Classical simulation of quantum-coherent thermal machines
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The performance enhancements observed in various models of continuous quantum thermal machines have been linked to the buildup of coherences in a preferred basis. But, is this connection always an evidence of ‘quantum-thermodynamic supremacy’? By force of example, we show that this is not the case. In particular, we compare a power-driven three-level quantum refrigerator with a four-level combined cycle, partly driven by power and partly by heat. We focus on the weak driving regime and find the four-level model to be superior since it can operate in parameter regimes in which the three-level model cannot, it may exhibit a larger cooling rate, and, simultaneously, a better coefficient of performance. Furthermore, we find that the improvement in the cooling rate matches the increase in the stationary quantum coherences exactly. Crucially, though, we also show that the thermodynamic variables for both models follow from a classical representation based on graph theory. This implies that we can build incoherent stochastic-thermodynamic models with the same steady-state operation or, equivalently, that both coherent refrigerators can be simulated classically. More generally, we prove this for any N-level weakly driven device with a ‘cyclic’ pattern of transitions. Therefore, even if coherence is present in a thermal machine, it is often unnecessary for the underlying energy conversion process.

PACS numbers: 05.70.–a, 03.65.–w, 03.65.Yz

I. INTRODUCTION

‘Quantum thermodynamics’ studies the emergence of thermodynamic behaviour in individual quantum systems [1]. Over the past few years, the field has developed very rapidly [2–6] and yet, key recurring questions remain unanswered:

What is quantum in quantum thermodynamics?

Can quantum heat devices exploit quantumness to outperform their classical counterparts?

Quantum thermal machines are the workhorse of quantum thermodynamics. Very generally, these consist of an individual system S which can couple to various heat baths at different temperatures and, possibly, is also subject to dynamical control by an external field. After a transient, S reaches a non-equilibrium steady state (or a limit cycle) characterized by certain rates of energy exchange with the heat baths. The direction of these energy fluxes can be chosen by engineering S, which may result in, e.g., a heat engine [7] or a refrigerator [8]. Considerable efforts have been devoted to optimize these devices [9–22] and to understand whether genuinely quantum features play an active role in their operation [23–41].

One might say that a thermal machine is quantum provided that S has a discrete spectrum. In fact, the energy filtering allowed by such discreteness can be said to be advantageous, since it enables energy conversion at the (reversible) Carnot limit of maximum efficiency [13, 16, 42]. In most cases, however, it is attributes such as entanglement or coherence which are regarded as the hallmark of genuine quantumness.

In particular, quantum coherence [43, 44] has often been seen as a potential resource, since it can influence the thermodynamic behaviour of open systems [45]. It has been argued, for instance, that radiatively and noise-induced coherences [23–26] might enhance the operation of quantum heat engines [31, 34, 38] and heat-driven quantum refrigerators [39–41]. However, it is not clear whether they are truly instrumental [18, 19, 39, 41], since similar effects can be obtained from stochastic-thermodynamic models [46–49], i.e., classical incoherent systems whose dynamics is governed by balance equations concerning only the populations in some relevant basis (usually, the energy basis).

A possible approach to elucidate the role of quantum coherence in any given model is to add dephasing, thus making it fully incoherent (or classical) [22, 30, 41]. An ensuing reduction in performance would be an evidence of the usefulness of coherence in quantum thermodynamics. Furthermore, if the ultimate limits on the performance of incoherent thermal machines can be established, coherences would become thermodynamically detectable—one would simply need to search for violations of such bounds [22, 50].

In this paper we shall adopt a much more stringent operational definition for ‘quantumness’: No thermal machine should be classified as quantum if its thermodynamic behaviour can be replicated exactly by an incoherent simulator. Interestingly, we will show that many quantum coherent heat devices are thermodynamically indistinguishable from their ‘classical simulators’ and hence, no external test can conclusively capture their quantumness.

If it exists, such simulator needs not be related to the coher-
ent device of interest by the mere addition of dephasing—it can be a different model so long as it remains incoherent at all times and that, once in the stationary regime, it exchanges energy with its surroundings at the same rates as the original machine. In particular, the transient dynamics of the coherent model can be very different from that of its simulator. In the steady state, however, it must be impossible to tell one from the other by only looking at heat fluxes and power.

We will focus on periodically driven continuous refrigerators with a ‘cyclic’ scheme of transitions (see Fig. 1), although the exact same argument could be made about heat engines. Specifically, ‘continuous’ thermal machines [3] are models in which the working substance $S$ couples simultaneously to a cold bath at temperature $T_c$, a hot bath at $T_h > T_c$, and a classical field $\hat{C}$. In the case of a refrigerator, the latter can drive heat transport against the temperature gradient in a suitable parameter range, or ‘cooling window’. We will work in the limit of very weak driving and average all quantities over a period of the external field. This will allow us to derive a ‘local’ master equation for $S$ [51]. Our main result is that the steady-state operation of any such quantum-coherent $N$-level machine admits a classical representation based on graph theory [48, 52–55]. It follows that an incoherent device can always be built such that its steady-state thermodynamic variables coincide with those of the original model. Hence, an entire family of thermal machines featuring quantum coherence in the (bare) energy basis can be simulated classically. We will then use the paradigmatic power-driven three-level refrigerator [8, 56, 57] as a benchmark for a novel four-level hybrid device, driven by a mixture of heat and work. Concretely, we will show that our new model may have a wider range of applications than the traditional four-level refrigerator [8, 56, 57] as a benchmark for a novel four-level thermal machine. In particular, the transient dynamics of the coherent machine can be very different from that of its simulator so long as it remains incoherent at all times and that, once in the stationary regime, it exchanges energy with its surroundings at the same rates as the original machine. In particular, the transient dynamics of the coherent model can be very different from that of its simulator. In the steady state, however, it must be impossible to tell one from the other by only looking at heat fluxes and power.

