Speeding-up a quantum refrigerator via counter-diabatic driving
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We study the application of a counter-diabatic driving (CD) technique to enhance the thermodynamic efficiency and power of a quantum Otto refrigerator based on a superconducting qubit coupled to two resonant circuits. Although the CD technique is originally designed to counteract non-adiabatic coherent excitations in isolated systems, we find that it also works effectively in the open system dynamics, improving the coherence-induced losses of efficiency and power. We compare the CD dynamics with its classical counterpart, and find a deviation that arises because the CD is designed to follow the energy eigenbasis of the original Hamiltonian, but the heat baths thermalize the system in a different basis. We also discuss possible experimental realizations of our model.

I. INTRODUCTION

Understanding the nonequilibrium dynamics of open quantum systems is essential for controlling small quantum devices and to improve existing quantum information processing technologies. Quantum thermodynamics offers a theoretical framework to achieve this aim, and one can, for example, study thermodynamically efficient protocols with low entropy production. Quite recently, utilizing recent technical progress in the fields of trapped ions, NMR systems, and superconducting qubits, several experiments have been performed to test important ideas in quantum thermodynamics such as the quantum fluctuation theorem [1,2] and Maxwell’s demon [3–6]. They are also used as a working substance to build up quantum heat engines and refrigerators [7–9]. We also note that a direct measurement of the stationary heat currents has become possible [10].

The studies of quantum heat engines and refrigerators [11,12] have attracted particular interest since they reveal fundamental limits on the conversion between work and heat in the quantum regime. For example, several studies have found quantum supremacy in their performance [13–17]. On the other hand, coherences built up during a cycle of a quantum heat engine are found to induce universal power losses in the linear response regime [18]. Similar result has also been reported in some specific models [19,20], where coherent oscillations are found in the output power and efficiency, leading to smaller values compared to their classical counterpart parts.

One may regard this as a manifestation of the trade-off between the protocol time and the efficiency of a given task in finite-time control theory. However, a recent quantum control technique, known as shortcuts to adiabaticity (STA), allows us to overcome this problem by mimicking quantum adiabatic dynamics in a finite protocol time [21,22]. In particular, the counter-diabatic driving (CD) technique [21,25] realizes STA by introducing an additional control field which enforces the system to follow the quantum adiabatic trajectory of the uncontrolled system. By utilizing these techniques, the performance of superadiabatic quantum heat engines have been studied extensively [27–31], whereas other optimization techniques have been utilized in the literature as well [32–34]. Note that the CD has been implemented in several experiments [35–38].

In this study, we take a model of a quantum Otto refrigerator based on a superconducting qubit coupled to two heat baths made of resonant circuits [19], and apply the CD to enhance its efficiency and power. The model we consider is illustrated in Fig. 1, where the energy level of the qubit is varied in time and it is resonantly coupled to the hot bath (H) and the cold bath (C) at different frequencies. Note that if we can switch on and off the interactions between the system and the baths, we can separate the adiabatic strokes and the thermalization strokes of the Otto engine (see also Fig. 1). Then, we can ideally apply the CD to speed up the adiabatic strokes [27,50]. On the other hand, we are interested in a situation where the coupling to the baths cannot be externally controlled and the adiabatic and thermalization strokes are not completely separated. From a practical point of view, this setup is relevant for realistic experiments where the system undergoes a continuous periodic cycle with some external drives under the influence of environments. From a fundamental point of view, this setup allows one to better understand how CD could be effective in open system dynamics, which has not been explored intensively [39,41].

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 4, we present the model studied in this paper describing a quantum Otto refrigerator. We also introduce the CD technique and the definition of the work flux and the heat flux for our model. The main result of our paper
We conclude this paper. In Sec. IV, we discuss possible experimental realizations of the quantum refrigerator studied in this paper. In Sec. V, we discuss the case of a system coupled to the hot and cold baths. The coupling between the system and the bath $i = \{C, H\}$ are assumed to take the forms $H_{\text{int}}^i = \sigma_y \otimes B^i$, where $B^i$ is the operator of the bath $i$ (including the coupling constant). Note that we discuss the case of a $\sigma_y$ (transversal) coupling between the system and the bath $i$ (see also Fig. 1 (b)), although a $\sigma_z$ (longitudinal) coupling does not significantly change the qualitative behavior of the results presented in this paper. After taking the standard weak-coupling, Born-
Markov, and rotating-wave approximations, the reduced dynamics of the system is given by the time-dependent Lindblad master equation [22,44]

