

Anti-Zeno quantum advantage in non-Markovian heat machines

V. Mukherjee,^{1,2,*} A. G. Kofman,^{3,2,*} and G. Kurizki²

¹*Department of Physical Sciences, IISER Berhampur, Berhampur 760010, India*

²*Department of Chemical and Biological Physics,*

Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 7610001, Israel

³*Department of Physics, Shanghai University, Baoshan District, Shanghai 200444, People's Republic of China*

We show that a fast-modulated cyclic quantum heat machine operating in the non-Markovian regime can lead to significant heat-current and power boosts induced by the anti-Zeno effect. Such boosts signify quantum advantage over almost all heat-machines proposed thus far that operate in the conventional Markovian regime, where the quantumness of the system-bath interaction plays no role. The present novel effect owes its origin to the time-energy uncertainty relation in quantum mechanics, which may result in enhanced system-bath energy exchange for modulation periods shorter than the bath correlation-time.

I. INTRODUCTION

The non-equilibrium thermodynamic description of heat machines consisting of quantum systems coupled to heat baths is almost exclusively based on the Markovian approximation [1, 2]. This approximation allows for monotonic convergence of the system-state to thermal equilibrium with its environment (bath) and yields a universal bound on entropy change (production) in the system [3]. Yet, the Markovian approximation is not required for the derivation of the Carnot bound on the efficiency of a cyclic two-bath heat engine (HE): this bound follows from the second law of thermodynamics, under the condition of zero entropy change over a cycle by the working fluid (WF), in both classical and quantum scenarios. In general, the question whether non-Markovianity is an asset remains open, although several works have ventured into the non-Markovian domain [4–8]. By contrast, it has been suggested that quantum resources, such as a bath consisting of coherently superposed atoms [9], or a squeezed thermal bath [10–12], may raise the efficiency bound of the machine. The mechanisms that can cause such a raise include either a conversion of atomic coherence and entanglement in the bath into WF heatup [9, 13, 14], or the ability of a squeezed bath to exchange ergotropy [10–12, 15] (alias non-passivity or work-capacity [16, 17]) with the WF, which is incompatible with a standard HE. However, neither of these mechanisms is exclusively quantum; both may have classical counterparts [18]. Likewise, quantum coherent or squeezed driving of the system acting as a WF or a piston [19] may boost the power output of the machine depending on the ergotropy of the system state, but not on its non-classicality [12].

Finding quantum advantage in machine performance has been one of the major aims of research in the field of quantum technology in general [20–22], and particularly in thermodynamics of quantum systems [23]. Overall,

the foregoing research leads to the conclusion that conventional thermodynamic description of cyclic machines based on a (two-level, multilevel or harmonic oscillator) quantum system in arbitrary two-bath settings may not be the arena for a distinct quantum advantage in machine performance [18]. An exception should be made for multiple identical machines that exhibit collective, quantum-entangled features [24, 25]).

Here we show that quantum advantage is in fact achievable in a quantum heat machine (QHM), whether a heat engine or a refrigerator, whose energy-level gap is modulated faster than what is allowed by the Markov approximation. To this end, we invoke methods of quantum system-control via frequent coherent (e.g. phase-flipping or level-modulating) operations [26, 27] as well as their incoherent counterparts (e.g. projective measurements or noise-induced dephasing) [28–32]. Such control has previously been shown, both theoretically [28, 29] and experimentally [32], to yield non-Markovian dynamics that conforms to one of two universal paradigms: i) quantum Zeno dynamics (QZD) whereby the bath effects on the system are drastically suppressed or slowed down; ii) anti-Zeno dynamics (AZD) that implies the opposite, i.e., enhancement or speedup of the system-bath energy exchange [28, 29, 33]. It has been previously shown that QZD leads to the heating of both the system and the bath at the expense of the system-bath correlation energy [34], whereas AZD may lead to alternating cooling or heating of the system at the expense of the bath or vice-versa [28, 29].

In our present analysis of cyclic heat machines based on quantum systems, we show that analogous effects can drastically modify the power output, without affecting their Carnot efficiency bound. AZD is shown to bring about a drastic power boost, thereby manifesting genuine quantum advantage, as it stems from the time-energy uncertainty relation of quantum mechanics.

In Sec. II we present the basic model of our QHM. In Sec. III we set the requirements for non-Markovian dynamics in the QHM. In Sec. IV we demonstrate the quantum advantage of the AZD regime and the inadequacy of the QZD regime as far as heat-machine performance is concerned. In Sec. V we discuss the results and

*These two authors contributed equally

suggest their experimental realization.

II. MODEL

We consider a quantum system \mathcal{S} that plays the role of a working fluid (WF) in a quantum thermal machine, wherein it is simultaneously coupled to cold and hot thermal baths. The system is periodically driven or perturbed with time period $\tau_S = 2\pi/\Delta_S$ by the time-dependent Hamiltonian $H_S(t)$:

$$\hat{H}_S(t + \tau_S) = \hat{H}_S(t). \quad (1)$$

In order to have frictionless dynamics at all times, we choose $H_S(t)$ to be diagonal in the energy basis of \mathcal{S} , such that.

$$[\hat{H}_S(t), \hat{H}_S(t')] = 0 \quad \forall t, t'. \quad (2)$$

The system interacts simultaneously with the independent cold (c) and hot (h) baths via

$$\hat{H}_I = \sum_{j=c,h} \hat{S} \otimes \hat{B}_j, \quad (3)$$

where the bath operators \hat{B}_c and \hat{B}_h commute: $[\hat{B}_c, \hat{B}_h] = 0$, and \hat{S} is a system operator. For example, for a two level system, $\hat{S} = \hat{\sigma}_x$, while $\hat{S} = \hat{X}$ for a harmonic oscillator, in standard notations. We do *not* invoke the rotating wave approximation in the system-bath interaction Hamiltonian Eq. (3). As in the minimal continuous quantum heat machine [35], or its multilevel extensions [36], we require the two baths to have non-overlapping spectra, e.g., super-Ohmic spectra with distinct upper cut-off frequencies. This requirement allows \mathcal{S} to effectively couple intermittently to one or the other bath during the modulation period τ_S , without changing the interaction Hamiltonian to either bath.

III. FROM MARKOVIAN TO NON-MARKOVIAN DYNAMICS

In what follows we assume weak system-bath coupling, consistent with the Born (but not necessarily the Markov) approximation. Our goal is to examine the dynamics as we transit from Markovian to non-Markovian time scales, and the ensuing change of the QHM performance as the period duration τ_S is decreased. To this end, we have adopted the methodology previously derived in Refs. [26, 27, 37, 38], to account for the periodicity of $H_S(t)$, by resorting to a Floquet expansion of the Liouville operator in the harmonics of $\Delta_S = 2\pi/\tau_S$ [35, 39, 40]. As explained below, we focus on system-bath coupling durations $\tau_C = n\tau_S$ of the order of a few modulation periods, where $n > 1$ denotes the number




Figure 1: (Color Online) Time-evolution of the $|1\rangle$ -state probability $p_1(t)$ of a TLS WF. The WF is first connected to the hot and cold baths, whose quasi-Lorentzian spectral functions are given by Eq. (D2), at a negative time $-t_{in}$ ($t_{in} \gg \tau_{th}$), under the initial condition $p_1(t = -t_{in}) = 0.6$, and reaches the steady-state value $p_{1,ss}$ at $t + t_{in} \gg \tau_{th}$. The WF is decoupled from the hot and cold thermal baths at a time $-\bar{t} \lesssim -\tau_B < 0$ after reaching the steady-state, and then recoupled again to the two baths at time $t = 0$, such that the WF is non-interacting with the hot and cold thermal baths for the time interval $-\bar{t} \leq t < 0$, shown by the red break-line. The QHM is operated in the AZD regime for $t \geq 0$, wherein it is decoupled from and recoupled to the thermal baths after every AZD cycle, for coupling time duration $\tau_C = n\tau_S$. The probability p_1 remains unchanged at the steady-state value, even after multiple AZD cycles. Inset: Same as the main plot, zoomed in for three consecutive AZD cycles. The WF is non-interacting with the thermal baths for time intervals $\bar{t} \gtrsim \tau_B$ between two consecutive AZD cycles, shown by the red break lines. Here (see Eqs. (7) - (11)) $\lambda = 0.2, \omega_0 = 20, \Delta_S = 10, n = 10, \beta_h = 0.0005, \beta_c = 0.005$, and we consider quasi-Lorentzian bath spectral functions Eq. (D2) with $\gamma_0 = 1, \Gamma_B = 0.2, \delta_h = \delta_c = 1$.

of periods. The time-scales of importance are the modulation time period τ_S , the system-bath coupling duration τ_C , the bath correlation-time τ_B and the thermalization time $\tau_{th} \sim \gamma_0^{-1}$, where γ_0 is the system-bath coupling strength. We consider $n \gg 1$ such that $\tau_C \gg \tau_S, (\omega + q\Delta_S)^{-1}$, where ω denotes the transition frequencies of the system \mathcal{S} , and q is an integer (see App. A). This allows us to implement the secular approximation, thereby averaging over the fast-rotating terms in the dynamics. In the limit of slow modulation, i.e. $\tau_S \gg \tau_B$, we have $\tau_C \gg \tau_B$, which allows us to perform the Born, Markov and secular approximations, and eventually arrive at a time-independent Markovian master equation for $\tau_C \gg \tau_S, \omega^{-1}, \tau_B$ (see App. A).