We will start by introducing the general model for a coherent cyclic thermal machine (see Fig. 1). The Hamiltonian for the system or working substance $S$ is comprised of two terms: a bare (time-independent) Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0$ and a time-dependent contribution $\hat{H}_d(t)$ which describes the coupling to a sinusoidal driving field. That is,

$$\hat{H}(t) = \hat{H}_0 + \hat{H}_d(t),$$

$$\hat{H}_0 = \sum_{j=1}^{N} E_j |j\rangle \langle j|,$$

$$\hat{H}_d(t) = 2\hbar \lambda |j\rangle \langle j+1| \cos \omega j t + \text{h.c.},$$

where $\hbar$ is the reduced Planck constant and $\lambda$ controls the strength of the interaction with the field. $E_j$ and $|j\rangle$ are, respectively, the energies and eigenstates of the bare Hamiltonian. In particular, the driving connects the bare energy states $|j\rangle$ and $|j+1\rangle$. For simplicity, we assume a resonant coupling,
i.e., $\omega_j \equiv (E_{j+1} - E_j)/\hbar$, which is optimal from a thermodynamic viewpoint. The generalization to the non-resonant case is, nevertheless, straightforward.

The hot and cold bath can be cast as infinite collections of independent bosonic modes with a well-defined temperature. Their Hamiltonians read

$$
\hat{H}_{\alpha} = \hbar \sum_{\mu} \omega_{\mu,\alpha} \hat{b}^\dagger_{\mu,\alpha} \hat{b}_{\mu,\alpha}, \quad \alpha \in \{c, h\},
$$

with $\hat{b}^\dagger_{\mu,\alpha}$ and $\hat{b}_{\mu,\alpha}$ being the bosonic creation and annihilation operators of the mode at frequency $\omega_{\mu,\alpha}$ in bath $\alpha \in \{c, h\}$. For the system-baths couplings, we adopt the general form $\hat{H}_{X_{\alpha}} = \hat{X}_\alpha \otimes \hat{B}_\alpha$, where

$$
\hat{X}_\alpha = \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}_\alpha} \omega_{\mu,\alpha} \hat{b}^\dagger_{\mu,\alpha} \hat{b}_{\mu,\alpha},
$$

and $\hat{B}_\alpha = \hbar \sqrt{\gamma_{\alpha}} \sum_{\mu} g_{\mu,\alpha} (\hat{b}_{\mu,\alpha} + \hat{b}^\dagger_{\mu,\alpha})$.

Here, $g_{\mu,\alpha} \propto \sqrt{\omega_{\mu,\alpha}}$ and $\gamma_{\alpha}$ is the dissipation rate for bath $\alpha$. $\mathbb{R}_\alpha$ stands for the labels of the eigenstates $|\mu\rangle$ dissipatively coupled to $|j + 1\rangle$ through the interaction with bath $\alpha$. For instance, in Fig. 1, $\mathbb{R}_c = \{1, 3, \ldots, j + 1, \ldots, N\}$ and $\mathbb{R}_h = \{2, 4, \ldots, j - 1, \ldots\}$. Notice that all levels $\mu$ are positioned to $|j + 1\rangle$ (provided that $i \neq j$) via either the hot or the cold bath. In particular, the $N$-th level couples to $i = 1$, hence closing the cycle. Without loss of generality, we consider that all transitions related to the same bath have different energy gaps, i.e., $|\omega_k| \neq |\omega_l|$ for $k, l \in \mathbb{R}_\alpha$ ($k \neq l$). This technical assumption simplifies the master equation but does not restrict the physics of the problem. The full Hamiltonian of the setup is thus

$$
\hat{H} = \hat{H}_e + \sum_{\alpha} \hat{H}_{X_{\alpha}} + \hat{H}_{\alpha}.
$$

### B. The local master equation for weak driving

When deriving an effective equation of motion for the system, it is important to consider the various time scales involved [58]. Namely, the bath correlation time $\tau_B$, the intrinsic time scale of the bare system $\tau_0$, the relaxation time scale $\tau_R$, and the typical time associated with the interaction of the bare system with the external field $\tau_{s-d}$. These are

$$
\tau_B \approx \max \left\{ \hbar/k_B T_c, \hbar/k_B T_h \right\} = \hbar/k_B T_c,
$$

$$
\tau_0 \approx \max \left\{ |\pm \omega_k \mp \omega_l|^{-1}, |2 \omega_k|^{-1} \right\}, \quad (k \neq l).
$$

$$
\tau_R \approx \gamma_{\alpha}^{-1}, \quad \alpha \in \{c, h\}.
$$

$$
\tau_{s-d} \approx \lambda^{-1}.
$$

For a moment, let us switch off the time-dependent term $\hat{H}_d(t)$ and discuss the usual weak-coupling Markovian master equation, i.e., the Gorini-Kossakowski-Lindblad-Sudarshan (GKLS) equation [59, 60]. Its microscopic derivation relies on the Born-Markov and secular approximations, which hold whenever $\tau_B \ll \tau_R$ and $\tau_0 \ll \tau_R$. It can be written as

$$
\frac{d\hat{\rho}_s}{dt} = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{H}_0(t), \hat{\rho}_s] + (\mathcal{L}_c + \mathcal{L}_h) \hat{\rho}_s,
$$

where $\hat{\rho}_s$ is the reduced state of the $N$-level system. Crucially, due to the underlying Born approximation of weak dissipation, Eq. (6) is correct only to $O(\max\{\gamma_c, \gamma_h\})$.

