Quantum simulation of clustered photosynthetic light harvesting in a superconducting quantum circuit
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We propose a scheme to simulate the exciton energy transfer (EET) of photosynthetic complexes in a quantum superconducting circuit system. Our system is composed of two pairs of superconducting charge qubits coupled to two separated high-Q superconducting transmission line resonators (TLRs) connected by a capacitance. When the frequencies of the qubits are largely detuned with those of the TLRs, we simulate the process of the EET from the first qubit to the fourth qubit. By tuning the couplings between the qubits and the TLRs, and the coupling between the two TLRs, we can modify the effective coupling strengths between the qubits and thus demonstrate the geometric effects on the EET. It is shown that a moderate clustered geometry supports optimal EET by using exciton delocalization and energy matching condition. And the population loss during the EET has been trapped in the two TLRs.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Energy plays an important role in the development of modern society. The chemical energy supporting all lives on the earth is mainly from the solar energy harvested by photosynthesis [1–4]. The solar energy can be captured and transferred to the reaction centers of photosynthetic complexes in a short time with a high efficiency [11–15]. Therefore, it might be beneficial to learn from the natural photosynthesis to design efficient artificial light-harvesting devices.

In the past few decades, many researchers devoted themselves to the study of the exciton energy transfer (EET) process in photosynthetic systems [35–39]. Based on the quantum dynamics, much has been learned about the efficiency of the EET [11–15], together with the spatial and energetic arrangement of the pigments [16–21]. In natural photosynthesis, EET can be accomplished within 100 picoseconds with almost 100% efficiency [22]. Schulten et al. observed that the bacteriochlorophylls involved in the overall excitation transfer are found in a coplanar arrangement [23]. Ishizaki and Fleming showed that the energy flow in the Fenna-Matthew-Olson (FMO) complex occurs primarily through two EET pathways [24]. Yang et al. found out that the dimerization in light-harvesting complex II (LH2) can effectively speed up the energy transfer between LH2 rings due to symmetry breaking [25]. In 2013, Ai et al. revealed that clustered geometry utilizes exciton delocalization and energy matching to optimize EET.

On the other hand, much progress has been made in quantum information science [27–31] and thus inspired several interesting quantum simulation experiments to verify the design principals for optimal light-harvesting systems [32–34]. By using bath engineering and gradient ascent pulse engineering algorithm, Wang et al. performed an experimental quantum simulation of photosynthetic energy transfer by using nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) [32]. It was demonstrated that an N-chromophore photosynthetic complex, with arbitrary geometry and bath spectral density, can be effectively simulated by an NMR system with \( \log_2 N \) qubits. Meanwhile, Gorman et al. showed in a trapped-ion system that the long-lived vibrational mode in the bath can assist the energy transfer [33]. Superconducting quantum circuit is another intriguing platform for quantum simulation [36–40]. In 2012, Mostame et al. mimicked a complicated environment with a given spectral density for the EET in photosynthetic complexes by using inductor-resistor-capacitor oscillators [33]. In 2018, Potočnik et al. experimentally demonstrated that the light harvesting for a given geometry can be optimized by tuning the environmental noise [34].

However, although they have shown the potential of optimizing energy transfer by engineering the bath, none of them have demonstrated the effect of geometry on the EET efficiency. In Ref. [26], it was shown that in a linear geometry moderate dimerization promotes the energy transfer. Therefore, it might be interesting to simulate the EET in different geometries to verify the design principals of optimal geometries. In this paper, we design a system composed of four superconducting charge qubits and two superconducting transmission line resonators (TLRs). Here, two qubits form a pair and are...
coupled to one TLR. And the two TLRs are capacitively coupled with each other. Although there are no direct interactions between the qubits, the effective couplings among them can be induced by the simultaneous couplings to the common TLRs. Furthermore, the effective couplings can be tuned by adjusting the level spacings of the qubits, and their interaction strengths with the TLRs, and the coupling strength between the two TLRs. In this way, we can investigate the EET for different geometries.

This paper is organized as follows: In the next section, we briefly introduce the theory for describing the EET in photosynthesis. In Sec. II we propose a setup consisting of four superconducting charge qubits and two TLRs connected by a capacitance to simulate the photosynthetic energy transfer. The effective Hamiltonian for the four qubits is obtained by the Fröhlich-Nakajima transformation. In Sec. III the energy transfer dynamics is numerically simulated by solving the master equation, which confirms the previous investigation in Ref. [26]. Finally, the experimental feasibility and the main conclusions are discussed in Sec. IV.

