Quantum Heat Engine and Quantum Phase Transition: through Anisotropic LMG and Full Dicke models

M. Aparicio Alcalde *
Instituto de Ciências Exatas e Tecnológicas, Universidade Federal de Viçosa, 38810-000, Rio Paranaíba, MG, Brazil

Enrique Arias †
Instituto Politécnico, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, 28625-570, Nova Friburgo, RJ, Brazil

June 4, 2019

Abstract

The enhancement of quantum heat engines (QHEs) efficiency is of great interest for fundamental studies and quantum technology developments, where collective many-body effects play an important role. In this work we analyze the efficiency of two QHEs where the working substance exhibits second order quantum phase transitions (QPT). One of these engines is defined by the working substance corresponding to the anisotropic Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick (LMG) model and the other to the full Dicke model. We consider that, working at thermal equilibrium, the heat engines realize a thermodynamic Stirling cycle type. For both QHEs, a remarkable enhancement of efficiency is obtained when during the cycle the working substances undergo a QPT, where eventually the efficiency reaches the Carnot bound. We also analyze the effect of the degree of anisotropy in the interaction term of the LMG model and the unbalance between rotating and counter-rotating terms in the full Dicke model. It is observed a better efficiency increase when the interaction term in the LMG model is more anisotropic, and in the full Dicke model, when the rotating and counter-rotating interaction terms are equally balanced. These behaviors are related to the symmetries of the models. Finally, we discuss an equivalence between our Stirling cycle and the Carnot cycle at some particular values of the model parameters, where the maximum efficiency is attained.

1 INTRODUCTION

The thermodynamics survey of quantum systems have been enriched and gained new perspectives by introducing the effects of quantum fluctuations, quantum correlations as well as strong system-reservoir coupling and non-Markovian dynamics into the thermodynamic description of quantum systems. In this way, concern about the validity and possible generalization of thermodynamic laws in the quantum domain, have lead to the formal development of quantum thermodynamics [1–3]. Therefore, analysis related to this field became relevant not only for fundamental research but also for modern technological applications.

Remarkable results using quantum resources in technology are well known, like the use of quantum entanglement for quantum computation and quantum information [4]. In a similar way, thermal machines that use quantum systems as working substance have attracted the attention of the community, these kind of machines are called quantum heat engines (QHEs) [5,6]. In order to study the heat exchange and work production in such engines, the concepts of heat, work and free energy need to be reviewed in the quantum realm, therefore one have to refer to the prescriptions of quantum thermodynamics. The principal advantage of QHEs over its classical counterpart, is that higher efficiencies could be reached [7,13]. Some quantum resources that allow such efficiency boost are the use of non-thermal reservoirs, as for example squeeze reservoirs and quantum-coherent baths, where efficiency can even overcome Carnot bound. Despite such results, is worth emphasizing that the second law of thermodynamics is not violated, since the Carnot’s limit is valid when heat engines use thermal reservoirs. All this interesting phenomenology motivated the experimental realization of QHEs [15,16].
Efficiency increase also happens due to interaction between different constituents of the working substance [17]. In addition, other resource allowing QHEs to increase their efficiency and power are collective effects within many-body working substances [18–21]. A well known collective phenomena of matter is quantum phase transition (QPT) [22]. Therefore, recent works found connections of QPT with higher efficiencies and power increase in QHEs [23–25]. Similarly, other study [26] explore the effects of topological phase transition in the work and efficiency of a QHE. Two paradigmatic quantum critical models are the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick (LMG) model [27–29] and the Dicke model [30]. The LMG model describes an ensemble of two-level system with all-to-all interaction, whereas the Dicke model is defined by an ensemble of two-level system interacting with a common bosonic mode inside an optical cavity. Both models exhibit second order QPT [27,31,32]. It has been shown previously that such models reveal interesting relations between QPT, maximum quantum entanglement [35,36] and quantum chaos [34,37,38]. Moreover, these models manifest a generalization of their criticality called of excited state quantum phase transition, which is an active area of study [39,40]. There exist experimental realizations of such models, where their principal phenomenology was observed [41,42].