\[
\partial_t \rho = -i[H_0, \rho] + D^C[\rho] + D^H[\rho],
\]
(5)

where we set \( h = 1 \) for simplicity. Here, the dissipator \( D^i \) describing the effect of the bath \( i \) is given by

\[
D^i[\rho] = S^i (\Delta \epsilon) \left[ L^i T - \frac{1}{2} L^i L^i, \rho \right] + S^i (-\Delta \epsilon) \left[ L^i L^i - \frac{1}{2} L L^i, \rho \right],
\]
(6)

where \( \{A, B\} = AB + BA \) denotes the anti-commutation relation and

\[
L = |\epsilon_g\rangle \langle \sigma_y | \epsilon_e \rangle \langle \epsilon_e | = i |\epsilon_g\rangle \langle \epsilon_e |,
\]

is the time-dependent Lindblad operator describing a jump from the excited state to the ground state. Here, \( S^i (\omega) \) is the noise power spectrum of the environment and it is related to the one-sided Fourier transform of the bath correlation function \( g^i (\tau) = \langle B^i (\tau) B^i (0) \rangle \) as

\[
\int_0^{\infty} d\tau e^{i \omega \tau} g^i (\tau) = \frac{1}{2} S^i (\omega) + i \lambda^i (\omega). \quad \text{Note that we ignore the Lamb shift term} \lambda^i (\omega) \text{in Eq. (5) for simplicity.}
\]

In this paper, we consider the following form of the noise power spectrum:

\[
S^i (\Delta \epsilon) = \frac{g_i}{2} \left( 1 + Q_i^2 (\Delta \epsilon / \omega_i - \omega_i / \Delta \epsilon)^2 \right) \frac{\Delta \epsilon}{1 - \exp(-\beta_i \Delta \epsilon)},
\]

since it is relevant to the possible experimental realizations of the refrigerators [19] (see also Fig. 1(b)). Here, \( \omega_i = 1/\sqrt{L_i C_i}, Q_i = R_i^{-1} \sqrt{L_i / C_i}, L_i, C_i, R_i, \beta_i \) and \( g_i \) are the bare resonance frequency, quality factor, inductance, capacitance, resistance, inverse temperature, and coupling strength of the circuit \( i = \{C, H\} \), respectively. We choose \( \omega_C = 2E_0 \Delta \omega \) and \( \omega_H = 2E_0 \sqrt{\Delta^2 + 1/4} \), such that the circuit C (H) is resonantly coupled to the qubit when \( q = 0 \) (\( q = 1/2 \)). We choose \( Q_i \) to adjust the width of the resonance.

### A. Counter-diabatic driving

In this subsection, we briefly introduce the idea of CD and then apply it to our model.

By following Ref. [26], we introduce the control field \( H_1 (t) \) to escort the state along the same label \( n \) of the energy eigenstate of \( H_0 (t) \) as

\[
|\epsilon_n (t) \rangle \rightarrow (1 - i \delta t H_1 (t)) |\epsilon_n (t) \rangle = e^{i \delta t A_n (t)} |\epsilon_n (t + \delta t) \rangle,
\]

and \( A_n (t) = i |\epsilon_n (t) \rangle \langle \partial_t \epsilon_n (t) | \) is the Berry connection. This means \( H_1 \) transports the state along the quantum adiabatic trajectory \( |\epsilon_n (t) \rangle \) for the original Hamiltonian \( H_0 \). Here, the control field can be obtained from Eq. (9) and its explicit form is given by

\[
H_1 (t) = i \sum_n (1 - |\epsilon_n \rangle \langle \epsilon_n |) \partial_t \epsilon_n \langle \epsilon_n |,
\]

which is called the Counter-Diabatic (CD) field [21,23,25]. As one can expect from Eq. (9), the unitary time-evolution \( U_{cd} = \text{Tr}[\exp(-i \int_0^t ds H_{cd} (s))] \), via the Hamiltonian \( H_{cd} = H_0 + H_1 \), mimics the quantum adiabatic time-evolution of \( H_0 \) in a finite time \( t \) as

\[
U_{cd} = \sum_n e^{i \int_0^t ds (A_n (s) - \epsilon_n (s))} |\epsilon_n (t) \rangle \langle \epsilon_n (0) |.
\]

Now we apply the CD technique to our model [1].