II. PHOTOSYNTHETIC LIGHT HARVESTING

In the photosynthesis with 4 chromophores, the EET is governed by the Frenkel-exciton Hamiltonian [1, 26]

\[ H = \sum_{j=1}^{4} \varepsilon_j |j\rangle \langle j| + \sum_{i \neq j=1}^{4} J_{ij} |i\rangle \langle j| + \text{h.c.,} \]

where \( \varepsilon_j \) is the site energy when \( j \)-th chromophore is in the excited state, \( |j\rangle \) is the state when \( j \)-th chromophore is in the excited state while all other chromophores are in the ground state, \( J_{ij} \) is the dipole-dipole interaction between \( i \)-th and \( j \)-th chromophores.

Due to the strong coupling \( J_{ij} \gtrsim |\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j| \), the exciton energy can coherently oscillate between any two sites \( i \) and \( j \). However, because of the pure-dephasing-form system-bath Hamiltonian,

\[ H_{SB} = \sum_{j,k} g_{jk} |j\rangle \langle k| (a_j^\dagger \sigma_{jk}^+ + a_{jk}), \]

where \( g_{jk} \) is the coupling strength between \( j \)-th chromophore and its local bath mode with frequency \( \omega_k \) and creation (annihilation) operator \( a_j^\dagger \) \( a_{jk} \), the exciton energy can be irreversibly transferred to the target chromophore. In general, the system-bath coupling is described by the spectral density,

\[ G(\omega) = \sum_{k} g_{jk}^2 \delta(\omega - \omega_k). \]

For a given geometry, the position \( \vec{r}_j \) and transition dipole \( \vec{\mu}_j \) of every chromophore is fixed and thus the dipole-dipole interaction between any pair of two chromophores is determined by

\[ J_{ij} = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0^3 r_{ij}^3} \left[ \vec{\mu}_i \cdot \vec{\mu}_j - 3(\vec{\mu}_i \cdot \vec{r}_{ij})(\vec{\mu}_j \cdot \vec{r}_{ij}) \right], \]

where \( \vec{r}_{ij} = r_{ij} \hat{r}_{ij} = \vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_j \) is the displacement vector from site \( j \) to site \( i \), \( \varepsilon_0 \) is the vacuum permittivity. In addition, the spatial distribution of \( \varepsilon_j \) also facilitates the energy transfer by making use of the energy gradient towards the target chromophore, as shown in Fig. 4(b).

III. PHYSICAL SETUP

Let us consider a superconducting quantum circuit composed of four superconducting charge qubits and two 1D high-Q superconducting TLRs, as shown in Fig. 1(a). The energy-level diagram of the four qubits is schematically shown in Fig. 1(b). Qubits \( Q_1 \) and \( Q_2 \) (\( Q_3 \) and \( Q_4 \)) are coupled to the TLR \( R_a \) (\( R_b \)) capacitively. Here, we take \( Q_1 \) and \( Q_2 \) as donors because their energies are higher than those of the qubits \( Q_3 \) and \( Q_4 \), acting as acceptors. The effective couplings between these qubits exhibit the geometrical effects in photosynthetic complexes, because the couplings between pigments sensitively depend on their relative distance and orientation of electric dipoles. The frequencies of TLRs should be much smaller than the qubits to avoid the excitation of the TLRs. The distances between any two qubits are far enough to avoid direct interactions between them. Therefore, the energy is transferred from \( Q_1 \) to \( Q_2 \) by the indirect interactions among the qubits induced by simultaneously couplings to the common TLRs.
Under the rotating-wave approximation \[41\], the Hamiltonian of the four qubits and two TLRs can be written as

\[
H_1 = \omega_a a^\dagger a + \sum_{j=1}^2 \left( \frac{\omega_j}{2} \sigma_j^z + g_{j1} \left( a^\dagger \sigma_j^- + a \sigma_j^+ \right) \right) + \omega_b b^\dagger b + \sum_{j=3}^4 \left( \frac{\omega_j}{2} \sigma_j^z + g_{j2} \left( b^\dagger \sigma_j^- + b \sigma_j^+ \right) \right) + g_b (a^\dagger + a)(b^\dagger + b),
\]