The action of the super-operator $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$ is given by

$$
\mathcal{L}_\alpha \hat{\rho}_s = \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}_\alpha} \Gamma_{\omega_{\mu,\alpha}} \left( \hat{A}_\mu \hat{\rho}_s \hat{A}_\mu^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} [\hat{A}_\mu^\dagger, \hat{A}_\mu, \hat{\rho}_s]_+ \right) + \Gamma_{-\omega_{\mu,\alpha}} \left( \hat{A}_\mu^\dagger \hat{\rho}_s \hat{A}_\mu - \frac{1}{2} [\hat{A}_\mu, \hat{A}_\mu^\dagger, \hat{\rho}_s]_+ \right).
$$

Here, $\hat{A}_\mu = |\mu\rangle \langle i + 1|$ and the notation $[\cdot, \cdot]_+$ stands for anti-commutator. The ‘jump’ operators $\hat{A}_\mu$ are such that $\hat{X}_\alpha = \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}_\alpha} \hat{A}_\mu$ and $[\hat{H}_0, \hat{A}_\mu] = -\omega_\mu \hat{A}_\mu$. As a result, the operators $\hat{X}_\alpha$ in the interaction picture with respect to $\hat{H}_0$ read

$$
e^{i \hat{H}_0 t/\hbar} \hat{X}_\alpha e^{-i \hat{H}_0 t/\hbar} = \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}_\alpha} e^{-i \omega_\mu t} \hat{A}_\mu.
$$

This identity is a key step in the derivation of Eq. (6) [58].

If we now switch $\hat{H}_d(t)$ back on, we will need to change the propagator in Eq. (8) over to the time-ordered exponential

$$
\hat{U}_s(t) = \mathcal{T} \exp \left[ -i \hbar^{-1} \int_0^t dt' [\hat{H}_0 + \hat{H}_d(t')] \right].
$$

When deriving a GKLS master equation for such a periodically driven system one also looks for a different decomposition on the right-hand side of Eq. (8) [16, 61, 62]. Namely,

$$
\hat{U}_s(t) \hat{X}_\alpha \hat{U}_s(t) = \sum_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{[\mu \mid [\mu \mid \gamma\alpha]} e^{-i (\omega_\mu + \omega_\gamma) t} \hat{A}_q^{(q)}.
$$

We will skip all the technical details and limit ourselves to note that, in addition to $\tau_B \ll \tau_R$ and $\tau_0 \ll \tau_R$, we make the weak driving assumption of $\tau_R \ll \tau_{s-d}$. Eq. (10) can be cast as

$$
\hat{U}_s(t) \hat{X}_\alpha \hat{U}_s(t) = e^{i \hat{H}_0 t/\hbar} \hat{X}_\alpha e^{-i \hat{H}_0 t/\hbar} + O(\lambda) = \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}_\alpha} e^{-i \omega_\mu t} \hat{A}_\mu + O(\lambda).
$$

This is due to the fact that $\hat{H}_d = O(\lambda)$ while $\hat{H}_0 = O(1)$. Exploiting Eq. (11) and following the exact same standard steps that lead to Eq. (6), one can easily see that the master equation

$$
\frac{d\hat{\rho}_s}{dt} = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{H}_0 + \hat{H}_d(t), \hat{\rho}_s] + (\mathcal{L}_c + \mathcal{L}_h) \hat{\rho}_s
$$

would hold up to $O(\lambda \max\{\gamma_c, \gamma_h\})$.

Effectively, Eq. (12) assumes that the dissipation is entirely decoupled from the intrinsic dynamics of $S$, which includes the driving. This is reminiscent of the ‘local’ master equations which are customarily used when dealing with weakly interacting multipartite open quantum systems [51, 63, 64].

We want to emphasize that, just like we have done here, it is very important to establish precisely the range of validity of such local equations [65] since using them inconsistently can lead to violations of the laws of thermodynamics [66, 67].

It is convenient to move into the rotating frame $\hat{\rho}_s \mapsto e^{i \hat{H}_0 t/\hbar} \hat{\rho}_s e^{-i \hat{H}_0 t/\hbar} = \hat{\sigma}_s$ in order to remove the explicit time dependence on the right-hand side of Eq. (12) and simplify the calculations. This gives

$$
\frac{d\hat{\sigma}_s}{dt} = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{H}_d, \hat{\sigma}_s] + (\mathcal{L}_c + \mathcal{L}_h) \hat{\sigma}_s.
$$
where the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_d(t)$ in the rotating frame is given by

$$\hat{h}_d = \hbar \lambda (|j\rangle \langle j+1| + \text{h.c.}).$$  (14)

Here, we have neglected two fast-rotating terms, with frequencies $\pm 2\omega_j$. This is consistent with our weak driving approximation $\tau_{\text{ext}} \gg \tau_h$, as all quantities here have been time-averaged over one period of the driving field.

The ‘decay rates’ $\Gamma_{\alpha}^{\omega}$ from Eq. (7) are the only missing pieces to proceed to calculate the thermodynamic variables in the non-equilibrium steady state of $S$. These are

$$\Gamma_{\alpha}^{\omega} = 2 \Re \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}r \ e^{\lambda \omega t} \text{Tr}[\hat{B}_x(t)\hat{B}_y(t-r)\hat{\rho}_\alpha],$$  (15)

where the operator $\hat{\rho}_\alpha$ represents the thermal state of bath $\alpha$. Assuming $d_\alpha$-dimensional baths with an infinite cutoff frequency, the decay rates become [58]

$$\Gamma_{\alpha}^{\omega} = \gamma_{\alpha} (\omega/\omega_0)^{d\alpha} \left[1 - \exp(-\hbar\omega_0/k_BT_α)\right]^{-1},$$  (16a)

$$\Gamma_{\alpha}^{\omega} = \exp(-\hbar\omega_0/k_BT_α)\Gamma_{\alpha}^{\omega},$$  (16b)

with $\omega > 0$. In our model, $\omega_0$ depends on the physical realization of the system-bath coupling. $d_\alpha = 1$ would correspond to Ohmic dissipation and $d_\alpha = [2,3]$, to the super-Ohmic case.