Since \( |\partial_t \epsilon_g \rangle = \theta_t |\epsilon_e \rangle \) and \( |\partial_t \epsilon_e \rangle = -\theta_t |\epsilon_g \rangle \), the CD field takes a simple form

\[
H_1 = \theta_t \sigma_y,
\]

with

\[
\theta_t = -\frac{\dot{\theta}}{2 \sqrt{\Delta^2 + q^2}}.
\]

Note that \( \dot{\theta} \) is proportional to \( \Omega \) (see also Fig. 2). The energy difference between the excited state and the ground state of \( H_{cd} \) is given by

\[
\Delta \epsilon_{cd} = 2 \sqrt{E_0^2 (\Delta^2 + q^2) + \dot{\theta}^2}.
\]

Next, we consider the time-dependent master equation [22,44] including the CD field, given by

\[
\partial_t \rho_{cd} = -i[H_0 + H_1, \rho_{cd}] + D^C [\rho_{cd}] + D^H [\rho_{cd}],
\]

where the dissipator \( D^i \) is given by Eq. (6) but replacing \( \Delta \epsilon \) and \( L \) by \( \Delta \epsilon_{cd} \) and

\[
L_{cd} := |\epsilon_{g,cd} \rangle \langle \epsilon_{e,cd} | \langle \epsilon_{e,cd} | \sigma_y |\epsilon_{e,cd} \rangle
\]

where \( |\epsilon_{cd} \rangle \) and \( |\epsilon_{cd} \rangle \) are the ground and excited state of \( H_{cd} \), respectively.

### B. Heat fluxes to the cold and hot baths

In this section, we introduce the expression of the heat fluxes from the cold and hot baths for the original [5] and CD [15] dynamics.

For the original dynamics without CD, the time-derivative of the internal energy of the system is given by \( \dot{E} = \text{Tr}[\{\partial_t H_0 |\rho\rangle + \text{Tr}[H_0 |\partial_t \rho\rangle] \} \). From the first law of thermodynamics \( \dot{E} = \dot{W} - \dot{Q} \), we identify \( W = \text{Tr}[\{\partial_t H_0 |\rho\rangle \} \) as the work flux, since this term characterizes the energy difference of the system induced by the external driving of the Hamiltonian. Similarly, we identify the term \( \dot{Q} = -\text{Tr}[H_0 |\partial_t |\rho\rangle = \text{Tr}[H_0 |D^C [\rho] + D^H [\rho] \rangle] \) as the heat flux and further decompose it into two parts...
\( \dot{Q} = \dot{Q}^G + \dot{Q}^H \), where

\[
\dot{Q}^i = \Delta \epsilon \left[ \Gamma_{\downarrow,i}(t)P_e(t) - \Gamma_{\uparrow,i}(t)P_g(t) \right]
\]

is the heat flux coming from the bath \( i \). Here, \( P_g(t) = \langle \epsilon_g | \rho(t) | \epsilon_g \rangle \) is the ground state occupation probability and \( P_e(t) = \langle \epsilon_e | \rho(t) | \epsilon_e \rangle \) is that for the excited state, and the transition rates are given by

\[
\Gamma_{\downarrow,i}(t) = S^i(\Delta \epsilon), \quad \Gamma_{\uparrow,i}(t) = S^i(-\Delta \epsilon).
\]

It is clear from the expression (17) that any change in the energy of the system related to a jump between energy eigenstates induced by the bath is interpreted as the heat. We note that the Gibbs equilibrium state \( \rho_\beta^G \) with inverse temperature \( \beta_i \) satisfies \( D'[^G \rho_\beta^G] = 0 \) and \(-i[H_0, \rho_\beta^G] = 0\). Therefore, the above definitions of the work and the heat for the Lindblad master equation dynamics are consistent with the second law of thermodynamics [45].