where \( \omega_a, \omega_b, \omega_j, \) and \( \omega_j \) are the transition frequencies of the TLRs \( R_a \) and \( R_b \), and qubits \( Q_j \) (\( s = 1, 2 \)), respectively. Here, \( j = 1, 2 \) and \( j = 3, 4 \). \( g_{j1} \) (\( g_{j2} \)) is the coupling strength between the qubit \( Q_j \) (\( Q_j \)) and the TLR \( R_a \) (\( R_b \)). \( g_b \) is the coupling strength between TLRs \( R_a \) and \( R_b \). \( a^\dagger \) and \( b^\dagger \) are the creation operators of \( R_a \) and \( R_b \), respectively. \( \sigma_j^+ = |e\rangle_j \langle g| \) and \( \sigma_j^- = |g\rangle_j \langle e| \) are the rising and Pauli operator of \( Q_j \), respectively. \( |g\rangle_j \) and \( |e\rangle_j \) are the ground and excited states of \( Q_j \), respectively.

By using the Fröhlich-Nakajima transformation \[37\],

\[
U = \exp \left[ \sum_{j=1}^2 \frac{g_{j1}}{\delta_j} (a^\dagger \sigma_j^- - a \sigma_j^+) + \sum_{j=3}^4 \frac{g_{j2}}{\delta_j} (b^\dagger \sigma_j^- - b \sigma_j^+) \right]
\]

with \( \delta_j = \omega_j - \omega_a \gg g_{j1} \) and \( \delta_j = \omega_j - \omega_b \gg g_{j2} \), we can omit the high-order terms of \( g_{j1}/\delta_j \) and simplify

\[
H_2 = U^\dagger H_1 U
\]
as

\[
H_3 = \omega_a a^\dagger a + \omega_b b^\dagger b + g_b (a^\dagger + a)(b^\dagger + b) + \sum_{j=1}^2 \frac{g_{j1}^2}{2 \delta_j} (a^\dagger + a)(b^\dagger + b) \sigma_j^z + \sum_{j=3}^4 \frac{g_{j2}^2}{2 \delta_j} (a^\dagger + a)(b^\dagger + b) \sigma_j^z
\]

\[
+ \sum_{j=1}^2 \frac{\omega_j}{2} \sigma_j^z + \frac{g_{j1}^2}{\delta_j} (a^\dagger a \sigma_j^+ - a^\dagger a \sigma_j^-) + \frac{g_{j2}^2}{\delta_j} (b^\dagger b \sigma_j^+ - b^\dagger b \sigma_j^-) + \frac{g_{j1}g_{j2}}{\delta_j} (a^\dagger \sigma_j^- + a \sigma_j^+) + \frac{g_{j1}^2}{\delta_j} (b^\dagger \sigma_j^- + b \sigma_j^+)
\]

\[
+ \sum_{j=1}^2 \frac{\omega_j}{2} \sigma_j^z + \sum_{j=3}^4 \frac{\omega_j}{2} \sigma_j^z
\]

When the TLRs are initially prepared in the vacuum state, Hamiltonian \( H_3 \) can be further reduced to

\[
H_{\text{eff}} = \sum_{j=1}^2 \left( \omega_j + \frac{g_{j1}^2}{\delta_j} \right) |e\rangle_j \langle e| + \sum_{j=3}^4 \left( \omega_j + \frac{g_{j2}^2}{\delta_j} \right) |e\rangle_j \langle e| + \frac{g_{j1}g_{j2}}{\delta_j \delta_4} (\sigma_1 \sigma_4^z + \sigma_1^z \sigma_4) + \frac{g_{j1}^2 g_{j2}}{\delta_j \delta_4} (\sigma_1^z \sigma_4 + \sigma_1 \sigma_4^z) + \frac{g_{j1}^2 g_{j2}}{\delta_j \delta_4} (\sigma_1^z \sigma_4 + \sigma_1 \sigma_4^z)
\]

\[
+ \frac{g_{j1}^2 g_{j2}}{\delta_j \delta_4} (\sigma_1^z \sigma_4 + \sigma_1 \sigma_4^z) + J_{12} (\sigma_1 \sigma_2^z + \sigma_2 \sigma_1^z) + J_{23} (\sigma_2 \sigma_3^z + \sigma_3 \sigma_2^z) + J_{13} (\sigma_1 \sigma_3^z + \sigma_3 \sigma_1^z) + J_{24} (\sigma_2 \sigma_4^z + \sigma_4 \sigma_2^z) + J_{14} (\sigma_1 \sigma_4^z + \sigma_4 \sigma_1^z),
\]