### C. Heat currents, power, and performance

As it is standard in quantum thermodynamics, we will use the master equation (13) to break down the average energy change of the bare system $\frac{dE}{dt}(t) = \text{tr}[(\hat{H}_0 \frac{d}{dt}\hat{\sigma}_s(t))]$ into ‘heat’ and ‘power’ contributions [i.e., $\frac{dE}{dt}(t) = \sum_\alpha \hat{Q}_\alpha(t) + \hat{\mathcal{P}}(t)$]. These can be defined as [68]

$$\hat{Q}_\alpha(t) := \text{tr}[(\hat{H}_0 L_\alpha \hat{\sigma}_s(t))],$$  (17a)

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}(t) := -i\hbar^{-1} \text{tr}[\hat{H}_0 [\hat{\sigma}_s(t)],].$$  (17b)

In the long-time limit, $\frac{dE}{dt}(t) \overset{t \to \infty}{\to} 0$, and we will denote the corresponding steady-state heat currents and stationary power input by $\hat{Q}_\alpha$ and $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$, respectively. In particular, from Eqs. (7) and (17) it can be shown that [68, 69]

$$\hat{Q}_c + \hat{Q}_h + \hat{\mathcal{P}} = 0,$$  (18a)

$$\frac{\hat{Q}_c}{T_c} + \frac{\hat{Q}_h}{T_h} \leq 0,$$  (18b)

which amount to the first and second laws of thermodynamics. Using Eqs. (1b), (7), (14), and (17), we find for our cyclic $N$-level model

$$\hat{Q}_\alpha = \sum_{i \in R_\alpha} (E_{i+1} - E_i) J_i,$$  (19a)

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}} = 2\hbar k\lambda \omega_j \text{Im} \langle j|\hat{\sigma}_s(\infty)|j+1\rangle,$$  (19b)

where $J_i = \Gamma_{\alpha i}^{\omega} P_{i+1}^{(\infty)} - \Gamma_{\alpha i}^{\omega} P_{i}^{(\infty)}$ is the net stationary transition rate from $|i\rangle$ to $|i+1\rangle$ and $P_{i}^{(\infty)} := \langle i|\hat{\sigma}_s(\infty)|i\rangle$. The super-index $\alpha_i$ stands for the bath associated with the dissipative transition $|i\rangle \leftrightarrow |i+1\rangle$. Crucially, Eq. (19b) implies that vanishing stationary quantum coherence results in vanishing power consumption ($\mathcal{P} = 0$) and hence, no refrigeration (see also, e.g., Ref. [3]). In fact, as we shall see below, $\hat{Q}_\alpha = 0$ in absence of coherence. Therefore, our cyclic model in Fig. 1 is inherently quantum since it requires non-zero coherences to operate.

### D. Steady-state populations and coherence

The key to understand why our weakly driven cyclic devices can be simulated classically resides in the interplay between populations and coherence in the eigenbasis of the bare Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0$. In this representation, Eq. (13) reads:

$$\frac{dp_i}{dt} = \Gamma_{\alpha i}^{\omega} P_{i+1} - \left(\Gamma_{\alpha i}^{\omega} + \Gamma_{\alpha i}^{\omega}\right) P_i + \Gamma_{\alpha i}^{\omega} P_{i+1},$$  (20a)

$$\frac{dp_j}{dt} = \Gamma_{\alpha j}^{\omega} P_{j+1} - \Gamma_{\alpha j}^{\omega} P_j - 2\lambda \text{Im} \langle j|\hat{\sigma}_s|j+1\rangle,$$  (20b)

$$\frac{dp_{j+1}}{dt} = \Gamma_{\alpha j+1}^{\omega} P_{j+2} - \Gamma_{\alpha j+1}^{\omega} P_{j+1} + 2\lambda \text{Im} \langle j|\hat{\sigma}_s|j+1\rangle,$$  (20c)

for $i \neq |j, j+1\rangle$. Note that we have omitted the time labels in $p_k = \langle k|\hat{\sigma}_s(t)|k\rangle$ for brevity. Importantly, the populations of the pairs of levels coupled to the driving field do depend on the coherence between them. In turn, this coherence evolves as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle j|\hat{\sigma}_s|j+1\rangle = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\Gamma_{\alpha j+1}^{\omega} + \Gamma_{\alpha j-1}^{\omega}\right) \langle j|\hat{\sigma}_s|j+1\rangle - i\lambda \langle j|\hat{\sigma}_s|j+1\rangle - i\lambda \langle j|\hat{\sigma}_s|j+1\rangle.$$  (21)

Hence, the steady-state coherence (i.e., $\frac{d}{dt} \langle j|\hat{\sigma}_d|j+1\rangle \overset{t \to \infty}{\to} 0$) in the subspace spanned by $|j\rangle$ and $|j+1\rangle$ is given in terms of the steady-state populations only. Namely, as

$$\langle j|\hat{\sigma}_s|j+1\rangle \overset{t \to \infty}{\to} \frac{2\lambda \langle j|\hat{\sigma}_s|j+1\rangle - 2\lambda \langle j|\hat{\sigma}_s|j+1\rangle}{\Gamma_{\alpha j+1}^{\omega} + \Gamma_{\alpha j-1}^{\omega}}.$$  (22)