On the other hand, in the regime of fast modulation $\tau_S \ll \tau_B$, the Markov approximation becomes inapplicable for coupling durations $\tau_C = n\tau_S \lesssim \tau_B$. This gives rise to the fast-modulation form of the master equation (see

Apps. A, B):

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\rho}_S(t) &= \sum_{j=h,c} \mathcal{L}_j[\rho_S(t)] \\
&= \sum_{j,\omega} \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_j(\omega, t) \mathcal{D}_{j,\omega}[\rho_S(t)] + \text{h.c.}; \\
\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_j(\omega, t) &\equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\nu G_j(\nu) \left[\frac{\sin[(\nu - \omega)t]}{\nu - \omega} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \pm i \left(\frac{\cos[(\nu - \omega)t] - 1}{\nu - \omega} \right) \right] \quad (4)
\end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, unless otherwise stated, we consider $\hbar = k_B = 1$. Here, for any modulation period τ_S , the generalized Liouville operators \mathcal{L}_j of the two baths act additively on the reduced density matrix $\rho_S(t)$ of \mathcal{S} , generated by the ω -spectral components of the Lindblad dissipators $\mathcal{D}_{j,\omega}$ (see below) for the $j = c, h$ bath acting on $\rho_S(t)$. For a two-level system, or an oscillator, \mathcal{D} does not depend on ω [1]. For $\rho_S(t)$ diagonal in the energy basis, which we consider below, the dynamics is dictated by the coefficients $\mathcal{I}_j(\omega, t) \equiv \text{Re}[\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_j(\omega, t)]$ in Eq. (4), which express the convolution of the j -th bath spectral response function $G_j(\nu)$ that has spectral width $\sim \Gamma_B \sim 1/\tau_B$, with the sinc function, imposed by the time-energy uncertainty relation for finite times (see App. B).

Our main contention is that overlap between the sinc function and $G_j(\nu)$ at $t \sim \tau_C \lesssim \tau_B$ may lead to the anti-Zeno effect, i.e., to remarkable enhancement in the convolution $\mathcal{I}_j(\omega, t)$, and, correspondingly, in the heat currents and power. One can stay in this regime of enhanced performance over many cycles, by running the QHM in the following two-stroke non-Markovian cycles: i) Stroke 1: we run the QHM by keeping the WF (system) and the baths coupled over n modulation periods, from time $t = 0$ to $t = n\tau_S = \tau_C \lesssim \tau_B$ ($n \gg 1$, $\tau_S \ll \tau_B$). ii) Stroke 2: At $t = n\tau_S = \tau_C$, we decouple the WF from the hot and cold baths. One needs to keep the WF and the thermal baths uncoupled (non-interacting) for a time-interval $\bar{t} \gtrsim \tau_B$, so as to eliminate all the transient memory effects, i.e., decorrelate the WF and the baths [33].

After this decoupling period, we recouple the WF to the hot and cold thermal baths and continue to drive the WF with the periodically modulated Hamiltonian Eq. (1). Thus the setup is initialized after time $\tau_C + \bar{t}$, provided we choose n to be such that $\rho_S(\tau_C + \bar{t}) = \rho_S(0)$, so as to close the steady-state cycle after n modulation periods, with the WF returning to its state at start of the cycle (see Fig. 1 and Sec. IV). The QHM may then run indefinitely in the non-Markovian cyclic regime.




Figure 2: (Color Online) The quasi-Lorentzian spectral functions of the hot bath $G_h(\nu)$ (red filled curve) and the cold bath $G_c(\nu)$ (blue filled curve) (see Eq. (D2)), and the sinc functions $\text{sinc}[(\nu - \omega_0 - \Delta_S)t]$ (black solid curve) and $\text{sinc}[(\nu - \omega_0 + \Delta_S)t]$ (cyan solid curve) for (a) fast modulation $\Delta_S = 60\Gamma_B$ and (b) slow modulation $\Delta_S = 10\Gamma_B$, at $t = 10\tau_S$. Fast (slow) modulation results in broadening (narrowing) of the sinc functions, thus leading to enhanced (reduced) overlap with the spectral functions. (c) Power \bar{W} (black lines) and heat currents \bar{J}_h (red lines) and \bar{J}_c (blue lines) averaged over $n = 10$ modulation periods (solid lines) and the same obtained under the Markovian approximation for long cycles, i.e., large number of modulation periods ($n \rightarrow \infty$) (dashed lines), versus the modulation frequency Δ_S . AZD for $\tau_C \lesssim \tau_B$ results in output power boost (shown by dotted double-headed lines) by up to more than a factor of 2, signifying quantum advantage in the heat-engine regime. The green dotted line corresponds to zero power and currents. Here $\lambda = 0.2, \omega_0 = 20, \gamma_0 = 1, \Gamma_B = 0.2, N = 1, \delta = 3, \epsilon = 0.01, \beta_h = 0.0005, \beta_c = 0.005$.




Figure 3: (Color Online) Overlap of super-Ohmic spectral functions $G_h(\nu)$ (red filled curve) and $G_c(\nu)$ (blue filled curve) with cutoff frequency $\bar{\nu}$ (see Eq. (D3)), with the modulation response functions $\text{sinc}[(\nu - \omega_0 - \Delta)t]$ (black solid curve) and $\text{sinc}[(\nu - \omega_0 + \Delta)t]$ (cyan solid curve) for (a) fast modulation, $\Delta_S = 12\bar{\nu}$, and (b) slow modulation $\Delta_S = 2\bar{\nu}$ at $t = 10\tau_S$. Fast (slow) modulation results in broad (narrow) sinc functions, and thus enhanced (reduced) overlap with the spectral functions. (c) Power \bar{W} (black lines) and heat currents \bar{J}_h (red lines) and \bar{J}_c (blue lines) averaged over $n = 10$ modulation periods (solid lines) as compared to the counterparts under Markovian approximation for long cycles, i.e., $n \rightarrow \infty$ (dashed lines), versus the modulation frequency Δ_S . A significant quantum advantage is obtained for $\tau_C \lesssim \tau_B$, when broadening of the sinc functions yields an output power boost (shown by dotted double-headed lines) of up to a factor greater than 7, in the heat engine regime. The green dotted line corresponds to zero power and currents. Here $s = 2$, $\bar{\nu} = 1$, $\delta = 0.1$, $\epsilon = 0.1$, $\omega_0 = 20$, $\gamma_0 = 1$, $\beta_h = 0.0005$, $\beta_c = 0.005$.