where \( J_{12} = \frac{g_{j1} g_{j2}}{\delta_1 \delta_2}, \ J_{13} = \frac{g_{j1} g_{j3}}{\delta_1 \delta_3}, \ J_{14} = \frac{g_{j1} g_{j4}}{\delta_1 \delta_4}, \ J_{23} = \frac{g_{j2} g_{j3}}{\delta_2 \delta_3}, \ J_{24} = \frac{g_{j2} g_{j4}}{\delta_2 \delta_4}, \) and \( J_{14} = \frac{g_{j1}^2 g_{j4}}{\delta_1 \delta_4} \) are the indirect coupling strengths between any two qubits, respectively.

Because the energy always transfers from the higher-energy level to the lower-energy level, the transition frequencies of the four qubits should satisfy the following relation, i.e., \( \left( \omega_1 + \frac{g_1^2}{\delta_1} \right) > \cdots > \left( \omega_4 + \frac{g_4^2}{\delta_4} \right) \), as shown in Fig. \( \text{II(b)} \). Moreover, coupling strengths \( J_{12} \) and \( J_{34} \) are assumed to be larger than \( J_{23} \) to indicate that qubits \( Q_1 \) and \( Q_2 \) form the donor pair, while qubits \( Q_3 \) and \( Q_4 \) are the acceptor pair. For simplicity, we take \( g_j = g_1 > g_2 = g_3 \) and \( \delta_1 \approx \delta_2 \approx \delta_3 \approx \delta_4 \) to achieve \( J_{12} = J_{34} \gg J_{23} \). Thus we use the following parameters \( \omega_a/2 \pi = 3 \text{ GHz}, \ \omega_b/2 \pi = 3 \text{ GHz} \), \( \omega_1/2 \pi = 13.099 \text{ GHz}, \ \omega_2/2 \pi = 12.991 \text{ GHz}, \ \omega_3/2 \pi = 13.078 \text{ GHz} \) in our numerical simulations.

**IV. SIMULATION OF EET PROCESS**

By dividing Hamiltonian \( H_1 = H_0 + H_i \) into two parts, where

\[
H_0 = \omega_a a^\dagger a + \sum_{j=1}^2 \frac{\omega_j}{2} \sigma_j^z + \omega_b b^\dagger b + \sum_{j=3}^4 \frac{\omega_j}{2} \sigma_j^z
\]
and the interaction Hamiltonian is
\[
H_i = \sum_{j=1}^{2} g_{j_1} (a\sigma^+_j + a^\dagger \sigma^-_j) + \sum_{j=3}^{4} g_{j_2} (b\sigma^+_j + b^\dagger \sigma^-_j) \\
+ g_a \left(a + a^\dagger\right) \left(b + b^\dagger\right),
\]
(11)
in the interaction picture, the interaction Hamiltonian \(H_i\) reads
\[
H_i = \exp(iH_0t) H_i \exp(-iH_0t) \\
= \sum_{j=1}^{2} g_{j_1} (a\sigma^+_j e^{i\delta_j t} + a^\dagger \sigma^-_j e^{-i\delta_j t}) \\
+ g_b (ab e^{-i\Delta_b t} + ab^\dagger e^{i\Delta_b t}) \\
+ \sum_{j=3}^{4} g_{j_2} (a\sigma^+_j e^{i\delta_j t} + a^\dagger \sigma^-_j e^{-i\delta_j t}),
\]
(12)
where \(\delta_b = \omega_b - \omega_a, \Delta_b = \omega_b + \omega_a\).

The state evolution of our circuit can be numerically simulated by the Lindblad-form master equation
\[
\dot{\rho} = -i [H_1, \rho] + \sum_{r=a,b} \kappa_r (N_r + 1) D [r] \rho \\
+ \sum_{r=a,b} \kappa_r N_r D [r^\dagger] \rho + \sum_{l=1}^{4} \Gamma^\gamma_l (N_l + 1) D [\sigma^-_l] \rho \\
+ \sum_{l=1}^{4} \Gamma^\phi_l N_l D [\sigma^-_l] \rho + \sum_{l=1}^{4} \Gamma^\phi_l D [\sigma^-_l] \rho,
\]
(13)
where
\[
D[A] \rho = \frac{(2A\rho A^\dagger - A^\dagger A\rho - \rho A^\dagger A)}{2},
\]
(14)
\[
N_r = \frac{1}{\exp(h\omega_r/k_B T) - 1},
\]
(15)
\[
N_l = \frac{1}{\exp(h\omega_l/k_B T) - 1},
\]
(16)
\(\kappa_r\) \((r = a, b)\) is the leakage rate of TLR \(r\), \(\Gamma^\gamma_l\) and \(\Gamma^\phi_l\) \((l = 1, 2, 3, 4)\) are the spontaneous emission and pure-dephasing rates of the \(l\)-th qubit, respectively.