Inserting Eq. (22) in (20) and imposing $\frac{d}{dt} p_{j+1}^{(\infty)} = 0$ yields a linear system of equations for the $N$ stationary populations $p_{j}^{(\infty)} := \langle p_j^{(\infty)}, p_{j+1}^{(\infty)}, \ldots, p_N^{(\infty)} \rangle^T$. This can be cast as $W p_{j}^{(\infty)} = 0$, where the non-zero elements of the ‘matrix of rates’ $W$ are

$$W_{i,i+1} = \Gamma_{\alpha i}^{\omega}, \quad W_{i+1,i} = \Gamma_{\alpha i}^{\omega},$$

$$W_{i,i-1} = \Gamma_{\alpha i-1}^{\omega}, \quad W_{i-1,i} = \Gamma_{\alpha i-1}^{\omega},$$

$$W_{i,i} = -\left(\Gamma_{\alpha i}^{\omega} + \Gamma_{\alpha i-1}^{\omega}\right),$$

for $i \neq |j, j+1\rangle$, and

$$W_{j+1,j+1} = \Gamma_{\alpha j+1}^{\omega} + \Gamma_{\alpha j+1}^{\omega}$$

$$W_{j,j} = -\left(\Gamma_{\alpha j}^{\omega} + \Gamma_{\alpha j-1}^{\omega}\right),$$

$$W_{j+1,j+1} = -\left(\Gamma_{\alpha j+1}^{\omega} + \Gamma_{\alpha j+1}^{\omega}\right).$$

Note that, even if $W p_{j}^{(\infty)} = 0$ (together with the normalization condition) determines the stationary populations of our model, Eqs. (20) certainly differ from

$$\frac{dq(t)}{dt} = W q(t).$$  (25)
That is, the $q(t)$ defined by Eq. (25) converges to $p_{\infty}$ asymptotically but it does not coincide with $(p_1(t), \cdots, p_N(t))^T$ at any finite time. Nonetheless, as we shall argue below, a classical system $S'$ made up of $N$ discrete states evolving as per Eq. (25) can simulate the steady-state energy conversion process of the quantum-coherent system $S$. Note that a similar trick has been used in [39], for an absorption refrigerator model where coherences appear accidentally, due to degeneracy. In contrast, as argued in Sec. II C, the quantum coherence in our model is instrumental for its operation.

III. CLASSICAL SIMULATORS

A. General properties

Let us now discuss in detail the properties of the simulator $S'$ as defined by Eq. (25). First of all, note that (25) is a proper balance equation since: (i) the non-diagonal elements of $W$ are positive, (ii) the pairs $\{W_{i,i+1}, W_{i+1,i}\}$ satisfy the detailed balance relations [cf. Eqs. (16b), (23), and (24)]

\[ \frac{W_{i+1,i}}{W_{i,i+1}} = \exp\left(-\frac{\hbar \omega_i}{k_B T_{a,i}}\right), \quad (i \neq j) \]  

\[ \frac{W_{j+1,i}}{W_{j,i+1}} = 1, \]

and (iii) the sum over columns in $W$ is zero (i.e., $W_{k,k} = -\sum_{i \neq k} W_{i,k}$), reflecting the conservation of probability. This also implies that $W$ is singular and that $p_{\infty}$ is given by its non-vanishing off-diagonal elements.

Notice as well that rates like $\{W_{i,i+1}, W_{i+1,i}\}$ in Eq. (26) can always be attributed to excitation-relaxation processes (across a gap $\hbar \omega_i$) mediated by a heat bath at temperature $T_{a,i}$. $\{W_{j,j+1}, W_{j+1,j}\}$ indicate instead saturation due to, e.g., the interaction with an external driving field or, equivalently, a heat bath at infinite temperature. Looking back at Eqs. (23), we see that the rates for the dissipative interactions in $S'$ are identical to those in $S$. However, according to Eq. (24), the coupling to the driving is much smaller in the simulator than in the original quantum-coherent model. Hence, $S'$ is not the result of dephasing the $N$-level cyclic machine, but a different device.

At this point, we still need to find a physical embodiment for our simulator, and show that its steady-state energy fluxes actually coincide with Eqs. (19). To do so, we will build a classical representation of $S'$ based on graph theory.

B. Graph representation and thermodynamic variables

Using graph theory for the thermodynamic analysis of a system described by a set of rate equations has two major advantages: First, it provides a clear interpretation of the underlying energy conversion mechanisms [54] and, secondly, it allows for the calculation of the thermodynamic variables directly from the matrix of rates [52]. In fact, the graph itself also follows from $W$ —each state $k = [1, 2, \ldots, N]$ becomes a ‘vertex’ and each pair of non-vanishing rates $\{W_{k,i}, W_{i,k}\}$ $k \neq i$ becomes an ‘undirected edge’ $(k, l)$ connecting $k$ and $l$. Specifically, this mapping would take Eq. (25) into the ‘circuit graph’ $\tilde{C}_N$ depicted in Fig. 2(a). We can thus think of $S'$ as a classical device transitioning cyclically between $N$ states.

Now that we have a physical picture in mind, we will show that such classical simulator is thermodynamically equivalent to the coherent $N$-level machine, once in its steady state. Specifically, we will focus on rewriting the thermodynamic variables of $S$ [cf. Eqs. (19)] in terms of elements of $S'$. To that end, some graph objects need to be introduced. For instance, the undirected graph $\tilde{C}_N$ may be oriented (or directed) either clockwise or anticlockwise, leading to the ‘cycles’ $\tilde{C}_N$ and $-\tilde{C}_N$, respectively [see Fig. 2(b)]. We may want to eliminate an edge from $\tilde{C}_N$, e.g., $(k, k + 1)$; the resulting undirected graph would be the ‘maximal tree’ $T_k$ [see Fig. 2(c)]. Maximal trees can also be oriented towards a vertex, e.g., $l$; the corresponding graph would then be denoted by $\tilde{T}_k^l$ [see Fig. 2(d)]. Finally, if the edge $(k, l)$ is directed, e.g., from vertex $k$ to vertex $l$, we may pair it with the transition rate $W_{k,l}$. Similarly, any directed subgraph $G$ can be assigned a numeric value $\mathcal{A}(G)$ given by the product of the transition rates of its directed edges. For example, $\mathcal{A}(\tilde{C}_N) = \prod_{k=1}^{N} W_{k+1,k}$ and $\mathcal{A}(-\tilde{C}_N) = \prod_{k=1}^{N} W_{k,k+1}$.