A recent theoretical study [23] defines a QHE with the isotropic LMG model as its working substance. The authors proved that higher values of efficiency are obtained (getting Carnot’s value at some cases) when during the thermodynamic cycle the substance undergoes a QPT. Another important issue of QHEs with quantum critical working substance, is that they are able to have finite values of power when Carnot’s efficiency is achieved [24,25].

In this work we study two QHEs, with working substances defined by models that exhibit QPT. For the first engine, we choose the LMG model being anisotropic, differently from the isotropic case of the reference [23]. For the second engine the full Dicke model is selected, where we refer by full because the use of different coupling constants for the rotating and counter-rotating interaction terms. The QHEs follow a Stirling thermodynamic cycle, defined by two isothermal processes (and changing coupling constant) and two processes at fixed coupling constant (and changing temperature). For both cases, higher efficiency values are obtained when during the process the system undergoes a QPT, and eventually Carnot efficiency is achieved. Moreover, we analyze the effect of the anisotropy of the LMG model and of the unbalance between the rotating and counter-rotating terms in the full Dicke model. We show that the efficiency grows faster to higher values when the LMG model is more anisotropic and in the full Dicke model case when the rotating and counter-rotating terms are equal balanced. It means, the presence of the counter-rotating term helps to increase the efficiency. The anisotropic LMG model was studied previously using an Otto cycle [45], where the authors find conditions for optimal efficiency, however this study was limited for the case with two particles. Here we generalize this behavior for a bigger number of particles, giving a good understanding of what happens in the thermodynamic limit. The Dicke model, due to its collective behavior, already proved to be important in other quantum technology set-ups [21,46,47]. Finally, our use of the full Dicke model, as far as we know, is the first attempt to exploit its non-trivial quantum properties into a QHE, therefore our results reveal once again the importance of its rich collective quantum behavior.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2 we introduce the LMG and Dicke models and some pertinent properties. In Sec. 3 it is shown how to obtain the thermodynamic quantities of the systems and is defined the thermodynamic cycle to be studied. In Sec. 4 we show the results of this work. Finally, in Sec. 5 we set our principal conclusions. In this paper, units with $h = 1$ and $k_B = 1$ are used.

## 2 THE ANISOTROPIC LIPKIN-MESHKOV-GLICK AND THE FULL DICKE MODELS

In this section are defined the two models to be studied and it is reviewed some pertinent critical properties for our study. In this paper, the LMG model describes an ensemble of two-level system with anisotropic all-to-all interaction. The Dicke model is defined by an ensemble of two-level systems interacting with a common bosonic mode inside an optical cavity.

The quantum Hamiltonian for LMG model is defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_{LMG} = -\omega_0 J_z - \frac{\lambda}{N} (J_x^2 + \gamma J_y^2),$$

(1)

and the Hamiltonian for the full Dicke model reads

$$\mathcal{H}_D = \omega a^\dagger a + \omega_0 J_z$$

$$+ \frac{\lambda(1+\gamma)}{2\sqrt{N}} (aJ_+ + a^\dagger J_-)$$

$$+ \frac{\lambda(1-\gamma)}{2\sqrt{N}} (aJ_- + a^\dagger J_+).$$

(2)

For both cases, the angular momentum operators are $J_x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma^{(i)}_x$, with $\alpha = x, y, z$; and $J_z \equiv J_z \pm iJ_y$; they represent collective transitions in the set of $N$ two-level atoms. In the Dicke model Hamiltonian, $a$ and $a^\dagger$ correspond to the creation and annihilation operators of the cavity bosonic mode. The energy gap between the two levels in each atom is $\omega_0$, the
energy of the bosonic mode is $\omega$, and the dimensional parameter $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$ weights the $X$ and $Y$ direction of interaction in the LMG model and allows to weight rotating and counterrotating terms in the Dicke model.