In natural photosynthesis, the energy transfer is generally restricted in the single-excitation subspace. For simplicity, we label the bases as \(|1\rangle = |e\rangle_1 |g\rangle_2 |g\rangle_3 |g\rangle_4 |00\rangle, |2\rangle = |g\rangle_1 |e\rangle_2 |g\rangle_3 |g\rangle_4 |00\rangle, |3\rangle = |g\rangle_1 |g\rangle_2 |g\rangle_3 |g\rangle_4 |00\rangle, and |4\rangle = |g\rangle_1 |g\rangle_2 |g\rangle_3 |g\rangle_4 |01\rangle. Here, \(|n_n\rangle\) is the Fock state of TLRs \(a\) and TLRs \(b\). In addition, \(|a\rangle = |g\rangle_1 |g\rangle_2 |g\rangle_3 |g\rangle_4 |10\rangle and |b\rangle = |g\rangle_1 |g\rangle_2 |g\rangle_3 |g\rangle_4 |01\rangle indicate single-excitation in one of the TLRs. In our simulation, the system composed of four superconducting qubits and two TLRs is initially prepared at the state \(|1\rangle\).

In Fig. 2, we show the time evolution of the populations of single-excitation states of the four qubits \(P_m = \langle m | \rho | m \rangle\) \((m = 1, 2, 3, 4)\). Here, we take \(1/\Gamma^\gamma_j = 200 \mu s\) \(\text{[44, 45]}\) and \(1/\Gamma^\phi_j = 70 \text{ ns}\) \((j = 1, 2, 3, 4)\) \(\text{[45, 46]}\), which meet the requirement \(\Gamma^\gamma_j \gg \Gamma^\phi_j\) \(\text{[47–49]}\). The leakage rates of two TLRs are \(\kappa_a^{-1} = \kappa_b^{-1} = 10 \mu s\) \(\text{[50, 51]}\).

In Fig. 2, we demonstrate the population dynamics of the four qubits for three different geometries, corresponding to three different sets of nearest-neighbor couplings \(J_{12}, J_{34}\), and \(J_{23}\). In Ref. \(\text{[26]}\), it has been proven that the next-nearest-neighbor couplings \(J_{13} J_{24}\), and the end-to-end coupling \(J_{14}\) plays a minor role in the EET. Intuitively, we would expect an optimal energy transfer for an equal-coupling geometry. Therefore, we investigate the energy transfer dynamics of the system with approximately equal-coupling strengths between adjacent qubits in Fig. 2(a). It corresponds to the equally-spaced geometry in Ref. \(\text{[26]}\). In order to achieve \(J_{12} = J_{34} \approx J_{23}\), coupling strengths are assumed to be \(g_1/2\pi = g_4/2\pi = 100 \text{ MHz}, g_2/2\pi = g_3/2\pi = 990 \text{ MHz}, and g_1/2\pi = 980 \text{ MHz}\). In this case, the energy transfer can be accomplished within about 350 ns. Figure 2(b) simulates the energy transfer dynamics in the moderate-
clustered geometry with \( J_{12} = J_{34} = 1.29J_{23} \). Here, we adopt \( g_1/2\pi = g_4/2\pi = 120 \text{ MHz}, g_2/2\pi = g_3/2\pi = 990 \text{ MHz}, \) and \( g_0 = 930 \text{ MHz} \). Compared to Fig. 2(a), the energy transfer from the first qubit to the last one can be completed within a shorter time, i.e., approximately 250 ns. The moderately-clustered geometry supports a faster energy transfer because the enhanced couplings within the cluster enlarge the intra-cluster energy gap and reduce the inter-cluster energy gap. Both the strong coherent hopping within the cluster and the resonant energy transfer between the two clusters accelerate the overall energy transfer. Moreover, when the ratio \( J_{12}/J_{23} \) increases to a larger value, e.g., \( J_{12} = J_{34} = 3.11J_{23} \) for \( g_1/2\pi = g_4/2\pi = 230 \text{ MHz}, g_2/2\pi = g_3/2\pi = 920 \text{ MHz}, \) and \( g_0 = 800 \text{ MHz} \), the energy transfer becomes extremely slow and it does not finish even at 400 ns, as shown in Fig. 2(c). That’s because the strong intra-cluster couplings enlarge the intra-cluster energy gap excessively and thus increase the inter-cluster energy gap. In order to find out the optimal parameters for the EET efficiency, we simulate the EET dynamics of our circuit for a broad range of the parameters \( g_1, g_2, \) and \( g_3 \) with \( g_1 = g_4 \) and \( g_2 = g_3 \) and keeping other parameters unchanged. The parameters are changed from 10 MHz to 990 MHz with 10 MHz step. According to the numerical simulations, we find that the optimal energy transfer occurs at \( J_{12} = J_{34} = 1.29J_{23} \), as shown in Fig. 2(b).

