arbitrary time-dependent phase factors.


[44] To obtain (11) from (5) and (6), standard linear-response theory is applied. This derivation exploits that, due to the detailed balance relation (9), the space of all system operators commuting with the unperturbed Hamiltonian $H$ is invariant under the action of the super operators $D$ and $D^\dagger$, for details see [30].

[45] The detailed-balance relation (9) implies that the set of Lindblad operators $\{V_k\}$ is self-adjoint [43, 80]. Additionally, we here assume that this set is irreducible such that $X = 1$ is the only solution of $D^\dagger X = 0$ [81]. Under this condition, the improper integrals showing up in (11) are well-defined [50].


[47] “Supplemental Material at URL.”

[48] For long cycles, the reduced temperature profile $f^t_i - f^q_i$ would oscillate slowly and thus be either positive or negative over substantial time ranges. Consequently, integrating (24) would yield a driving protocol $f^t_i \nu$ with large amplitude, which violates the linear-response condition underlying the derivations leading to (21) and (24).


I. BOUND ON COHERENT POWER

We prove that the coherent power \( P^c \) as defined in Eq. 11 obeys the bound stated in Eq. 16. To this end, it is instructive to introduce the scalar product [1]

\[
\langle X, Y \rangle = \int_0^\beta d\lambda \text{tr} \left\{ X^\dagger e^{-\lambda H} Y e^{(\lambda-\beta)H} \right\}/\text{tr} \left\{ e^{-\beta H} \right\} \tag{16}
\]

for any \( X \) and \( Y \) drawn from the space of system operators \( \mathcal{L} \). Furthermore, we define the super-operators \( H X \equiv [H, X]/\hbar \) and \( L \equiv iH + D^\dagger \), which have two important properties following from the detailed balance relation, Eq. 9. First, both, \( H \) and \( D \) are self-adjoint with respect to the inner product (1). It follows that \( L^\dagger = -iH + D^1 \), where the double dagger indicates the super-operator adjoint with respect to (1). Second, \( H \) and \( D^1 \) commute. Therefore, \( L \) is normal, i.e., \( L L^\dagger = L^\dagger L \) [2].

Using the definitions (1) and (2), Eq. 11 can be rewritten as

\[
P^c = -\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T dt \int_0^\infty d\tau f^w_t f^{ww}_{t-\tau} \left\{ L e^{t\delta G^c} \delta G^c, \delta G^c \right\}, \tag{3}
\]

where \( \delta X \equiv X - \langle 1, X \rangle/\beta \) (4) for any \( X \in \mathcal{L} \). Due to its convolution-type structure, this expression is conveniently analyzed in Fourier space. Specifically, inserting the series

\[
f^w_t \equiv \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} c^w_n e^{i n \Omega t} \quad \Omega \equiv 2\pi/T \tag{5}
\]

into (3) yields the mode expansion

\[
P^c = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} P_n^c c^w_n c^{w*}_n = \sum_{n > 0} (P_n^c + P^{c*}_n) c^w_n c^{w*}_n \quad \text{with} \quad c^w_n = c^w_{-n*} \in \mathbb{C} \quad \text{and} \quad c^w_0 = 0,
\]

since the period average \( f^w_t \) vanishes by assumption. The second expression is thereby obtained by formally carrying out the improper integral in (3). This operation is well-defined, since the super-operator \( D^1 \) is negative semidefinite, i.e., the eigenvalues of \( L \) have non-positive real part [3].

The real part of the coefficient \( P^c_n \) defined in (6) can be bounded from above as follows. First, for \( \mu \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( n \neq 0 \), we define the quadratic form

\[
Q^c_n(\mu) \equiv \langle T^{* n}_n(\mu) \delta G^c, (L + L^\dagger) T_n^{* n}(\mu) \delta G^c \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad (Y^t, Z^t) = (\overline{Z}, Y) \quad \text{and} \quad (LY)^t = LY^t, \quad (L^1 Y)^t = L^1 Y^t \tag{9}
\]

for arbitrary operators \( X, Y \in \mathcal{L} \). Using these relations and the fact that the operator \( \delta G^c \) is Hermitian, the quadratic form (7) can be expanded as

\[
Q^c_n(\mu) = 4\mu^2 \left\{ \langle L \delta G^c, L \delta G^c \rangle / \langle n \Omega \rangle^2 + 4\mu^2 \langle \delta G^c, L \delta G^c \rangle + 8\mu \delta G^c, L \delta G^c \rangle + 2 \left( P^c_n + P^{c*}_n \right) \leq 0. \tag{10}
\]