For the CD dynamics, we can define the heat flux in a manner similar to that for the original dynamics by replacing \( H_0 \) with \( H_{\text{cd}} \). After some similar arguments, the heat flux from the system to the bath \( i \) is found to be

\[
\dot{Q}^{cd}_i = \Delta \epsilon_{cd} \left[ \Gamma^{cd}_{\downarrow,i}(t)P^{cd}_e(t) - \Gamma^{cd}_{\uparrow,i}(t)P^{cd}_g(t) \right],
\]

where \( P^{cd}_g(t) = \langle \epsilon_g | \rho^{cd}(t) | \epsilon_g \rangle \) is the ground state occupation probability and a similar definition applies to \( P^{cd}_e(t) \), while the transition rates are given by

\[
\Gamma^{cd}_{\downarrow,i}(t) = \left( \frac{\Delta \epsilon}{\Delta \epsilon_{cd}} \right)^2 S^i(\Delta \epsilon_{cd}),
\]

\[
\Gamma^{cd}_{\uparrow,i}(t) = \left( \frac{\Delta \epsilon}{\Delta \epsilon_{cd}} \right)^2 S^i(-\Delta \epsilon_{cd}).
\]

Note that when the driving \( \Omega \) is slow, \( \dot{\theta} \) becomes negligible and Eqs. (20) and (18) become identical.

## III. MAIN RESULTS: HEAT FLUXES AND THE THERMODYNAMIC EFFICIENCY OF THE OTTO CYCLE

We now numerically solve the Lindblad master equation and calculate the heat flux as well as the efficiency of the Otto refrigerator, which constitute our main results.

### A. Dynamics of the Otto cycle

We first note that the design of the protocol lets the CD field become small (\( \dot{\theta} \approx 0 \)) when the qubit is interacting with the hot or cold baths (\( q \approx 0 \) or \( q \approx 1/2 \)). This ensures that the CD is less affected by the baths and is able to cancel nonadiabatic excitations during the cycle. As a result, the coherence between different energy eigenstates of the original Hamiltonian is suppressed, and the

![Graph showing functional form of the relative energy scale of the CD field](image)

**FIG. 3.** Functional form of the relative energy scale of the CD field with respect to the original Hamiltonian \( \delta(t) = \theta/\Delta \epsilon \) for different driving frequency \( \Omega \) [black curves]. The vertical red (blue) dashed lines indicate the time region in which the interaction between the hot (cold) bath and the qubit is dominant. Note that the CD works well if \( \delta(t) \) is sufficiently small during the time region in which the system interacts with the heat baths (see Eq. (23)). From this figure, we find that the CD-assisted control is affected by the cold bath, and the performance of the refrigerator is degraded. The parameters used here are \( a = 2, E_0 = 1, \Delta = 0.12, \beta_C^{-1} = 0.15, \beta_d^{-1} = 0.3, \) \( gc = g_n = 1, \) and \( Q_C = Q_n = 30. \)

coherence induced power and efficiency losses [15] can be avoided.

To support this idea, let us denote the matrix elements of \( \rho_{cd} \) using the basis \( |\epsilon_n\rangle \) as

\[
P^{cd}_{\langle \epsilon_n |} = \langle \epsilon_n | \rho^{cd} | \epsilon_n \rangle, \quad \delta^{cd}_{\langle \epsilon_n |} = \langle \epsilon_n | \rho^{cd} | \epsilon_n \rangle.
\]

The Lindblad master equation [15] can be rewritten as a Pauli master equation-like form

\[
\partial_t P^{cd}_{\langle \epsilon_n |} = \sum_i \left( \Gamma^{cd}_{\downarrow,i} P^{cd}_{\langle \epsilon_n |} - \Gamma^{cd}_{\uparrow,i} P^{cd}_{\langle \epsilon_n |} \right) + O(\delta^2) + O(\delta^{cd}_{\langle \epsilon_n |} \delta),
\]

\[
\partial_t \delta^{cd}_{\langle \epsilon_n |} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_i \left( \Gamma^{cd}_{\downarrow,i} + \Gamma^{cd}_{\uparrow,i} \right) \delta^{cd}_{\langle \epsilon_n |} + O(\delta),
\]