Our aim is to cast $\mathcal{D}_a$ and $\mathcal{P}$ solely as functions of graph objects referring to $\tilde{C}_N$. Let us start by noting that, the steady
state populations \( p_i^{(\infty)} \) of \( S \) can be written as [53]

\[
p_i^{(\infty)} = \mathcal{D}(C_N)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T}_k^i),
\]

since, by definition, they coincide with those of \( S' \). Here, \( \mathcal{D}(C_N) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T}_k^i) \).

Introducing Eq. (27) in the definition of \( J_i \) [see text below Eqs. (19)], we get

\[
J_i = \mathcal{D}(C_N)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left[ W_{i+1,i} \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T}_k^i) - W_{i,i+1} \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T}_k^{i+1}) \right].
\]

The bracketed term in Eq. (28) turns out to be \( [\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{C}_N) - \mathcal{A}(-\mathbf{C}_N)] \delta_{ii} \) [55], where \( \delta_{ii} \) stands for the Kronecker delta. Therefore \( J_i \) does not depend on \( i \)

\[
J_i = \mathcal{D}(C_N)^{-1} \left[ \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{C}_N) - \mathcal{A}(-\mathbf{C}_N) \right] = J.
\]

That is, in the steady state, the system exchanges energy with both baths and the driving field, at the same rate. This is often referred to as ‘strong coupling’ between heat and work fluxes [13] and implies that our \( N \)-level device is ‘endoreversible’ [16] and hence, that it can operate in the reversible limit of maximum efficiency [28].

As a result, Eq. (19a) becomes \( \mathcal{J}_a = J \sum_{i \in R_a} E_{i+1} - E_i \).

Using (23) and (26a), we can see that

\[
\sum_{i \in R_a} E_{i+1} - E_i = -T_a k_B \ln \frac{\mathcal{A}^a(\mathbf{C}_N)}{\mathcal{A}^a(-\mathbf{C}_N)} := -T_a \mathcal{X}^a(\mathbf{C}_N),
\]

where \( \mathcal{A}^a(\pm\mathbf{C}_N) \) is the product of the rates of the directed edges in \( \pm\mathbf{C}_N \) associated with bath \( a \) only. Combining Eqs. (29) and (30), we can finally express the steady-state heat currents \( \mathcal{J}_a \) of the quantum-coherent \( N \)-level device \( S \) as:

\[
\mathcal{J}_a = -T_a \mathcal{X}^a(\mathbf{C}_N) \left[ \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{C}_N) - \mathcal{A}(-\mathbf{C}_N) \right] \equiv \mathcal{J}_a(C_N).
\]

On the other hand, the power is easily calculated from energy conservation [cf. Eq. (18a)]. Remarkably, the right-hand side of Eq. (31) coincides with the steady-state heat currents of the circuit graph in Fig. 2(a), i.e., \( \mathcal{J}_a = \mathcal{J}_a(C_N) \) [52]. Note that this is far from trivial, since (31) refers to \( S \), even if written in terms of graph objects related to \( S' \).

Therefore, we have shown that the \( N \)-level refrigerator and its classical simulator exhibit the same stationary heat currents and power consumption and are thus, thermodynamically indistinguishable. This is our main result. Note that the significance of Eq. (31) is not just that our model is classically simulable, but that it is classically simulable in spite of requiring quantum coherence to operate (cf. Sec. II C).

### C. Performance optimization of the thermal machine

The graph-theoretic expression (31) for the circuit currents of the classical simulator can also prove useful in the performance optimization of our quantum-coherent thermal machines \( S \) [55]. For instance, from the bracketed factor we see that the asymmetry in the stationary rates associated with opposite cycles is crucial in increasing the energy-conversion rate. On the other hand, the number of positive terms in the denominator scales as \( \mathcal{D}(C_N) \sim N^2 \), leading to vanishing currents. Therefore, larger energy-conversion rates are generally obtained in small few-level devices [17] featuring the largest possible asymmetry between opposite cycles.

Let us now focus on the refrigerator operation mode (i.e., \( \mathcal{J}_c > 0 \), \( \mathcal{J}_h < 0 \) and \( \mathcal{J}_t > 0 \)). Besides maximizing the cooling rate \( \mathcal{J}_c \), it is of practical interest to operate at large ‘coefficient of performance’ (COP) \( \varepsilon \), i.e., at large cooling per unit of supplied power. In particular, the COP writes as

\[
\varepsilon := \mathcal{J}_c(C_N) = \frac{\mathcal{J}_c(C_N)}{\mathcal{J}_h(C_N)} = \frac{T_c \mathcal{X}^c(C_N)}{T_h \mathcal{X}^c(C_N) + T_h \mathcal{X}^h(C_N)}.
\]

As a consequence of the second law [cf. Eq. (18b)], \( \mathcal{J}_c(C_N) \) is upper bounded by the Carnot COP

\[
\varepsilon(C_N) \leq \varepsilon_C = \frac{T_c}{T_h - T_c}.
\]

This limit would be saturated when \( \mathcal{X}^h(C_N) = -\mathcal{X}^c(C_N) \).