Maximizing this expression with respect to \( \mu \) yields

\[
P^c_n + P^{c*}_n \leq \frac{2 \left\{ \langle L \delta G^c, \delta G^c \rangle + \langle L \delta G^c, L \delta G^c \rangle / \langle n \Omega \rangle^2 \right\}}{\left\{ \langle L \delta G^c, \delta G^c \rangle + \langle L \delta G^c, L \delta G^c \rangle / \langle n \Omega \rangle^2 \right\} \leq 0. \tag{11}
\]

We now observe that

\[
-\langle L \delta G^c, \delta G^c \rangle = \int_0^\infty dt \left\{ e^{tL^1 \delta G^c}, L \delta G^c \right\} = \int_0^\infty dt \left\{ \left( G_{t}^{(1)} \right)^*, \hat{G}_{0}^{(1)} \right\} = L^1 \geq 0. \tag{12}
\]

and

\[
-\langle L \delta G^c, L^2 \delta G^c \rangle = \int_0^\infty dt \left\{ e^{tL^1 \delta G^c}, L^2 \delta G^c \right\} = \int_0^\infty dt \left\{ \left( G_{t}^{(2)} \right)^*, \hat{G}_{0}^{(2)} \right\} = L^2 \geq 0. \tag{13}
\]

Hence, the bound (11) can be cast into the compact form

\[
P^c_n + P^{c*}_n \leq -\frac{2 \left\{ L^1 \delta G^c, \delta G^c \right\}}{\langle n \Omega \rangle^2 + 2 \langle L^2 \delta G^c, L^2 \delta G^c \rangle}. \tag{14}
\]

Using this result to bound the mode expansion (6) yields

\[
P^c = -\frac{2 \left\{ L^1 \delta G^c, \delta G^c \right\}}{\langle n \Omega \rangle^2 + 2 \langle L^2 \delta G^c, L^2 \delta G^c \rangle} \sum_{n > 0} c^w_n c^{w*}_n = -\frac{2 \left\{ L^1 \delta G^c, \delta G^c \right\}}{\langle n \Omega \rangle^2 + 2 \langle L^2 \delta G^c, L^2 \delta G^c \rangle} \int_0^T dt \left( f^w_t \right)^2 \leq 0, \tag{15}
\]

i.e., the upper bound stated in Eq. 16.

We note that, first, for \( \Omega \to 0 \), the coefficients \( P^c_n \) defined in (6) vanish such that \( P^c \to 0 \). Second, (7) and (10) imply

\[
\lim_{\Omega \to \infty} Q^c_n(\mu = 0) = -4L^1 \leq 2 \left( P^c_n + P^{c*}_n \right). \tag{16}
\]
Recalling (6), we thus obtain
\[ \lim_{\Omega \to \infty} P^c = -2L^c \sum_{n>0} c_n^w q_n^w = -\frac{L^c}{T} \int_0^T \langle f_t w \rangle^2. \] (17)

Consequently, the bound (15) is saturated in the two limits $\Omega \to 0$ and $\Omega \to \infty$. Finally, the coefficients $L^c_n$ defined in (12) and (13) vanish if and only if $\delta G^c = 0$, because all eigenvalues of $L$ have non-positive real part and the operator $\delta G^c$ is orthogonal to the null space of $L$. Since the set of Lindblad operators $\{ V_\tau \}$ is self-adjoint and irreducible, this space contains only scalar multiples of the identity operator [3].

II. BOUND ON TOTAL POWER

The upper bound on the total power output stated in Eq. 19 can be established in two major steps. First, we observe that using Eq. 11 and the notation introduced in the previous section, $P = P^c + P^d$ can be written as
\[ P = -\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \int_0^\infty dt \int_0^T \langle f_t w \rangle \{ L^c \delta G^c, \delta G^c \} + \int_0^T \int_0^\infty dt \int_0^T \langle L^c \delta G^d, \delta G^d \rangle + \int_0^T \int_0^\infty dt \int_0^T \langle L^c \delta G^g, \delta G^g \rangle. \] (18)

Upon insertion of the Fourier series expansion
\[ f_t \equiv \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} c_n e^{i\Omega t} \quad (\Omega = 2\pi/T) \] (19)
with $c_n = c_n^a \in \mathbb{C}$ and $a = w, q$, this expression becomes
\[ P = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left( \frac{P^d_n}{P^c_n + P^d_n} \right) c_n^w c_n^{w*} + P^q_n c_n^w c_n^{q*} + P^q_n c_n^{w*} c_n^q \] (20)
where
\[ P^d_n \equiv \left( \frac{\text{in} \Omega \text{Di}}{\text{in} \Omega - L} \right) \delta G^d, \delta G^d \] (21)
\[ P^q_n \equiv \left( \frac{\text{in} \Omega \text{Di}}{\text{in} \Omega - L} \right) \delta G^q, \delta G^q \] (22)
and $P^d_n$ was defined in (6). In (21) and (22), we could replace $L = iH + \text{Di}$ by $\text{Di}$ since, by construction, both $\delta G^d$ and $\delta G^q$ commute with $H$, i.e., $H\delta G^d = H\delta G^q = 0$. We now observe that the real part of the coefficient $P^d_n$ obeys
\[ -2L^d \leq P^d_n + P^d_n^{\ast} \leq 0, \] (23)
where, analogous to (12),
\[ L^d_1 \equiv \int_0^\infty dt \langle \dot{G}_t^{d(1)} \rangle \geq 0. \] (24)