where

\[
\delta(t) = \frac{\dot{\theta}}{\Delta \epsilon(t)}
\]

quantifies the relative energy scale of the CD field with respect to the original Hamiltonian (see Fig. 3). We therefore find that if \( \delta^{cd}_{\langle \epsilon_n |}(0) = 0 \) and the driving frequency \( \Omega \) is not too large such that \( \delta \) is small, the CD dynamics is essentially described by the classical master equation (i.e., the first line of Eq. (23) by neglecting \( O(\delta^2) \) and \( O(\delta^{cd}_{\langle \epsilon_n |} \delta) \) terms). However, in general, we cannot completely cancel the coherent excitations because there is a mismatch between the basis \( |\epsilon_n\rangle \) in which the CD is
The parameters used here are $\Omega = 0.1$, $a = 2$, $E_0 = 1$, $\Delta = 0.12$, $\beta_C^{-1} = 0.15$, $\beta_H^{-1} = 0.3$, $g_C = g_H = 1$, and $Q_C = Q_H = 30$. We adopt the relative entropy of coherence $C(\rho_{cd}) = S(\sigma^d) - S(\sigma)$ for a density matrix $\sigma$, which is found to be a proper measure of coherence [46]. Here, $S(\sigma) = -\text{Tr}[\sigma \ln \sigma]$ is the von Neumann entropy and $\sigma^d = \sum_n |\epsilon_n\rangle \langle \epsilon_n| \sigma |\epsilon_n\rangle \langle \epsilon_n|$ is the diagonal part of $\sigma$. Note that when $C(\sigma) = 0$, $\sigma$ has no coherence between eigenstates $|\epsilon_n\rangle$. We adopt the relative entropy of coherence $C(\sigma) = S(\sigma^d) - S(\sigma)$ for a density matrix $\sigma$, which is found to be a proper measure of coherence [46]. Here, $S(\sigma) = -\text{Tr}[\sigma \ln \sigma]$ is the von Neumann entropy and $\sigma^d = \sum_n |\epsilon_n\rangle \langle \epsilon_n| \sigma |\epsilon_n\rangle \langle \epsilon_n|$ is the diagonal part of $\sigma$. Note that when $C(\sigma) = 0$, $\sigma$ has no coherence between eigenstates $|\epsilon_n\rangle$. In Fig. 5, we plot $C(\rho_{cd})$ which shows an excellent agreement with that of the classical model. On the other hand, we find coherent oscillations for the original dynamics $P_\sigma$. We further consider the effectiveness of CD by analyzing the coherence of the system between different energy eigenstates $|\epsilon_n\rangle$. We adopt the relative entropy of coherence $C(\sigma) = S(\sigma^d) - S(\sigma)$ for a density matrix $\sigma$, which is found to be a proper measure of coherence [46]. Here, $S(\sigma) = -\text{Tr}[\sigma \ln \sigma]$ is the von Neumann entropy and $\sigma^d = \sum_n |\epsilon_n\rangle \langle \epsilon_n| \sigma |\epsilon_n\rangle \langle \epsilon_n|$ is the diagonal part of $\sigma$. Note that when $C(\sigma) = 0$, $\sigma$ has no coherence between eigenstates $|\epsilon_n\rangle$. In Fig. 5, we plot the relative entropy of coherence for the CD $C(\rho_{cd})$ and original $C(\rho)$ dynamics, and find that $C(\rho_{cd})$ is at least one order of magnitude smaller than $C(\rho)$. 