By contrast, in the limit of long WF-baths coupling duration $\tau_C = n\tau_S \gg \tau_B$, the sinc functions take the form of delta functions, and therefore, as expected, the integral Eq. (4) reduces to the standard form obtained in the Markovian regime, given by

$$\mathcal{I}_j(\omega, t) = \pi G_j(\omega). \quad (5)$$

IV. A MINIMAL QUANTUM THERMAL MACHINE BEYOND MARKOVIANITY

A. Steady-state performance

Here we consider as the QHM a two-level system (TLS) WF with states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, interacting with a hot and a cold thermal bath, described by the Hamiltonian

$$H(t) = \hat{H}_S(t) + \hat{\sigma}_x \otimes (\hat{B}_c + \hat{B}_h) + \hat{H}_B. \quad (6)$$

The Pauli matrices $\hat{\sigma}_j$ ($j = x, y, z$) act on the TLS, the operator \hat{B}_c (\hat{B}_h) acts on the cold (hot) bath, and \hat{H}_B denotes the bath Hamiltonian. The resonance frequency $\omega(t)$ of the TLS is sinusoidally modulated by the periodic-control Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_S(t) &= \frac{1}{2}\omega(t)\hat{\sigma}_z; \quad \sigma_z|1\rangle = |1\rangle, \sigma_z|0\rangle = -|0\rangle \\ \omega(t) &= \omega_0 + \lambda\Delta_S \sin(\Delta_S t), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where the relative modulation amplitude is small: $0 < \lambda \ll 1$. The periodic modulation Eq. (7) gives rise to Floquet sidebands (denoted by the index $q = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$) with frequencies $\pm\omega_q = \pm(\omega_0 + q\Delta_S)$ and weights P_q , which diminish rapidly with increasing $|q|$ for small λ (see App. B) [27, 35, 38].

A crucial condition of our treatment is the choice of spectral separation of the hot and cold baths, such that the positive sidebands ($q > 0$) only couple to the hot bath and the negative sidebands (with $q < 0$) sidebands only couple to the cold bath. This requirement is satisfied, for example, by the following bath spectral functions:

$$\begin{aligned} G_h(\omega) &= 0 \quad \text{for } 0 < \omega \leq \omega_0 \\ G_c(\omega) &= 0 \quad \text{for } \omega \geq \omega_0, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

which ensures that for small λ , only the $q = 1$ harmonic exchanges energy with the hot bath at frequencies $\pm\omega_1 = \pm(\omega_0 + \Delta_S)$, while the $q = -1$ harmonic does the same with the cold bath at frequencies $\pm\omega_{-1} = \pm(\omega_0 - \Delta_S)$. We neglect the contribution of the higher order sidebands ($|q| > 1$) for $0 < \lambda \ll 1$, for which $P_q \rightarrow 0$ [27, 35, 38, 40, 41]. Further, we impose the Kubo-Martin-Schwinger (KMS) detailed-balance condition

$$G_j(-\omega) = G_j(\omega) \exp(-\omega\beta_j), \quad (9)$$

where $\beta_j = 1/T_j$.

The AZD can be expected to arise for generic bath spectra as long as $n\tau_S \lesssim \tau_B$. For simplicity, in what

follows, $G_h(\omega)$ and $G_c(\omega)$ are assumed to be mutually symmetric around ω_0 , i.e.,

$$G_h(\omega_0 + \nu) = G_c(\omega_0 - \nu) \quad (10)$$

for $0 \leq \nu < \omega_0$ (see App. C). The WF is first coupled to the thermal baths at an initial time $-t_{\text{in}}$ ($t_{\text{in}} \gg \tau_{\text{th}} > 0$). Irrespective of the value of τ_S , at large times $t + t_{\text{in}} \gg \tau_{\text{th}}$, and under the condition of weak WF-baths coupling, one can arrive at a time-independent steady state $\rho_S \rightarrow \rho_{ss}$ in the energy-diagonal form (see App. C):

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{ss} &= p_{1,ss}|1\rangle\langle 1| + p_{0,ss}|0\rangle\langle 0| \\ \frac{p_{1,ss}}{p_{0,ss}} &=: w = \frac{e^{-\beta_h(\omega_0 + \Delta_S)} + e^{-\beta_c(\omega_0 - \Delta_S)}}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

One can then decouple the WF and the baths, such that they are non-interacting for a time interval exceeding τ_B so as to eliminate all memory effects, then recouple them again at $t = 0$, keeping $\rho_S = \rho_{ss}$, and run the QHM in the cycle described in Section III.

In general, owing to the finite widths ($\sim 1/\tau_C$) of $\mathcal{I}_{h,c}(\omega_q, t)$ in the frequency domain for short coupling times ($\tau_C \lesssim \tau_B$), the WF would be driven away from ρ_{ss} , as follows from Eq. (4), causing $\rho_S(t)$ to evolve with time within the time interval $0 < t \leq \tau_C$. However, in order to generate a cyclic QHM operating in the steady-state, we focus on cycles consisting of n modulation periods that satisfy

$$\tau_C^{-1} \ll T_{c,h}; \quad \tau_C^{-1} < \omega_0 - \Delta_S, \quad (12)$$

so that

$$e^{-\frac{\omega_0 \pm \Delta_S + 1/\tau_C}{T_{c,h}}} \approx e^{-\frac{\omega_0 \pm \Delta_S}{T_{c,h}}}. \quad (13)$$

The above conditions Eq. (12) and (13), along with the KMS condition Eq. (9), imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_h(-(\omega_0 + \Delta_S), t) &\approx e^{-\frac{\omega_0 + \Delta_S}{T_h}} \mathcal{I}_h(\omega_0 + \Delta_S, t) \\ \mathcal{I}_c(-(\omega_0 - \Delta_S), t) &\approx e^{-\frac{\omega_0 - \Delta_S}{T_c}} \mathcal{I}_c(\omega_0 - \Delta_S, t). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Equation (14), in turn, guarantees that Eq. (11) yields the steady state even at short times, and thus eliminates any time dependence in ρ_S (see Fig. 1). For a QHM operating in the steady state,

$$\dot{\rho}(t) = (\mathcal{L}_h + \mathcal{L}_c)[\rho_{ss}]$$

remains zero even during de-coupling from, and re-coupling with the hot and cold baths. This ensures that the system remains in its steady state ρ_{ss} throughout the cycle.

Equations (12) - (14) can be easily satisfied for experimentally achievable parameters; eg., $\Delta_S \sim \text{kHz}$, and $n = 10$ would imply $T_c \gg \hbar\Delta_S/2\pi n k_B \sim 10^{-9}$ K.

From the First Law of thermodynamics, the QHM output power $\dot{W}(t)$ is given in terms of the hot and cold heat currents $J_h(t)$ and $J_c(t)$, respectively, by [41]

$$\dot{W}(t) = -(J_h(t) + J_c(t)). \quad (15)$$

The possible operational regimes of the heat machine, i.e., its being a heat-engine or a refrigerator [35, 41], are determined by the signs of the WF-baths coupling duration-averaged \overline{J}_h , \overline{J}_c and \overline{W} . One can calculate the steady-state efficiency η , average power output \overline{W} and average heat currents \overline{J}_j ($j = h, c$)

$$\begin{aligned} \eta &= -\frac{\oint_{\tau_C} \dot{W}(t) dt}{\oint_{\tau_C} J_h(t) dt}; \\ \overline{W} &= \frac{1}{\tau_C} \oint_{\tau_C} \dot{W}(t) dt; \quad \overline{J}_j = \frac{1}{\tau_C} \oint_{\tau_C} J_j(t) dt \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

as a function of the modulation speed Δ_S , searching for the extrema of the functions in Eq. (16).

The heat currents J_c and J_h , flowing out of the cold and hot baths, respectively, are obtained consistently with the Second Law [35, 41] in the form

$$\begin{aligned} J_h(t) &= \frac{\lambda^2}{4} (\omega_0 + \Delta_S) \mathcal{I}_h(\omega_0 + \Delta_S, t) \frac{e^{-(\omega_0 + \Delta_S)\beta_h} - w}{w + 1}, \\ J_c(t) &= \frac{\lambda^2}{4} (\omega_0 - \Delta_S) \mathcal{I}_c(\omega_0 - \Delta_S, t) \frac{e^{-(\omega_0 - \Delta_S)\beta_c} - w}{w + 1}, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where we have used $P_{\pm 1} = \lambda^2/4$.