This constraint can be derived by repeating the steps (7) to (14) with the quadratic from
\[ Q^d_n(\mu) \equiv \langle T^d_n(\mu) \delta G^d, \text{Di} T^d_n(\mu) \delta G^d \rangle \leq 0, \quad \text{where} \quad T^d_n(\mu) \equiv \mu + \frac{\text{in} \Omega}{\text{Di} + \text{in} \Omega} \quad \text{and} \quad n \neq 0, \mu \in \mathbb{R}. \] (25)

With (14), (23) implies
\[ 1 + \frac{P^c_n}{P^d_n + P^d_n^{\ast}} \geq \frac{1}{1 + L^d_1 \Omega^2 + L^d_2 \Omega^2} = \phi_{\Omega} \geq 1 \] (26)
and thus, recalling (20),
\[ P \leq \sum_{n>0} \phi_{\Omega} \left( P^d_n + P^d_n^{\ast} \right) c_n^w c_n^{w*} + P^q_n c_n^w c_n^{q*} + P^q_n c_n^{w*} c_n^q. \] (27)

For the second step of our analysis, we note that the inequality (27) can then be rewritten as
\[ P \leq \sum_{n>0} \phi_{\Omega} \left( \frac{\text{in} \Omega \text{Di}}{\text{in} \Omega - \text{Di}} \delta G^q, \delta G^q \right) c_n^w c_n^{q*} + \frac{1}{2\phi_{\Omega}} c_n^{q*} c_n^q \] (29)
with
\[ K_n \equiv c_n^w \frac{\text{in} \Omega}{\text{Di} + \text{in} \Omega} \delta G^q + c_n^{q*} \delta G^q. \] (30)

Here, we have exploited that $\delta G^d$ and $\delta G^q$ are Hermitian operators, the relations (8) and (9) and the fact that the super-operator $\text{Di}$ is self-adjoint. Moreover, since, $\text{Di}$ is negative semidefinite, the first term under the sum in (29) is non-positive, while the second one is non-negative. Thus, we have
\[ P \leq -\frac{1}{4\phi_{\Omega}} \sum_{n>0} c_n^{q*} c_n^q \] (31)

Finally, making the identification
\[ -\langle \delta G^q, \text{Di} \delta G^q \rangle = \int_0^\infty dt \langle \dot{G}_t^{q(1)} \rangle \leq L^q_1 \] (32)
and defining $\psi_{\Omega} \equiv \phi_{\Omega} - 1$ completes our proof of Eq. 19.

III. OPTIMAL CLASSICAL DRIVING

We investigate the conditions that allow saturation of the quasi-classical bound on the total power output
stated in Eq. 21. To this end, using the previously introduced notation, the deviation of $P$ from its upper limit $L_\xi^2 F_q/4$ can be written in the form

$$ P - L_\xi^2 F_q/4 = 2 \sum_{n>0} \left( K_n', D^\dagger K_n' \right) \tag{33} $$

with

$$ K_n' = \frac{in\Omega}{D^\dagger} \delta G^w + \frac{c_n^w}{2} \delta G^q. \tag{34} $$

This expression can be obtained by repeating the derivation of (29) and invoking the additional condition $\delta G^c = 0$, which implies $\delta G^c = \delta G^w$.

From (33) and (34), it follows that $P = L_\xi^2 F_q/4$ if and only if, each $K_n'$ lies in the null space of the superoperator $D^\dagger$, i.e., if $K_n'$ is a scalar multiple of the identity operator for any integer $n > 0$. This condition requires

$$ 0 = 2in\Omega c_n^w \delta G^w + in\Omega c_n^q \delta G^q + c_n^q D^\dagger \delta G^q. \tag{35} $$

We now observe that, since $\delta G^w$ and $\delta G^q$ must be Hermitian operators, (35) has a non-trivial solution only if

$$ \delta G^w = \mu \delta G^q \quad \text{and} \quad D^\dagger \delta G^q = -\lambda \delta G^q $$

for some real $\mu$ and $\lambda > 0$, i.e., if the variable $G^w$ is proportional to the unperturbed Hamiltonian $H$ and $\delta G^q$ is an eigenvector of $D^\dagger$. This connection can be established by splitting the Fourier coefficients $c_n^w$ and $c_n^q$ in real and imaginary parts and therewith separating (35) into two linear equations with real coefficients. Recalling the definition (4) and that $G_q = -H/T$, (36) can be written as

$$ G^w = -\mu H/T \quad \text{and} \quad D^\dagger H = -\lambda (H - \langle H \rangle). \tag{37} $$