Designed to follow and the basis $|\epsilon_{cd}\rangle$ in which the dissipation acts on. Note that this mismatch is quantified by $|\langle \epsilon_C^d | \epsilon_G \rangle |^2 = 1/2 + \Delta \epsilon / (2\Delta \epsilon_{cd}) = 1 - \delta^2 + O(\delta^3)$. In Fig. 4, we plot $P_{\epsilon_c}^{\text{cd}}$ which shows an excellent agreement with that of the classical model. On the other hand, we find coherent oscillations for the original dynamics $P_\sigma$. We further consider the effectiveness of CD by analyzing the coherence of the system between different energy eigenstates $|\epsilon_n\rangle$. We adopt the relative entropy of coherence $C(\sigma) = S(\sigma^d) - S(\sigma)$ for a density matrix $\sigma$, which is found to be a proper measure of coherence [46]. Here, $S(\sigma) = -\text{Tr}[\sigma \ln \sigma]$ is the von Neumann entropy and $\sigma^d = \sum_n |\epsilon_n\rangle \langle \epsilon_n| \sigma |\epsilon_n\rangle \langle \epsilon_n|$ is the diagonal part of $\sigma$. Note that when $C(\sigma) = 0$, $\sigma$ has no coherence between eigenstates $|\epsilon_n\rangle$. In Fig. 5, we plot the relative entropy of coherence for the CD $C(\rho_{cd})$ and original $C(\rho)$ dynamics, and find that $C(\rho_{cd})$ is at least one order of magnitude smaller than $C(\rho)$.
B. Heat flux between the system and the two heat baths

Next, we study the heat flux. Here, the sign convention of the heat is chosen such that when it is positive, heat flows from the system to the bath. In Fig. 6 (a), we plot the heat flux to the hot bath, where the interaction is dominant around \( q = 1/2 \). Here, the heat flux \( Q_{\text{cd}}^{H} \) via CD has an excellent agreement with its classical counterpart \( Q_{\text{cl}}^{H} \), calculated from the classical master equation. This agreement can be understood from Fig. 3 that \( \delta \simeq 0 \) when the system is interacting with the hot bath \( (q \simeq 1/2) \). In Fig. 6 (b), we plot the heat flux to the cold bath, where the interaction is dominant around \( q = 0 \). Here, the heat flux \( Q_{\text{cd}}^{C} \) agrees well with its classical counterpart \( Q_{\text{cl}}^{C} \), although we find a slight deviation because \( \delta \) is finite when the system is interacting with the cold bath \( (q \geq 0) \). See also Fig. 3.

The heat fluxes for the original dynamics \( Q_{\text{H}}^{C} \) and \( Q_{\text{C}}^{C} \) [green solid curve] take different values compared with the classical model because of the coherent oscillations shown in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5. When \( \Omega \) is too large, the heat from the cold bath may change sign, i.e. the cold bath is heated up.

C. Thermodynamic efficiency of the refrigerator

Finally, we compare the power and the thermodynamic efficiency (coefficient of performance) of the refrigerator. The efficiency of the original dynamics is given by \( \eta = \frac{Q_{\text{C}}^{C}}{W} = \frac{-Q_{\text{C}}^{C}}{Q_{\text{H}}^{C} + Q_{\text{C}}^{C}} \), where we use the first law of thermodynamics \( W = Q_{\text{H}}^{C} + Q_{\text{C}}^{C} \) for a stationary cycle and obtain the second equality, and \( Q_{\text{cl}} = \int dt \dot{Q}(t) \) and \( W = \int dt W(t) \) are the heat and work for one stationary cycle, respectively. The efficiencies for the CD dynamics and the classical dynamics are defined in a similar manner. Note that we include the effect of the CD in a standard manner by defining the efficiency based on the total Hamiltonian including the CD field. We also note that there are several proposals for the energy costs of STA [17,49], including a modified definition of the efficiency [20]. The cooling power of the cold bath is defined as \( \Pi_{\text{C}}^{C} = Q_{\text{C}}^{C}/(2\pi/\Omega) \), and a similar definition applies to the heating power \( \Pi_{\text{H}}^{C} \) as well.

We plot the power in Fig. 7 and the efficiency in Fig. 8 as a function of the driving frequency \( \Omega \) for the original dynamics, CD dynamics, and classical dynamics. Because of the coherent oscillations seen in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 for the original dynamics, the population of the ground and excited states may be reversed and \( Q_{\text{C}}^{C} \) varies from negative to positive values depending on \( \Omega \). This af-
fects the cooling power and the efficiency as it falls down rapidly in the large $\Omega$ regime. For the CD dynamics, we can largely improve them in the large $\Omega$ regime. For the CD dynamics, we have also discussed experimental feasibility of the proposed quantum refrigerator. We hope that this investigation of efficient cooling and heat transferring techniques will contribute to further developments of quantum information technologies.
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