In Fig. 2 there are coherent oscillations in the short-time regime, which correspond to the quantum coherence phenomena discovered in 2D spectroscopy experiments 1, 52. When the intra-pair couplings are slightly increased from the equally-spaced geometry, the coherent oscillations become more pronounced. It seems that the coherent oscillation is closely related to the EET efficiency. However, if the intra-pair couplings are further increased, the transfer efficiency is reduced although the coherent oscillations are more frequent and larger. The results presented in Fig. 2 show that the efficiency of EET is related with the quantum coherence but not always positively correlated with the coherent evolution. Moreover, strong coupling between a charge qubit and a TLR can be achieved in superconducting circuit 53, 55. Figure 2(b) shows that when the circuit is in the steady-state, the population of each qubit is about 23.75%. That is, the efficiency of the EET can reach 95%. To explore the reason why the summation of all the populations of the four qubits cannot reach 100% in Fig. 2(b), we plot the time evolution of populations in the TLRs \( P_a = \langle 1_a | \rho | 1_a \rangle \) and \( P_b = \langle 1_b | \rho | 1_b \rangle \) in Fig. 3. It is shown that after some oscillations in the short-time regime, \( P_a \) and \( P_b \) increase linearly with respect to the time. And both of them reach about 2.4% at 250 ns. Therefore, the population which has not been transferred to the target qubit has been trapped in the two TLRs.

\[ \begin{align*}
J_{12} &= J_{34} = 1.29J_{23} \\
g_1/2\pi &= g_4/2\pi = 120 \text{ MHz} \\
g_2/2\pi &= g_3/2\pi = 990 \text{ MHz} \\
g_0 &= 930 \text{ MHz}
\end{align*} \]

In our simulations, we select the charge qubits with the dissipation time \( T_1 = 200 \mu s \) 44, 45, which is much longer than their pure-dephasing time \( T_2 = 0.07 \mu s \) 45, 46, because in dephasing-assisted photosynthetic energy transport the spontaneous fluorescence can be ignored 47, 49. Parameters used here have been realized in experiments. The quality factor of a superconducting TLR can reach \( 10^5 \) 56. The frequency of the fundamental mode of the TLR can be designed from 1 GHz to 10 GHz 57, 58. The frequency of a superconducting charge qubit can be effectively tuned from 5 GHz to 15 GHz, by varying the flux that applied though the loop of the qubit 57. In addition, the strong coupling between a charge qubit and a TLR is achieved when \( \min\{g_j\} \gg \sqrt{\kappa_\alpha \Gamma'_\alpha} \) (\( j = 1, 2, 3, 4, \alpha = a, b \)) 52.

In natural photosynthetic complexes, the energy is transferred from the outer antenna to the reaction center across tens of nanometers 1, 24, 32. There is a large energy gap between the lowest eigenstate of the outer antenna and the reaction center, which can prevent the back transfer of energy. Thus, the transfer rate from the lowest-energy state to the reaction center is much smaller than the transfer rate within the outer antenna 32, 60. It is reasonable to simulate the energy transfer without the reaction center in this work.

In summary, we have proposed a simulation scheme for demonstrating geometric effects on the photosynthetic EET in four superconducting charge qubits plus two separated high-Q TLRs. The loss of population during the EET is trapped in the TLRs. In the future work, it might be interesting to demonstrate the effect of fluorescence on the EET by varying the couplings between the qubits and the TLRs.
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