In order to study the steady-state QHM performances for different modulation frequencies, we consider the example of two non-overlapping spectral response functions of the two baths displaced by δ with respect to ω_q , i.e., $G_h(\nu)$ ($G_c(\nu)$) characterized by a quasi-Lorentzian peak of width Γ_B , with the peak at $\nu_h = \omega_0 + \Delta_S + \delta$ ($\nu_c = \omega_0 - \Delta_S - \delta$). Alternatively, we also consider the example of two non-overlapping super-Ohmic spectral response functions $G_h(\nu)$ and $G_c(\nu)$ of the two baths, with their origins shifted from $\nu = 0$ by $\nu_h = \omega_0 + \Delta_S - \delta$ and $\nu_c = \omega_0 - \Delta_S + \delta$ respectively, for $0 < \delta \ll \Delta_S, \omega_0, \omega_0 - \Delta_S$ (see App. D). The dependence of $\nu_{h,c}$ on Δ_S amounts to considering baths with different spectral functions for different modulation frequencies, and ensures that any enhancement in heat currents and power under fast driving results from the broadening (rather than the shift) of the sinc functions, which are centered at $\omega_0 \pm \Delta_S$.

We plot the bath spectral functions, sinc functions, and the corresponding time averaged heat currents and power, as obtained from Eq. (17) in Figs. 2 - 4. The Markovian approximation: $\text{sinc}(x) \propto \delta(x)$ in Eq. (4) reproduces the correct heat currents and power only in the limit of slow modulation ($\tau_C \gg \tau_B$). By contrast, the Markovian approximation reproduces the exact efficiency for both slow and fast modulation rates (see Fig. 5). Thus, although the efficiency grows as τ_S decreases, it is still limited by the Carnot bound.

B. Anti-Zeno dynamics

The performance of the QHM depends crucially on the relative width of the spectral function and the sinc functions (see Fig. 2). A slow modulation ($\tau_S \gg \tau_B$) results

in sinc functions which are non-zero only over a narrow frequency range, wherein $G_j(\nu)$ can be assumed to be approximately constant, which leads to time-independent $\mathcal{I}_j(\omega_q)$ and Markovian dynamics. On the other hand, fast modulation ($\tau_C \lesssim \tau_B$) is associated with broad sinc functions, for which $G_j(\nu)$ is variable over the frequency range $\sim \tau_C^{-1}$ for which the sinc functions are non-zero. This regime is a consequence of the time-energy uncertainty relation of quantum mechanics, and is associated with the anti-Zeno effect [28, 29]. This effect results in dynamically enhanced system-bath energy exchange, which we title anti-Zeno dynamics (AZD). Remarkably, in a QHM, appropriate choices of $\mathcal{I}_{h,c}(\omega_q, t)$ may yield a power and heat-currents boost whenever the sinc functions have sufficient overlap with $G_{h,c}(\nu)$.

Importantly, we find that spectral functions peaked at frequencies sufficiently detuned from $\omega_0 \pm \Delta_S$ (i.e., $\delta > \Gamma_B$) may increase the overlap with the sinc functions appreciably under fast modulation in the anti-Zeno regime, for $\tau_C^{-1}, \delta \gtrsim \Gamma_B$, thus resulting in substantial output power boost. This regime indicates that finite spectral width of the sinc functions may endow a HE with significant quantum advantage. In the numerical examples shown here, the quantum advantage in the HEs powered by baths with quasi-Lorentzian (super-Ohmic) spectral functions can increase the power by a factor larger than two (seven) (see Figs. 2 and 3), for the same efficiency (see Fig. 5a).

C. Quantum refrigeration above the quantum speed limit

The quantum speed limit Δ_{qsl} is defined as the largest modulation rate which allows the system to operate as a heat engine, i.e., a modulation with $\Delta_S > \Delta_{\text{qsl}}$ results in $\overline{W} > 0$ [36, 42]. Above this modulation rate, the setup stops acting as a heat engine, and instead starts operating as a refrigerator, where the heat current flows from the cold bath to the hot bath, in presence of $\overline{W} > 0$ (see Fig. 4) [35, 36, 41]. Analysis of the heat currents Eq. (17) yields, for bath temperatures $T_h > T_c$,

$$\Delta_{\text{qsl}} = \frac{2\pi}{\tau_{\text{qsl}}} = \omega_0 \frac{T_h - T_c}{T_h + T_c}. \quad (18)$$

Interestingly, the same result is obtained for Markovian heat engines characterized by $\tau_S \gg \tau_B$. Therefore, under fast modulation, the quantum thermal machine operates as a quantum refrigerator (QR) for

$$\tau_S < \tau_{\text{qsl}} \ll \tau_B \quad (19)$$

and as a heat engine (HE) for

$$\tau_{\text{qsl}} < \tau_S \ll \tau_B. \quad (20)$$

AZD can lead to quantum advantage in the refrigerator regime as well, by enhancing the heat current \overline{J}_c , thus




Figure 4: (Color Online) Power \overline{W} (black lines) and heat currents \overline{J}_h (red lines) and \overline{J}_c (blue lines) averaged over $n = 10$ modulation periods (solid lines) as compared to the counterparts under Markovian approximation for long cycles, i.e., $n \rightarrow \infty$ (dashed lines), versus the modulation frequency Δ_S , for (a) the spectral functions shown in Fig. 2 and (b) the spectral functions shown in Fig. 3. The enhanced overlap resulting from fast modulation (large Δ_S) enhances the heat currents \overline{J}_c to up to a factor larger than 2 for (a) and larger than 9 for (b) in the refrigerator regime (shown by dotted double-headed arrows), signifying quantum advantage. The green dotted line corresponds to zero power and currents. Here $\lambda = 0.2, \omega_0 = 20, \gamma_0 = 1, \Gamma_B = 0.2, \beta_h = 0.001, \beta_c = 0.002$.

resulting in faster cooling of the cold bath. As for HE, numerical analysis shows that quasi-Lorentzian, as well as super-Ohmic bath spectral functions can lead to significant quantum advantage in the AZD regime (see Fig. 4). On the other hand, as for the efficiency in case of the HE, the coefficient of performance

$$\text{COP} = -\frac{\overline{J}_c}{\overline{W}} \quad (21)$$

is not significantly affected by the broadening of the sinc function, and on average remains identical to that ob-




Figure 5: (a) Efficiency η for the heat engine shown in Fig. 2, in the AZD regime (green solid line), and the same in the long coupling time limit $\tau_C \rightarrow \infty$ (black dashed line), versus the modulation frequency Δ_S . The efficiency approaches the Carnot limit (blue dotted line) $\eta_C = 1 - \beta_h/\beta_c$ at $\Delta = \Delta_{\text{qsl}}$ (b) Coefficient of performance for the refrigerator shown in Fig. 4a, and the same in the long time $t \rightarrow \infty$ limit (black dashed line).

tained under slow modulation in the Markovian regime (see Fig. 5b).

D. Zeno dynamics

In contrast to the advantageous AZD, ultra-fast modulations with $\tau_B, \delta^{-1} \gg \tau_C$, lead to the Zeno regime, where the maximum of $t \text{sinc}(\nu t)$ at $\nu \rightarrow 0$ and $t = n\tau_S = \tau_C$ is given by

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow 0} t \text{sinc}(\nu t) \rightarrow \tau_C = n\tau_S \rightarrow 0. \quad (22)$$

Consequently, the convolutions $\mathcal{I}_{c,h}(\omega_q, t) \rightarrow 0$, resulting in vanishing heat currents and power (see Figs. 6 and 7). However, the Zeno regime might be beneficial for work extraction in the presence of appreciable system-bath correlations, that are neglected here [34].




Figure 6: (Color Online) Schematic display of the different regimes of operation, as a function of the WF (system) - baths coupling duration τ_C .

V. DISCUSSION

We have explored the hitherto uncharted domain of quantum heat engines (QHEs) and refrigerator (QRs) based on quantum working fluids (WFs) intermittently coupled and decoupled from heat baths operating on non-Markovian time scales. We have shown that for driving (control) faster than the correlation (memory) time of the bath, one may achieve dramatic output power boost in the anti-Zeno dynamics (AZD) regime (see Fig. 6).