Provided the two conditions (36) are met, the solution of (35) reads

$$ 2in\Omega c_n^w = \lambda c_n^q/\mu - in\Omega c_n^q/\mu. \tag{38} $$

Inverting the Fourier transformation (19) thus yields the differential equation

$$ 2\dot{f}_n^w = \lambda(f_n^q - \bar{f}_n^q)/\mu - \dot{f}_n^q/\mu. \tag{39} $$

### IV. SINGLE-QUBIT ENGINE

We consider the two-level engine described by the Hamiltonian shown in Eq. 26. For this system, the superoperator $L$ defined in (2) has the explicit form

$$ LX = \frac{i\omega}{2} [\sigma_z, X] + \frac{\gamma e^{-\kappa}}{2} \left( V_z[X, V_z] + [V_z, X]V_z \right) + \frac{\gamma e^{\kappa}}{2} \left( V_z[X, V_z] + [V_z, X]V_z \right) $$

with $V_z \equiv (\sigma_z \pm i\sigma_y)/2$. It fulfills

$$ L\sigma_z = -\lambda (\sigma_z + \tanh \kappa) = -\lambda (\sigma_z - \langle \sigma_z \rangle), $$

$$ LV_z = (\pm i\omega - \lambda/2) V_z. \tag{41} $$

Using these relations and the fact that $\sigma_z = V_z + V_z$, it is straightforward to evaluate the coefficients $L_j^c$ defined in Eq. 18. Specifically, we find

$$ L_j^c = \frac{\hbar \omega \lambda (1-r)^2 \tanh \kappa}{4} (\omega^2 + \lambda^2/4)^{j-1}, $$

$$ L_j^d = \frac{\hbar \omega \lambda^2 r^2}{2 \cosh^2 \kappa} \lambda^{2j-1}, $$

$$ L_j^q = \frac{\hbar \omega \lambda \kappa}{2 \cosh^2 \kappa} \lambda^{2j-1} \frac{T^2}{T^2}. \tag{42} $$

Plugging these results into the general bounds given in Eqs. 16 and 19 yields Eq. 27.

For the plots of Fig. 2, we use the piecewise defined temperature profile

$$ f_t^q = \Delta T \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
1, & t \leq T/4 \\
2 - 4t/T, & T/4 \leq t \leq T/2 \\
0, & T/2 \leq t \leq 3T/4 \\
4t/T - 3, & 3T/4 \leq t \leq T
\end{array} \right. \tag{43} $$

with Fourier coefficients

$$ c_n^q = \Delta T/2, \quad c_n^q = -\Delta T \frac{(-1)^n (i^n + 1)(i^n - 1)}{n^2 \pi^2} (n \neq 0), \tag{44} $$

see (19). The Fourier coefficients of the work protocol defined through the conditions Eq. 28 and $\int_0^T dt \ f_t^w = 0$ are given by $c_0^w = 0$ and

$$ c_n^w = \frac{1}{T} \frac{in - 1}{2in} c_n^q (n \neq 0). \tag{45} $$

Evaluating the corresponding mean square amplitudes, which were defined in Eqs. 17 and 20, yields

$$ F^w = 2 \sum_{n>0} c_n^w c_n^w \frac{\Delta T^2 T^2 + 10}{240} \quad \text{and} \quad F^q = 2 \sum_{n>0} c_n^q c_n^q \frac{\Delta T^2}{6}. \tag{46} $$

Furthermore, the mode expansion coefficients of the coherent and the classical power, which were introduced in (6), (21) and (22), respectively, become

$$ P_n^c = \frac{\hbar \omega (1-r)^2 \tanh \kappa}{4} \times \left( \frac{\hbar \Omega (i\omega - \lambda/2)}{\hbar \Omega (i\omega + \lambda/2)} - \frac{\hbar \Omega (i\omega + \lambda/2)}{\hbar \Omega (i\omega - \lambda/2)} \right). $$

$$ P_n^d = \frac{\hbar \omega \lambda r^2}{2 \cosh^2 \kappa} \frac{\Omega \lambda}{\Omega \lambda}, $$

$$ P_n^q = \frac{1}{T} \frac{\hbar \omega \lambda}{2 \cosh^2 \kappa} \frac{\Omega \lambda}{\Omega \lambda}. \tag{47} $$

The plots shown in Fig. 2 are now obtained by numerically approximating the improper sums in (6) and (20).