Both models exhibit a second order QPT, in the LMG model there is a transition from paramagnetic phase ($\lambda < \lambda_C = \omega_0$) to ferromagnetic phase ($\lambda > \lambda_C = \omega_0$) \[31, 40\], and in the Dicke model there is a transition from normal phase ($\lambda < \lambda_C = \sqrt{\omega_0}$) to superradiant phase ($\lambda > \lambda_C = \sqrt{\omega_0}$) \[33, 34\]. For the LMG and Dicke models we define the number excitation operator as $\hat{N}_{LMG} = J_z N + N/2$ and $\hat{N}_D = a^\dagger a + J_z N + N/2$ respectively. In both cases we define the parity operator as $\Pi = e^{i\pi \hat{N}}$ with the respective definition of the operator $\hat{N}$. Since for both models it is possible to verify that $[\hat{H}, \Pi] = 0$, they possess the discrete parity symmetry. In the special cases where $\gamma = 1$ (isotropic LMG model and rotated wave approximation in Dicke model), they additionally possess the continuous symmetry $[e^{i\theta \hat{N}}, \hat{H}] = 0$ for any $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, since $[\hat{H}, \hat{N}] = 0$. At the QPT, respective symmetries are broken.

QPT is defined in the thermodynamic limit $N \to \infty$, since nonanalyticities appear in an order parameter at the transition. Nevertheless, these models exhibit good convergence to the thermodynamic limit at $N = 20$. The spectrum of the LMG and Dicke models are respectively given in Figs. 1 and 2. An important characteristic in both models when $\gamma = 1$ is the level crossing for the lower energetic levels, in the ferromagnetic, and superradiant phases respectively. Such behavior is associated to the continuous symmetry of the models in the cases where $\gamma = 1$ \[22, 34\].

In this section we review briefly the notions of quantum thermodynamics in order to define our QHEs. We have that in the quantum domain the definitions of heat and work have to be revisited. In order to accomplish this we can use the standard approach to distinguish the different kinds of energy exchanges of the quantum system. Let us suppose that the system state is given by the density operator $\rho$ and that its dynamics is governed by the Hamiltonian $H$. Hence, the system mean energy is given by $U = \text{Tr}(\rho H)$ and the energy exchange of the system is

$$dU = \text{Tr}(d\rho H) + \text{Tr}(\rho dH).$$

In Eq. (3), we identify the first term on the right hand side as the heat $\delta\langle Q \rangle$ absorbed by the system. This definition of heat is in agreement with the usual notion of heat as the energy variation associated with the change of the system internal state. Also, as we will see, this definition is compatible with the interpretation of heat as the energy variation related to an entropy increase. On the other hand, the second term in the right hand side of Eq. (3) is identified as the work performed over the system, which is equivalent to the negative of the work realized by the system $-\delta\langle W \rangle$. This definition relates work to the energy variation caused by changes in the external parameters that define the Hamiltonian of the system, as external fields or cavity size for example. It is worth mentioning that, work is not an observable and its probability distribution and characteristic function should be properly defined by a two-measurement protocol \[48\]. Therefore, we have that the mean values of absorbed heat and work realized by the quantum system in a
thermodynamic transformation are

\[
\langle Q \rangle = \int \text{Tr} (d\rho \mathcal{H}) ,
\]

\[
\langle W \rangle = -\int \text{Tr} (\rho d\mathcal{H}) ,
\]

(4)

these quantities are path dependent and their values depend on the way that the density state, or the Hamiltonian, changes during the process. For our case, we assume that the system is always in thermal equilibrium with a thermal bath at temperature \( \beta^{-1} \), and its density operator is a Gibbs state of the form

\[
\rho (\beta, \lambda) = e^{-\beta H(\lambda)} / Z(\beta, \lambda),
\]

(5)

where \( Z(\beta, \lambda) = \text{Tr} (e^{-\beta H(\lambda)}) \) is the partition function and \( H(\lambda) \) is the system Hamiltonian parametrized by a general external variable \( \lambda \). In our study, we consider for \( \mathcal{H} \) the LMG and Dicke Hamiltonian, where \( \lambda \) is the coupling constant, which drives the QPT in each model. We also consider a quantum Stirling heat engine, defined by two isothermals (i.e., constant \( \beta \)) and two processes with fixed value of coupling constant \( \lambda \). For these processes we are able to rewrite our formal expressions of mean quantum heat and mean quantum work. By using the notions of entropy and free energy

\[
S = -\text{Tr} (\rho \ln \rho),
\]

\[
F = -\ln Z / \beta,
\]

(6)

one can show that if we are always on a Gibbs state Eq. (5) and the probabilities are conserved, \( \text{Tr}(d\rho) = 0 \), we have that

\[
\langle Q \rangle = \int \frac{dS(\beta, \lambda)}{\beta},
\]

\[
\langle W \rangle = -\int \frac{dF(\beta, \lambda)}{\partial \lambda} d\lambda,
\]