Let us revisit our findings, using as a benchmark the Markovian regime under periodic driving: In the latter regime, detailed balance of transition rates between the WF levels, as well as the periodic driving (modulation) rate, determine, according to the First and Second Laws of thermodynamics, the heat currents between the (hot and cold) baths, and thereby the power produced or consumed. In our present treatment, the Markovian regime is recovered under slow modulation, such that the WF-baths coupling duration τ_C exceeds the bath correlation time τ_B . Then, the Markovian approximation is adequate for studying the operation of the QHE or the QR. By contrast, under fast modulations, such that $\tau_C = n\tau_S \lesssim \tau_B$, the working fluid interacts with the baths over a broad frequency range of the order of $\sim \tau_C^{-1}$, according to the time-energy uncertainty relation in quantum mechanics. The frequency-width over which system-bath energy exchange takes place can lead to anti-Zeno dynamics (AZD). The resultant quantum advantage is then especially pronounced for bath spectral functions that are appreciably shifted by $\delta > \Gamma_B \sim \tau_B^{-1}$, from the centers of the sinc functions that govern the system-bath energy exchange rates

The quantum advantage of AZD manifests itself in the form of higher output power, for the same efficiency, in the QHE regime ($\Delta_S < \Delta_{\text{qsl}}$), as compared to that obtained under Markovian dynamics in the limit of large τ_C , all other parameters remaining the same. Alternatively, in the QR regime ($\Delta_S > \Delta_{\text{qsl}}$), AZD may lead

to quantum advantage over Markovian dynamics in the form of higher heat current \bar{J}_c , or, equivalently, higher cooling rate of the cold bath, for the same coefficient of performance. The latter effect leads to the enticing possibility of quantum-enhanced speed-up of the cooling rate of systems as we approach the absolute zero, and raises questions regarding the validity of the Third Law of Thermodynamics in the quantum non-Markovian regime, if we expect the vanishing of the cooling rate at zero temperature as a manifestation of the Third Law [43–45].

Finally, in the regime of ultrafast modulation with $\tau_C^{-1} \gg \Gamma_B, \delta$, quantum Zeno dynamics sets in, leading to vanishing heat currents and power, thus implying that such a regime is incompatible with thermal machine operation (see Figs. 6 and 7).

The Markovian approximation suffices to find the correct efficiency (for a QHE) or the coefficient of performance (for a QR), even in the non-Markovian regimes, for mutually symmetric bath spectral functions (see Eq. (10)). This guarantees that the efficiency always remains below the Carnot bound, even under fast modulations (see Fig. 5).

Experimental scenarios where the predicted AZD quantum advantage may be tested can be envisaged. Since non-Markovianity in general, and AZD in particular, require non-flat bath spectral functions, suitable candidates for the hot and cold baths are microwave cavities and waveguides in which dielectric gratings are embedded, with distinct cut-off and bandgap frequencies [41, 46] by fields in the optical wavelength regime. The required qubit modulations are then compatible with MHz periodic driving of superconducting transmon qubits [47, 48] or NV-center qubits in diamonds [49, 50].

The novel effects and performance trends of QHE and QR in the non-Markovian time domain, particularly the anti-Zeno induced power boost, open new, dynamically-controlled pathways in the quest for genuine quantum features in heat machines, which has been a major motivation of quantum thermodynamics in recent years [9–12, 51–55].

Acknowledgement

We acknowledge the support of ISF, DFG, FET Open (EU) and VATAT.

Appendix A: Floquet Analysis of the non-Markovian Master Equation

Let us consider the differential non-Markovian master equation for the system density operator $\rho_S(t)$ in the in-

teraction picture [27]:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\rho}_S(t) = & - \int_0^t ds \text{Tr}_B [\hat{S}(t) \otimes \hat{B}_c(t) \\ & + \hat{S}(t) \otimes \hat{B}_h(t), [\hat{S}(s) \otimes \hat{B}_c(s) \\ & + \hat{S}(s) \otimes \hat{B}_h(s), \rho_S(t) \otimes \rho_B]]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

Here $\rho_B = \rho_{Bc} \otimes \rho_{Bh}$, where ρ_{Bj} is the density operator of bath j . In the derivation of Eq. (A1) we have assumed that $\text{Tr}[\hat{B}_j, \rho_{Bj}] = 0$. We consider commuting bath operators $[\hat{B}_c(t), \hat{B}_h(t')] = 0$, such that the two baths act additively in Eq. (A1). Below we focus on only one of the baths and omit the labels c/h for simplicity. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{S}^\dagger(t) &= \hat{S}(t) \\ \hat{B}^\dagger(t) &= \hat{B}(t) \\ \text{Tr} [\hat{B}(t) \hat{B}(s) \rho_B] &= \langle \hat{B}(t) \hat{B}(s) \rangle \equiv \Phi(t-s) \\ \hat{S}(t) &= \sum_{q,\omega} S_{q,\omega} e^{-i(\omega+q\Delta_S)t}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

where q are integers and ω are transition frequencies of the system \mathcal{S} .

One can use Eq. (A2) to write the first term on the r.h.s. of Eq. (A1) as

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 = & - \sum_{\omega,\omega',q,q'} e^{i[(\omega'-\omega)+(q'-q)\Delta_S]t} \hat{S}_{q',\omega'}^\dagger \hat{S}_{q,\omega} \rho_S(t) \\ & \times \int_0^t [\Phi(t-s) e^{i(\omega+q\Delta_S)(t-s)}] ds. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

In the limit of times of interest, i.e., times larger than the period of driving τ_S and the effective periods of the system, $t \gg \tau_S, (\omega + q\Delta_S)^{-1}$, the terms with the fast oscillating factor before the integral in Eq. (A3) become small and can be neglected, i.e., the secular approximation becomes applicable, such that

$$(q' - q) \Delta_S = \omega - \omega', \quad (\text{A4})$$

which generally holds only for

$$\omega' = \omega; \quad q' = q, \quad (\text{A5})$$

as long as $(q' - q) \Delta_S$ is not close to $(\omega' - \omega)$ for any q, q', ω, ω' . Condition (A5) gives us

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 \approx & - \sum_{\omega,q} \hat{S}_{q,\omega}^\dagger \hat{S}_{q,\omega} \rho_S(t) \\ & \int_0^t [\Phi(t-s) e^{i(\omega+q\Delta_S)(t-s)}] ds \\ = & - \sum_{\omega,q} \hat{S}_{q,\omega}^\dagger \hat{S}_{q,\omega} \rho_S(t) \int_0^t [\Phi(\alpha) e^{i(\omega+q\Delta_S)\alpha}] d\alpha \\ = & - \sum_{\omega,q} \hat{S}_{q,\omega}^\dagger \hat{S}_{q,\omega} \rho_S(t) \\ & \times \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(\nu) \int_0^t e^{-i[\nu - (\omega+q\Delta_S)]\alpha} d\alpha d\nu, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

where $\alpha = t - s$, and

$$\Phi(\alpha) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\nu G(\nu) e^{-i\nu\alpha}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

In the limit of slow modulation, such that $t = n\tau_S \gg \tau_B$, one can perform the Markov approximation, thereby extending the upper limit of the integral in time in Eq. (A6) to $t \rightarrow \infty$, which finally results in the time-independent Markovian form [1]

$$T_1 \approx -\pi \sum_{\omega, q \geq 0} \hat{S}_{q,\omega}^\dagger \hat{S}_{q,\omega} \rho_S(t) G(\omega, q). \quad (\text{A8})$$

On the other hand, in the limit of $t \sim n\tau_S \lesssim \tau_B$, the Markovian approximation becomes invalid, and one gets

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 \approx & -\sum_{\omega, q} \hat{S}_{q,\omega}^\dagger \hat{S}_{q,\omega} \rho_S(t) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\nu G(\nu) \\ & \left[\frac{\sin([\nu - (\omega_0 + q\Delta_S)]t)}{\nu - (\omega_0 + q\Delta)} \right. \\ & \left. + i \left(\frac{\cos([\nu - (\omega_0 + q\Delta_S)]t) - 1}{\nu - (\omega_0 + q\Delta_S)} \right) \right]. \quad (\text{A9}) \end{aligned}$$

Progressing similarly as above, one can arrive at similar expressions for other terms in Eq. (A1) as well.