Since the coupling to the driving field sets the smallest energy scale in our problem, the corresponding transition rate will normally satisfy \( W_{j,j+1} \ll W_{i,j+1}, \forall j \neq i \), unless some \( \omega_j \) becomes very small. In turn, recalling the definition of an oriented maximal tree \( \mathbf{T}_k^i \) [see Fig. 2(d)], this implies \( \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T}_k^i)_{k \neq j} \ll \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T}_k^j)_{k \neq i} \), since the latter do not contain the small factors \( W_{j,j+1} = W_{i,j+1} \), and allows for a convenient simplification of \( \mathcal{D}(C_N) \) that we shall use below. Namely,

\[
\mathcal{D}(C_N) = \left( \sum_{k \neq j}^{N} \sum_{l=1}^{N} \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T}_k^j) \right) + 1 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T}_i^j) \approx \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T}_i^j).
\]

### IV. EXAMPLE: A FOUR-LEVEL COMBINED-CYCLE QUANTUM REFRIGERATOR

#### A. The model

Before presenting our combined-cycle four-level model, let us introduce the three-level refrigerator that will serve as benchmark. The system is depicted in Fig. 3(a) and consists of three states \( \{1,2,3\} \) with energies \( \{h_0, h_0, h_0\} \) connected through dissipative interactions with a cold and a hot
The system $S$ consists of three levels with energies $0, \hbar \omega_c, \hbar \omega_h$, such that $0 \leq \omega_c \leq \omega_h$. The dissipative transitions tagged $e$ and $h$ are mediated by a cold (blue arrow) and a hot bath (red arrow), respectively. The transition $w$ is driven by an external sinusoidal field (curly green arrow). (b) Four-level model. An extra level with energy $\hbar (\omega_h + \epsilon)$ is added to the three-level scheme. Note that $\epsilon$ can be positive or negative. The driving is now applied to the transition $|2 \rangle \leftrightarrow |4 \rangle$ and the new dissipative transition $|4 \rangle \leftrightarrow |3 \rangle$, due to the hot bath, is added to close the thermodynamic cycle. The circuit graphs associated with the three and four-level models are depicted in panels (c) and (d), respectively. The thick blue (red) lines stand for dissipative transitions via the cold (hot) baths and the thin green lines, for the coupling to the driving.

where $X_c := \hbar \epsilon / k_B T_h$ is a third thermodynamic force associated with the new dissipative transition. Note that the energy supplied by the hot bath for the process $|4 \rangle \leftrightarrow |3 \rangle$ is not included in the denominator of Eq. (36b) as it is residual heat, essentially free of cost.

B. Cooling window

The operation mode —i.e., heat engine or refrigerator— will depend on the specific parameters of the models. In particular, to achieve cooling action in the three-level benchmark we must have $\mathcal{Q}_c(C_3) > 0$. According to Eq. (35a), this implies $X_c - X_h < 0$ or, equivalently,

\[
\omega_c < \omega_{c,\text{rev}} := \frac{T_c}{T_h}.
\]

Taking a fixed $\omega_h$, the range of values $\omega_c < \omega_{c,\text{rev}}$ is thus referred to as cooling window. On the other hand, from Eq. (36a) we can see that cooling is possible on $C_4$ if

\[
\omega_c < (\omega_h + \epsilon) \frac{T_c}{T_h}.
\]

Hence, whenever $\epsilon > 0$ the cooling window of the four-level model is wider than that of the benchmark for the same parameters $\omega_h$, $T_h$, $\lambda$, $\gamma_h$, and $d_d$. Conversely, if we were interested in building a quantum heat engine, a negative $\epsilon$ [as depicted in Fig. 3(b)] would broaden the operation range.

C. Power enhancement

We will now try to maximize the ratio $\mathcal{R} := \mathcal{Q}_c(C_4) / \mathcal{Q}_c(C_3)$ by tuning the free parameter $\epsilon$. Finding $\mathcal{R} > 1$ would indicate
that upgrading the three-level model into a four-level device can increase the energy-conversion rate.

A manageable analytical approximation for $\mathcal{R}$ can be obtained by combining Eqs. (23), (24), (35a), and (36a) with the assumption that the smallest transition rate is the one related to the driving field [i.e., Eq. (34)]. This gives

$$\mathcal{R} = \frac{\mathcal{Q}_c(C_4)}{\mathcal{Q}_c(C_3)} = AD,$$  \hspace{1cm} (39a)

$$A := \frac{1 + \exp(X_c) + \exp(X_b - X_h)}{1 + \exp(X_c) + \exp(X_b - X_h) + \exp(X_c - X_h - X_b)} \times \frac{1 - \exp(X_c - X_b - X_h)}{1 - \exp(X_c - X_h)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (39b)

$$D := \frac{1 + \Gamma_h^b}{1 + \Gamma_b^c}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (39c)

As we can see, the factor $A$ depends exclusively on the thermodynamic forces $X_c$, $X_b$, and $X_h$. It is thus only related to the degree of asymmetry between the orientations of the corresponding circuit graphs. In contrast, the quantity $D$ is purely dissipative. Fig. 4(a) illustrates how the approximation (39a) may hold almost exactly; namely, we work with one-dimensional baths ($d_c = d_b = 1$) at moderate to large temperatures ($k_B T_a/k_B \geq 1$). In this range of parameters, $A$ is the main contribution to the enhancement of $\mathcal{Q}_c$, so that $\mathcal{R}$ is nearly insensitive to changes in the dissipation strengths.

On the contrary, when taking three-dimensional baths ($d_c = d_b = 3$), the frequency-dependence of the transition rates is largely accentuated. At small $\epsilon$ the rate $W_{2,4}$ ceases to be the smallest in $\mathcal{C}_4$, which invalidates Eqs. (39) [see Fig. 4(b)] \footnote{Recall that, for Eq. (12) to be valid, we must have $2\epsilon \gg \gamma_b$ as required by the underlying secular approximation $\omega_0 \ll \omega_\epsilon$ [cf. Eq. (5)]. The solid lines in Figs. 4 are mere guides to the eye, which smoothly interpolate between points well within the range of validity of the master equation.}. In this case, the behaviour of $\mathcal{R}$ is dominated by $D$, and grows almost linearly with $\gamma_b$. Similar disagreements between $\mathcal{R}$ and the approximate formula Eq. (39) can be observed in the low-temperature regime.