(7)

here we have put into evidence that the entropy and free energy depend on both temperature \( \beta^{-1} \) and the coupling constant \( \lambda \). Hence, in general, the amount of heat absorbed and work realized by the system in a given process are path dependent. Nonetheless, the first law of thermodynamics is always obeyed, since for any infinitesimal process we have \( dU = \delta(Q) - \delta(W) \). Therefore, in a finite process we have

\[
\Delta U = \langle Q \rangle - \langle W \rangle.
\]

(8)

For the Stirling QHE we have two kind of processes: Isothermal transformation: In this process the temperature \( \beta^{-1} \) of the system is kept constant by exchanging heat with a reservoir, and it realizes work over the environment. In this transformation the parameter \( \lambda \) changes from some initial value \( \lambda_i \) to a final one \( \lambda_f \). Hence, from Eq. (7) we have that in an isothermal process, the heat and work respectively read

\[
\langle Q \rangle_{\text{isoth}} = \Delta S / \beta = (S(\beta, \lambda_f) - S(\beta, \lambda_i)) / \beta,
\]

\[
\langle W \rangle_{\text{isoth}} = -\Delta F = -F(\beta, \lambda_f) + F(\beta, \lambda_i).
\]

(9)

\( \lambda \)-fixed transformation: In this process the external parameter \( \lambda \), that defines the Hamiltonian, is kept constant while the temperature of the system \( \beta^{-1} \) changes. Through the process, the system does not realize any work, but it could exchange heat with the reservoir. Since in this case \( \lambda \) remains constant and the temperature changes from some initial value \( \beta_i^{-1} \) to a final one \( \beta_f^{-1} \), we have from Eqs. (7) and (8) that in the \( \lambda \)-fixed process

\[
\langle Q \rangle_{\lambda-\text{fixed}} = U(\beta_f, \lambda) - U(\beta_i, \lambda),
\]

\[
\langle W \rangle_{\lambda-\text{fixed}} = 0.
\]

(10)

As we just saw above, the thermodynamic processes depend on the internal energy \( U \), entropy \( S \) and free energy \( F \), where they can be obtained from the partition function \( Z \). The computation of this partition function depends on the Hamiltonian and the Hilbert space of the system, therefore it is important to clearly define these two last physical aspects.

In this work, the QHEs are defined by the LMG Hamiltonian \( H_{\text{LMG}} \) (see Eq. (1)) in one case, and the Dicke Hamiltonian \( H_D \) (see Eq. (2)) in the other. The angular momentum operators in both models are collective operators defined by \( J_\alpha \equiv \frac{i}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma^{(i)}_\alpha \), with \( \alpha = x, y, z \), and they are derived from a \( N \) two-level atoms composition. The whole angular momentum Hilbert space is spanned by the set of states \( \{ |j, m \rangle \} \), where \( j = \{ 0, 1, \ldots, N \} \) for \( N \) even, or \( j = \{ \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, \ldots, \frac{N}{2} \} \) for \( N \) odd, and \( m = \{ -j, -j+1, \ldots, j-1, j \} \). The trace to be computed in the partition function of Eq. (5) depends on the Hilbert space of the models, where according on the nature of the experiment to realize the models, two possibilities are identified. The first one considers distinguishable two-level atoms, in this scenario the thermodynamics properties of the systems are well known [49, 50]. The second possibility considers indistinguishable two-level atoms, in this situation the Hilbert space is restricted to the totally symmetric states under particle permutations operations. Indeed, instead of atoms, the physical realization for this case uses a set of bosonic particles in a collective two-level unique system. In the indistinguishable case, the Hilbert space is spanned by the set \( \{ |j, m \rangle \} \), where \( j \) acquires the fixed maximum value \( j = \frac{N}{2} \) whereas \( m = \{ -\frac{N}{2}, -\frac{N}{2} + 1, \ldots, \frac{N}{2} - 1, \frac{N}{2} \} \). For the thermodynamics in both models we have that in the distinguishable case there are both quantum and thermal phase transitions [49, 50], while in the indistinguishable case, at least for the Dicke model in the ultrastrong-coupling limit, the thermal phase transition is avoided [51]. In this study we consider the indistinguishable case for both models.
Moreover, the thermodynamic cycle of our QHEs is the Stirling cycle, it is shown in Fig. 3 and defined by the following processes:

**Process A → B**: Isothermal process at fixed temperature $\beta_H^{-1}$. In this process the coupling constant $\lambda$ changes from $\lambda_1$ to $\lambda_2$, going through the critical value $\lambda_C$ when $\lambda_2 > \lambda_C$. Here the absorbed heat of the system is given by

$$\langle Q \rangle_{AB} = (S_B - S_A) / \beta_H > 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

**Process B → C**: Process at fixed coupling constant $\lambda_2$. Here, the temperature of the system diminishes from $\beta_H^{-1}$ to $\beta_C^{-1}$. The system does not realize work but releases heat given by

$$\langle Q \rangle_{BC} = U_C - U_B < 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

**Process C → D**: Isothermal process at fixed temperature $\beta_C^{-1}$. In this transformation the coupling constant $\lambda$ goes back from $\lambda_2$ to its initial value $\lambda_1$, going through the critical value $\lambda_C$ when $\lambda_2 > \lambda_C$. In this process it releases heat given by

$$\langle Q \rangle_{CD} = (S_D - S_C) / \beta_C < 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

**Process D → A**: Process at fixed coupling constant $\lambda_1$. Here the temperature increases from $\beta_C^{-1}$ to $\beta_H^{-1}$. The system does not realize work but absorbs heat given by

$$\langle Q \rangle_{DA} = U_A - U_D > 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

For the whole cycle, the efficiency of the quantum Stirling heat engine is defined by

$$\eta = \frac{\langle W \rangle}{\langle Q \rangle_{abs}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

where $\langle W \rangle$ is the total work performed by the system and $\langle Q \rangle_{abs} = \langle Q \rangle_{AB} + \langle Q \rangle_{DA}$, is the amount of heat absorbed by the system. Since we have a cyclic process, and due to the first law of thermodynamics, we have $\langle W \rangle = \langle Q \rangle_{AB} + \langle Q \rangle_{BC} + \langle Q \rangle_{CD} + \langle Q \rangle_{DA}$.

### 4 RESULTS

In this section we show numerical results for the efficiency of the QHEs defined in the last section. These systems are always at thermal equilibrium, then their states are defined by Gibbs states (see definition in Eq. (5)). In such context, the thermodynamic quantities are obtained from the partition function, which is computed by numerical diagonalization of respective Hamiltonian, given in Eqs. (1) and (2). For the full Dicke model case, this technique requires a cut-off in the infinite Hilbert space of the bosonic mode. The cut-off was set up demanding a good convergence of the results.

The principal results for the anisotropic LMG and full Dicke models are shown in Figs. 4 and 5 respectively. In the calculations the atoms energy gaps $\omega_0 = 1$ and the bosonic energy excitations $\omega = 1$, with such values the QPT occurs at $\lambda_C = 1$ for both models. As defined in the last section, our QHEs follow a Stirling cycle, see Fig. 3, where the coupling constant of the initial state $A$ is fixed at $\lambda_1 = 0.5$, it means that the system starts in the paramagnetic phase for the LMG model, and in the normal phase for the Dicke model. In Figs. 4 and 5, several results are displayed when the coupling constant $\lambda_2$ (of states $B$ and $C$) varies from some minimum value $\lambda_2 = 0.5$ to some maximum, crossing in that interval the critical value $\lambda_2 = \lambda_C = 1$.

It is evident, from Figs. 4 and 5, that the efficiency has lower values when $\lambda_2$ satisfies $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \lambda_C$, i.e. the whole cycle remains in the paramagnetic phase for the LMG model, or normal phase for the Dicke model. When we allow that the systems undergo a QPT during the thermodynamic cycle, in such a way that points $B$ and $C$ of the cycle are now in the ferromagnetic phase for the LMG model and in the super-radiant phase for the Dicke model, i.e. $\lambda_2 > \lambda_C$, we obtain a great enhancement of the cycle efficiency. Moreover in last cases, the cycle efficiency eventually achieves the Carnot bound. It is important to mention that, such high efficiency values happens for low values of temperature, for higher temperatures the efficiency falls.