Appendix B: Non-Markovian dynamics of a driven two-level system in presence of a dissipative bath

The non-Markovian master equation followed by the TLS WF subjected to the Hamiltonian Eq. (6) is (see Eq. (A1))

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}[\rho_s(t)] = & [(A_\downarrow + \bar{A}_\downarrow) \sigma^+ \rho_s(t) \sigma^- - A_\downarrow \sigma^- \sigma^+ \rho_s(t) - \bar{A}_\downarrow \rho_s(t) \sigma^- \sigma^+] \\ & + [(A_\uparrow + \bar{A}_\uparrow) \sigma^- \rho_s(t) \sigma^+ - A_\uparrow \sigma^+ \sigma^- \rho_s(t) - \bar{A}_\uparrow \rho_s(t) \sigma^+ \sigma^-] + M \sigma^- \rho_s(t) \sigma^- + \bar{M} \sigma^+ \rho_s(t) \sigma^+, \quad (\text{B1}) \end{aligned}$$

where we have removed the h, c indices for simplicity, and considered the dynamics due to a single bath. Here

$$\begin{aligned} A_\downarrow &= \sum_{q, q' \in \mathbb{Z}} \xi(q') \bar{\xi}(q) e^{i(q-q')\Delta_S t} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(\nu) \int_0^t e^{-i[\nu - (\omega_0 + q\Delta_S)]\tau} d\nu d\tau, \\ A_\uparrow &= \sum_{q, q' \in \mathbb{Z}} \bar{\xi}(q') \xi(q) e^{-i(q-q')\Delta_S t} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(\nu) \int_0^t e^{-i[\nu + (\omega_0 + q\Delta_S)]\tau} d\nu d\tau, \\ M &= \sum_{q, q' \in \mathbb{Z}} \xi(q) \xi(q') e^{-i[2\omega_0 + (q+q')\Delta_S]t} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(\nu) \left(\int_0^t e^{i[\nu - (\omega_0 + q\Delta_S)]\tau} d\tau + \int_0^t e^{-i[\nu + (\omega_0 + q\Delta_S)]\tau} d\tau \right) d\nu \\ \sigma_x(t) &= \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\xi(q) e^{-i(\omega_0 + q\Delta_S)t} \sigma^- + \bar{\xi}(q) e^{i(\omega_0 + q\Delta_S)t} \sigma^+ \right). \quad (\text{B2}) \end{aligned}$$

\bar{A}_\downarrow , \bar{A}_\uparrow and \bar{M} are the complex conjugates of A_\downarrow , A_\uparrow and M , respectively. The terms corresponding to $\sigma^\pm \rho_S(t) \sigma^\pm$ in Eq. (B1) vanish for diagonal steady-state $\rho_S(t) \rightarrow \rho_{ss}$ (see Eq. (11)). Further, here we focus on several modulation periods, i.e., $t = n\tau_S \gg \tau_S$, when the fast oscillatory terms corresponding to $q \neq q'$ vanish as well,

such that

$$\begin{aligned} A_\downarrow &\approx \sum_q P_q \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(\nu) \int_0^t e^{-i[\nu - (\omega_0 + q\Delta_S)]\tau} d\nu d\tau, \\ A_\uparrow &\approx \sum_q P_q \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(\nu) \int_0^t e^{-i[\nu + (\omega_0 + q\Delta_S)]\tau} d\nu d\tau, \\ P_q &= |\xi(q)|^2. \quad (\text{B3}) \end{aligned}$$

We note that

$$\int_0^t e^{\pm i[\nu \pm (\omega_0 + q\Delta_S)]\tau} d\tau = \frac{\sin([\nu \pm (\omega_0 + q\Delta_S)]t)}{\nu \pm (\omega_0 + q\Delta_S)}$$

$$\mp i \left[\frac{\cos([\nu \pm (\omega_0 + q\Delta_S)]t) - 1}{\nu \pm (\omega_0 + q\Delta_S)} \right]. \quad (\text{B4})$$

The imaginary part in Eq. (B4) acts on terms of the form $i\text{Im}[\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_j(\pm\omega_q, t)](\sigma^\mp \sigma^\pm \rho_S(t) - \rho_S(t) \sigma^\mp \sigma^\pm)$, which vanish for large times when the off-diagonal elements $\rho_S(t)$ approach zero for any initial state. On the other hand, the real part of Eq. (B4) gives rise to terms of the form

$$\mathcal{I}_j(\pm\omega_q, t) := \text{Re}[\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_j(\pm\omega_q, t)]$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G_j(\nu) \frac{\sin([\nu \pm (\omega_0 + q\Delta)]t)}{\nu \pm (\omega_0 + q\Delta)} d\nu, \quad (\text{B5})$$

In the limit of slow modulation such that $t \sim n\tau_S \gg \tau_B$ ($n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $n \gg 1$), the function $\sin([\nu \pm (\omega_0 + q\Delta)]t) / [\nu \pm (\omega_0 + q\Delta)]$ assumes a delta function centred at $\nu = \pm(\omega_0 + q\Delta)$, thus leading to the familiar Markovian form of master equation, with

$$\mathcal{I}_j(\pm\omega_q, t) = \pi G_j[\pm(\omega_0 + q\Delta_S)] \quad \forall t. \quad (\text{B6})$$

On the other hand, in the anti-Zeno regime of fast modulation: $t \sim n\tau_S \lesssim \tau_B$, $\mathcal{I}_j(\pm\omega_q, t)$ is not given by Eq. (B6), and one needs to consider the full form Eq. (B5).

In particular, for a diagonal state $\rho_S(t) = p_1(t)|1\rangle\langle 1| + p_1(t)|0\rangle\langle 0|$, the dynamics Eq. (B1) - Eq. (B5) leads us to the rate equations

$$\dot{p}_1(t) = -\dot{p}_0(t) = \frac{\lambda^2}{4} [R_0(t)p_0(t) - R_1(t)p_1(t)]$$

$$R_0(t) = \mathcal{I}_h(-\omega_0 - \Delta_S, t) + \mathcal{I}_c(-\omega_0 + \Delta_S, t)$$

$$R_1(t) = \mathcal{I}_h(\omega_0 + \Delta_S, t) + \mathcal{I}_c(\omega_0 - \Delta_S, t) \quad (\text{B7})$$




Figure 7: The quasi-Lorentzian spectral function $G_h(\nu)$ (red filled curve) shown in Fig. 2, and $\text{sinc}[(\nu - \omega_0 - \Delta)t]$ (black solid curve) at time $t = 10\tau_S$ for (a) Markovian dynamics with $\Delta_S = 10\Gamma_B$, (b) anti-Zeno dynamics with $\Delta_S = 80\Gamma_B$ and (c) Zeno dynamics with $\Delta_S = 2000\Gamma_B$. The overlap between the two functions is maximal for anti-Zeno dynamics, while it vanishes both for slow modulation, when the sinc function is narrow, as well as for Zeno dynamics, when the sinc function is much broader than $G_h(\nu)$, and approaches zero for all ν . Here the same $G_h(\nu)$ is considered in (a), (b) and (c); all the parameters are same as in Fig. 2.

In the Zeno regime of ultra-fast modulation, obtained in the limit of $t \sim n\tau_S \ll \tau_B$, the integral $\mathcal{I}(\omega_q, t)$ vanishes (see Fig. 7), thus leading to the Zeno effect of no dynamics.

Appendix C: Steady states in the anti-Zeno dynamics (AZD) regime

Now we study the regimes which allow us to operate the setup with a time-independent steady state ρ_{ss} even inside the AZD regime. We note that for $t \rightarrow \infty$, $I_j(\omega_q, t)$ reduces to the time-independent form $\pi G_j(\omega_q)$, thus leading us to the Eq. (11). On the other hand, for $t \sim n\tau_S \lesssim \tau_B$, $I_j(\omega_q, t)$ includes contributions from $G_j(\omega_q + \nu)$, where

$$|\nu| \lesssim 1/t = 1/(n\tau_S). \quad (\text{C1})$$

Further, we consider ω_0 , T_c, T_h , and $\Delta_S < \omega_0$ large enough, such that $1/t \ll \omega_0 \pm \Delta_S, T_c, T_h$. Therefore in this limit the KMS condition gives us

$$\begin{aligned} G_j(-(\omega_q + \nu)) &\approx e^{-(\omega_q + \nu)\beta_j} G_j(\omega_q + \nu) \\ &\approx e^{-\omega_q \beta_j} G(\omega_q + \nu). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C2})$$