Factorizing $\mathcal{R}$ as in Eqs. (39) thus provides insights into the physical mechanisms which dominate the energy-conversion process in different parameter ranges. Such factorization would not be obvious without resorting to the graph representation of the corresponding thermodynamic cycles, which highlights the usefulness of this formalism.

Interestingly, as illustrated in Fig. 4(b), the hybrid four-level design can operate at much larger energy-conversion rates than the benchmark. Indeed, for the arbitrarily chosen parameters in the figure, $\mathcal{Q}_c$ can increase by an order of magnitude at appropriate values of $\epsilon$.

D. Coefficient of performance

The COPs $\epsilon(C_3)$ and $\epsilon(C_4)$ are related through

$$\frac{\epsilon(C_4)}{\epsilon(C_3)} = \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon/\omega_\epsilon}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (40)

As already mentioned, $\epsilon < 0$ results in an increase of the energetic performance of the four-level machine due to the lower power consumption [see Fig. 4(c)]. Interestingly, the ratio $\mathcal{R}$ can be larger than one for $\epsilon < 0$, which entails a \textit{simultaneous power and efficiency enhancement}. For instance, comparing Figs. 4(b) and 4(c), we observe increased power by a factor of 10 together with a 10% improvement in energy-efficiency.

E. Power enhancement and quantum coherence

From Eqs. (20),(21), (19b), and (29), it follows that the energy-conversion rate $J_N$ in any weakly driven cyclic $N$-level device is given by

$$J_N = 2\lambda \left| \left< j|\hat{\sigma}_s^{(N)}(\infty)|j+1 \right> \right| = 2\lambda C_1 \left[ \hat{\sigma}_s^{(N)}(\infty) \right].$$  \hspace{1cm} (41)
where \( C_l[\hat{\sigma}_{\ell}(N) (\infty)] \) stands for the \( l \)-norm of coherence [43, 44] in the stationary state \( \hat{\sigma}_{\ell}(N) (\infty) \) of the \( N \)-level thermal machine. This is a bona fide quantifier of the amount of coherence involved in the steady-state operation of the device. Note that, in our case, the relevant basis for energy exchanges is that of the bare Hamiltonian \( H_0 \). In particular, there will only be coherence in the driven subspace \( \{ |j\}, |j + 1\} \).

As a result, we have

\[
\mathcal{R} = \frac{\dot{\mathcal{J}}_4(C_4)}{\dot{\mathcal{J}}_3(C_3)} = \frac{J_4}{J_3} \frac{C_{l_1}[\hat{\sigma}_{\ell}(4)(\infty)]}{C_{l_1}[\hat{\sigma}_{\ell}(3)(\infty)]}.
\]

That is, the power enhancement exactly coincides with the increase in stationary quantum coherence. It would be wrong, however, to claim that quantum coherence is necessary for such performance boost. Indeed, we know that a fully incoherent four-state device \( C_4 \) can convert energy at exactly the same rate \( J_4 \) as our quantum-coherent four-level thermal machine when operating between the same heat baths and driving field. In fact, since there is no externally measurable difference between a quantum-coherent thermal machine and its classical simulator, we would be unable to determine whether coherence is at all present in one such device without knowing its Hamiltonian in full detail.

**V. CONCLUSIONS**

We have analyzed periodically driven thermal machines weakly coupled to an external field and characterized by a cyclic sequence of transitions. We have proposed a new approach to build fully incoherent classical simulators for this family of quantum-coherent heat devices, which exhibit the same thermodynamic operation in the long-time limit. In particular, we exploit the fact that the steady state of this type of coherent thermal machines coincides with that of some stochastic-thermodynamic model obeying consistent rate equations and representable by a circuit graph.

We have then shown how the performance of a three-level quantum-coherent refrigeration may be significantly improved by driving it with a combination of waste heat and external power—both the energy-efficiency and the cooling rate can be boosted in this way. In particular, we have shown that the cooling enhancement is identical to the increase in stationary quantum coherence, when comparing our hybrid model with an equivalent benchmark solely driven by power. In spite of the close connection between the observed effects and the buildup of additional quantum coherence, we remark that these cannot be seen as unmistakable signatures of quantumness since our model belongs to the aforementioned family of “classically simulable” thermal machines.

In fact, the possibility to simulate classically a quantum heat device goes far beyond the cyclic and weakly driven models discussed here. For instance, in the opposite limit of strong periodic driving (i.e., \( \tau_d \ll \tau_R \) one can always resort to Floquet theory to map the steady state operation of the machine into a fully incoherent stochastic-thermodynamic process in some relevant rotating frame [16, 61, 62]. Graph theory can then be directly applied for a complete thermodynamic analysis [54]. Note that this holds for any periodically-driven model and not just for those with a cyclic transition pattern. Similarly, all heat-driven (or “absorption”) thermal machines with non-degenerate energy spectra are incoherent in their energy basis and thus, classically simulable in the weak coupling limit [55]. Furthermore, the equivalence between multi-stroke and continuous heat devices in the small action limit [30] provides a means to generalize our “classical simulability” argument to reciprocating quantum thermodynamic cycles.

In this paper, we have thus extended the applicability of Hill theory [52, 53] to enable the graph-based analysis of a whole class of quantum-coherent thermal devices. We have also put forward a novel hybrid energy conversion model of independent interest, which exploits heat recovery for improved operation. More importantly, we have neatly illustrated why extra care must be taken when linking quantum effects and enhanced thermodynamic performance. This becomes especially delicate in, e.g., biological systems [70], in which the details of the underlying physical model are not fully known.

Note that it is far from clear that any quantum thermal machine whose steady-state quantum coherences can be expressed exclusively in terms of its stationary populations can be simulated classically—for our arguments to hold, the resulting equations of motion [analogous to our Eq. (25)] must also be proper balance equations. The search for classical simulators of more complicated devices (e.g., models including multiple circuits) will be the subject of future work.
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