This immediately leads us to

$$\mathcal{I}_j(-\omega_q, t) \approx e^{-\omega_q \beta_j} \mathcal{I}_j(\omega_q, t), \quad (\text{C3})$$

and consequently (see Eq. (11))

$$\begin{aligned} w &\approx \frac{e^{-(\omega_0 + \Delta_S)\beta_h} \mathcal{I}_h(\omega_0 + \Delta_S, t)}{\mathcal{I}_h(\omega_0 + \Delta_S, t) + \mathcal{I}_c(\omega_0 - \Delta_S, t)} \\ &\quad + \frac{e^{-(\omega_0 - \Delta_S)\beta_c} \mathcal{I}_c(\omega_0 - \Delta_S, t)}{\mathcal{I}_h(\omega_0 + \Delta_S, t) + \mathcal{I}_c(\omega_0 - \Delta_S, t)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C4})$$

where we have considered the two sidebands $q = 1, -1$ only. Clearly, the condition

$$\mathcal{I}_h(\omega_0 + \Delta_S, t) \approx \mathcal{I}_c(\omega_0 - \Delta_S, t), \quad (\text{C5})$$

which is true for mutually symmetric bath spectral functions $G_h(\omega_0 + x) \approx G_c(\omega_0 - x)$ for any real x (see Fig. 8), leads to the time-independent steady state ρ_{ss} with (see Eq. (11))

$$w \approx \frac{e^{-(\omega_0 + \Delta_S)\beta_h} + e^{-(\omega_0 - \Delta_S)\beta_c}}{2}. \quad (\text{C6})$$

Appendix D: Bath spectral functions

1. Quasi-Lorentzian bath spectral functions

We focus on baths characterized by spectral functions:

$$\begin{aligned} G_h(\nu \geq 0) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{r=1}^N \left[c_r \frac{\gamma_0 \Gamma_{B,r}^2 \Theta(\nu - \omega_0 - \epsilon)}{(\omega_0 + \Delta_S + \delta_r - \nu)^2 + \Gamma_{B,r}^2} \right], \\ G_c(\nu \geq 0) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{r=1}^N \left[c_r \frac{\gamma_0 \Gamma_{B,r}^2 \Theta(\omega_0 - \epsilon - \nu) \Theta(\nu - \epsilon)}{(\omega_0 - \Delta_S - \delta_r - \nu)^2 + \Gamma_{B,r}^2} \right] \\ G_{h,c}(-\nu) &= G_{h,c}(\nu) e^{-\nu \beta_{h,c}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D1})$$

where we have considered the KMS condition, Θ is the step function, $N \in \mathbb{Z}$, $N > 0$ denotes the number of




Figure 8: (Color Online) The time dependent rates $\mathcal{I}_h(\omega_0 + \Delta_S, t)$ (red solid line) and $\mathcal{I}_c(\omega_0 - \Delta_S, t)$ (green dashed line) as a function of time-periods t/τ_S for spectral functions Eq. (D2) with $\delta = 4.5$ for (a) $\tau_S = 2\pi/\Delta_S = 2$ and (b) $\tau_S = 2\pi/\Delta_S = 10$. As explained in App. C, symmetric spectral functions $G_h(\omega + x) = G_c(\omega - x)$ for real x lead to $\mathcal{I}_h(\omega_0 + \Delta_S, t) = \mathcal{I}_c(\omega_0 - \Delta_S, t)$. A fast modulation ($\tau_S = 2$) results in oscillating and time-dependent $\mathcal{I}_{h,c}(t)$ for large t/τ_S , while slow modulation ($\tau_S = 10$) leads to an approximately constant $\mathcal{I}_{h,c}$ even for small t/τ_S . Here $\omega_0 = 10$, $\gamma_0 = 1$, $\Gamma_B = 1$.

peaks and $\Gamma_{B,r} = 1/\tau_{B,r} > 0$ is the width of the r -th peak. δ_r are the (real) Lamb self energy shifts, such that G_h (G_c) is peaked at $\nu = \omega_0 + \Delta + \delta_r$ ($\nu = \omega_0 - \Delta - \delta_r$). As seen from Eq. (D1), we consider bath spectral functions with different resonance frequencies ($= \omega_0 \pm \Delta_S \pm \delta_r$) for different modulation rates Δ_S ; as mentioned in the main text, this ensures that the detuning between the r -th resonance frequency of a bath spectral function, and the maximum of the corresponding sinc function, is always δ_r , and is independent of the modulate rate Δ_S . For example, this can be implemented by choosing different baths for operating thermal machines with different modulation frequencies. Consequently, any enhancement in heat currents and power originate from the broadening of the sinc functions, rather than from the shift of the maxima of the sinc functions. Here $c_r \geq 0$ is the weight of the r -th term in the sums in Eq. (D1). A non-zero (but small) $\epsilon > 0$ ensures that $G_c(\nu)$ and $G_h(\nu)$ vanish at $\nu = 0$, thus resulting in vanishing thermal excitations and entropy at the absolute zero temperature, as is de-

manded by the third law of thermodynamics [43, 45]. Since $G_c(\nu = \omega_0) = G_c(\nu = \omega_0) = 0$, the 0-th sideband ($q = 0$) does not contribute to the dynamics. Figure 9 shows the quantum advantage obtained for bath spectral functions of the form Eq. (D1) with $N = 2$.

For $N = 1$, the above functions Eq. (D1) reduce to quasi-Lorentzian spectral functions of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
 G_h(\nu \geq 0) &= \frac{\gamma_0 \Gamma_B^2 \Theta(\nu - \omega_0 - \epsilon)}{(\omega_0 + \Delta_S + \delta - \nu)^2 + \Gamma_B^2}, \\
 G_c(\nu \geq 0) &= \frac{\gamma_0 \Gamma_B^2 \Theta(\omega_0 - \epsilon - \nu) \Theta(\nu - \epsilon)}{(\omega_0 - \Delta_S - \delta - \nu)^2 + \Gamma_B^2}, \\
 G_{h,c}(-\nu) &= G_{h,c} e^{-\nu \beta_{h,c}}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{D2}$$




Figure 9: (Color Online) Double-peaked spectral functions $G_h(\nu)$ (red filled curve) and $G_c(\nu)$ (blue filled curve), and the sinc functions $\text{sinc}[(\nu - \omega_0 - \Delta)t]$ (black solid curve) and $\text{sinc}[(\nu - \omega_0 + \Delta)t]$ (blue solid curve) for (a) fast modulation $\Delta_S = 60\Gamma_B$ and (b) slow modulation $\Delta_S = 10\Gamma_B$ at $t = 10\tau_S$. Fast (slow) modulation results in broadening (narrowing) of the sinc functions, thus leading to enhanced (reduced) overlap with the spectral functions. (c) Power \bar{W} (black lines) and heat currents \bar{J}_h (red lines) and \bar{J}_c (blue lines) averaged over $n = 10$ modulation periods (solid lines) and the same obtained under the Markovian approximation for long cycles ($n \rightarrow \infty$) (dashed lines), versus the modulation frequency Δ_S . A significant quantum advantage (shown by dotted double-arrow lines) is obtained for fast modulation, when broadening of the sinc functions yields an output power boost by a factor greater than 2 in the heat engine regime. The green dotted line corresponds to zero power and currents. Here $N = 2$, $\delta_1 = 2$, $\delta_2 = 4$. All other parameters are same as in Fig. 2

The condition $\delta = 0$ results in the spectral functions and the sinc function attaining maxima at the same frequencies, viz., at $\nu = \omega_0 \pm \Delta_S$.

2. Super-Ohmic bath spectrum

We also consider super-Ohmic bath spectral functions of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
 G_h(\nu \geq 0) &= \Theta(\nu - \nu_h) \gamma_0 \frac{(\nu - \nu_h)^s}{\bar{\nu}^{s-1}} e^{[-(\nu - \nu_h)/\bar{\nu}]} \\
 G_c(\nu \geq 0) &= \Theta(\nu_c - \nu) \Theta(\nu - \epsilon) \gamma_0 \frac{(\nu_c - \nu)^s}{\bar{\nu}^{s-1}} e^{[-(\nu_c - \nu)/\bar{\nu}]} \\
 G_{h,c}(-\nu) &= G_{h,c}(\nu) e^{-\nu\beta_{h,c}}, \tag{D3}
 \end{aligned}$$

with the origin shifted from $\nu = 0$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \nu_h &= \omega_0 + \Delta_S - \delta \\
 \nu_c &= \omega_0 - \Delta_S + \delta \tag{D4}
 \end{aligned}$$

Here $s > 1$, and $0 < \delta \ll \Delta_S, \omega_0, \omega_0 - \Delta_S$ ensures that $G_{h,c}(\nu)$ is non-zero at the maxima of the sinc functions at $\omega_0 \pm \Delta_S$. As before, a small $\epsilon > 0$ guarantees that $G_c(\nu = 0) = 0$, and we consider Δ_S -dependent ν_h and ν_c , to ensure that any enhancement in heat currents and power are due to the broadening of the sinc functions for fast modulations, rather than due to the shifting of the peaks of the sinc functions.

-
- [1] H. P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, 2002).
- [2] A. Rivas and S. F. Huelga, *Open Quantum Systems* (Springer, 2012).
- [3] H. Spohn, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **19**, 1227 (1978).
- [4] V. Mukherjee, V. Giovannetti, R. Fazio, S. F. Huelga, T. Calarco, and S. Montangero, *New Journal of Physics* **17**, 063031 (2015).
- [5] R. Uzdin, A. Levy, and R. Kosloff, *Entropy* **18** (2016), ISSN 1099-4300.
- [6] M. Pezzutto, M. Paternostro, and Y. Omar, arXiv:1806.10075 (2018).
- [7] G. Thomas, N. Siddharth, S. Banerjee, and S. Ghosh, *Phys. Rev. E* **97**, 062108 (2018).
- [8] P. Abiuso and V. Giovannetti, arXiv:1902.07356 (2019).
- [9] M. O. Scully, M. S. Zubairy, G. S. Agarwal, and H. Waltherl, *Science* **299**, 862 (2003).
- [10] J. Roßnagel, O. Abah, F. Schmidt-Kaler, K. Singer, and E. Lutz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 030602 (2014).
- [11] J. Klaers, S. Faelt, A. Imamoglu, and E. Togan, *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 031044 (2017).
- [12] W. Niedenzu, V. Mukherjee, A. Ghosh, A. G. Kofman, and G. Kurizki, *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 165 (2018).
- [13] O. Abah and E. Lutz, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **106**, 20001 (2014).
- [14] C. B. Dağ, W. Niedenzu, F. Ozaydin, O. E. Müstecaplıoğlu, and G. Kurizki, arXiv:1801.04529 (2018).
- [15] W. Niedenzu, D. Gelbwaser-Klimovsky, A. G. Kofman, and G. Kurizki, *New Journal of Physics* **18**, 083012 (2016).
- [16] W. Pusz and S. L. Woronowicz, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **58**, 273 (1978), ISSN 1432-0916.
- [17] A. Lenard, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **19**, 575 (1978), ISSN 1572-9613.
- [18] A. Ghosh, V. Mukherjee, W. Niedenzu, and G. Kurizki, *The European Physical Journal Special Topics* **227**, 2043 (2019).
- [19] A. Ghosh, C. L. Latune, L. Davidovich, and G. Kurizki, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **114**, 12156 (2017).
- [20] G. Kurizki, P. Bertet, Y. Kubo, K. Mølmer, D. Petrosyan, P. Rabl, and J. Schmiedmayer, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112**, 3866 (2015).
- [21] A. W. Harrow and A. Montanaro, *Nat.* **549**, 203 (2017).
- [22] S. Boixo, S. V. Isakov, V. N. Smelyanskiy, R. Babbush, N. Ding, Z. Jiang, M. J. Bremner, J. M. Martinis, and H. Neven, *Nat. Phys.* **14**, 595 (2018).
- [23] A. Ghosh, W. Niedenzu, V. Mukherjee, and G. Kurizki, *Thermodynamic Principles and Implementations of Quantum Machines* (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2018), pp. 37–66.
- [24] W. Niedenzu, D. Gelbwaser-Klimovsky, A. G. Kofman, and G. Kurizki, *New Journal of Physics* **18**, 083012 (2016).
- [25] J. Jaramillo, M. Beau, and A. del Campo, *New J. Phys.* **18**, 075019 (2016).
- [26] A. G. Kofman and G. Kurizki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 270405 (2001).
- [27] A. G. Kofman and G. Kurizki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 130406 (2004).
- [28] A. G. Kofman and G. Kurizki, *Nature* **405**, 546 (2000).
- [29] M. N. N. Erez, G. Gordon and G. Kurizki, *Nat.* **452**, 724 (2008).
- [30] G. Gordon, G. Bensky, D. Gelbwaser-Klimovsky, D. D. B. Rao, N. Erez, and G. Kurizki, *New Journal of Physics* **11**, 123025 (2009).
- [31] G. Bensky, D. B. Rao, G. Gordon, N. Erez, and G. Kurizki, *Physica E: Low-dimensional Systems and Nanostructures* **42**, 477 (2010), ISSN 1386-9477, proceedings of the international conference Frontiers of Quantum and Mesoscopic Thermodynamics {FQMT} '08.
- [32] G. A. Álvarez, D. D. B. Rao, L. Frydman, and G. Kurizki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 160401 (2010).
- [33] D. D. Bhaktavatsala Rao and G. Kurizki, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 032105 (2011).
- [34] D. Gelbwaser-Klimovsky, N. Erez, R. Alicki, and G. Kurizki, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 022112 (2013).
- [35] D. Gelbwaser-Klimovsky, R. Alicki, and G. Kurizki, *Phys. Rev. E* **87**, 012140 (2013).
- [36] V. Mukherjee, W. Niedenzu, A. G. Kofman, and G. Kurizki, *Phys. Rev. E* **94**, 062109 (2016).
- [37] E. Shahmoon and G. Kurizki, *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 013841 (2013).
- [38] R. Kosloff, *Entropy* **15**, 2100 (2013).
- [39] K. Szczygielski, D. Gelbwaser-Klimovsky, and R. Alicki,

- Phys. Rev. E **87**, 012120 (2013).
- [40] R. Alicki, *Open Systems And Information Dynamics* **21**, 1440002 (2014).
- [41] D. Gelbwaser-Klimovsky, W. Niedenzu, and G. Kurizki, *Advances In Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics* **64**, 329 (2015), ISSN 1049-250X.
- [42] S. Deffner and S. Campbell, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **50**, 453001 (2017).
- [43] M. Kolář, D. Gelbwaser-Klimovsky, R. Alicki, and G. Kurizki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 090601 (2012).
- [44] N. Freitas and J. P. Paz, *Phys. Rev. E* **95**, 012146 (2017).
- [45] L. Masanes and J. Oppenheim, *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 14538 (2017).
- [46] R. Magnusson and S. S. Wang, *Applied Physics Letters* **61**, 1022 (1992).
- [47] A. A. Houck, J. A. Schreier, B. R. Johnson, J. M. Chow, J. Koch, J. M. Gambetta, D. I. Schuster, L. Frunzio, M. H. Devoret, S. M. Girvin, et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 080502 (2008).
- [48] M. J. Peterer, S. J. Bader, X. Jin, F. Yan, A. Kamal, T. J. Gudmundsen, P. J. Leek, T. P. Orlando, W. D. Oliver, and S. Gustavsson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 010501 (2015).
- [49] S. Sangtawesin, T. O. Brundage, Z. J. Atkins, and J. R. Petta, *Applied Physics Letters* **105**, 063107 (2014).
- [50] S. Sangtawesin, T. O. Brundage, and J. R. Petta, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 020506 (2014).
- [51] O. Fialko and D. W. Hallwood, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 085303 (2012).
- [52] A. Bérut, A. Arakelyan, A. Petrosyan, S. Ciliberto, R. Dillenschneider, and E. Lutz, *Nature* **403**, 187 (2012).
- [53] R. Uzdin, A. Levy, and R. Kosloff, *Phys. Rev. X* **5**, 031044 (2015).
- [54] D. Gelbwaser-Klimovsky, A. Bylinskii, D. Gangloff, R. Islam, A. Aspuru-Guzik, and V. Vuletic, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 170601 (2018).
- [55] A. Ghosh, D. Gelbwaser-Klimovsky, W. Niedenzu, A. I. Lvovsky, I. Mazets, M. O. Scully, and G. Kurizki, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* (2018), ISSN 0027-8424.