The degree of anisotropy in the LMG model and of unbalance between the rotating and counter-rotating terms in the full Dicke model, are determined by the value of the parameter $\gamma$. The effect over the cycle efficiency due to the different values of $\gamma$ are shown in panels (a), (b) and (c) of Figs. 4 and 5 for the LMG and Dicke models, respectively. Setting the parameter $\gamma = 0$, we have the more anisotropic coupling for the LMG model, and equal balance between rotating and counter-rotating terms for the full Dicke model. The results for this case of $\gamma = 0$ is exhibited in panels (a), where we observe that the efficiency converges to the Carnot efficiency after $\lambda_2$ exceeds the critical value $\lambda_C$. We notice also that the mentioned con-
Figure 4: The efficiency for the LMG model is shown in panels (a), (b) and (c) for $\gamma = 0$, 0.5 and 1 respectively. For the three cases, the full, dashed, dot-dashed and dotted lines correspond to number of particles $N = 20$, 8, 4 and 2 respectively, and the gray upper line to the Carnot efficiency. The heat transferred for each path of the engine process (see Fig. 3), are shown in panels (d), (e) and (f) respectively for $\gamma = 0$, 0.5 and 1; with $N = 8$. For all the panels: $\omega_0 = 1$, $\beta_{C}^{-1} = 1/30$, $\beta_{H}^{-1} = 1/15$, $\lambda_1 = 0.5$

Figure 5: The efficiency for the Dicke model is shown in panels (a), (b) and (c) for $\gamma = 0$, 0.5 and 1 respectively, for number of particles $N = 20$, 8, 4 and 2 as indicated. The gray upper line correspond to the Carnot efficiency. The heat transferred for each path of the engine process (see Fig. 3), are shown in panels (d), (e) and (f) respectively for $\gamma = 0$, 0.5 and 1; with $N = 4$. For all the panels: $\omega = \omega_0 = 1$, $\beta_{C}^{-1} = 1/30$, $\beta_{H}^{-1} = 1/15$, $\lambda_1 = 0.5$
vergence is more rapidly obtained when compared to cases of bigger values of $\gamma$. In the cases where $\gamma < 1$ but close to 1, oscillatory values of efficiency appears as the coupling constant $\lambda_2$ changes, where such behavior is suppressed for lower values of $\gamma$. The different dependence of efficiency with respect to the $\gamma$ parameter, indeed depends on the characteristics of the spectrum of the model, and it is possible to see that as more level crossings there are, more accentuated are the oscillations of efficiency, see Fig. 4 and Fig. 2. The same oscillations for the isotropic LMG model was reported in Ref. [23]. It is possible to extend this relation of the behavior of efficiency with the values of $\gamma$, to the symmetry of the models. In this case, as $\gamma$ get closer to 1, the continuous symmetries derived from $[\mathcal{H}, \hat{N}] = 0$ (see section 3) becomes dominant, in other words the respective interacting term with such symmetry ($J^2 + J_y^2 = J^2 - J_z^2$ for the anisotropic LMG and the rotating term in the full Dicke model) gets dominant, consequently more level crossings are present. On the other hand, when $\gamma$ gets different from 1 (approaching to 0) the continuous symmetric term becomes less relevant, and the Hamiltonian loses such symmetry (remaining only the parity symmetry). In such situation the number of level crossings decrease, specially at the lower energetic levels, which have enough influence on the thermodynamic quantities studied here.

In general, Carnot engines are reversible heat engines, operating by two processes at constant temperature (using a cold and hot thermal baths for each one), and by two adiabatic processes (i.e. with no heat exchange). The QHEs studied in this paper follow a Stirling cycle type, defined by two isothermal processes $A \rightarrow B$ (hot temperature) and $C \rightarrow D$ (cold temperature), and by two processes where the coupling constant $\lambda$ is fixed, and by two processes where the coupling constant $\lambda$ is fixed, $B \rightarrow C$ and $D \rightarrow A$, see Fig. 3. From our results in panels (d), (e) and (f) of Figs. 4 and 5, for the LMG and Dicke models respectively, it is possible to note that Carnot bound is achieved when the exchanged heat in processes $BC$ and $DA$ are zero (it means, they become adiabatic processes). Therefore, for these particular cases, the QHE with Stirling cycle agrees with the Carnot engine definition, since heat exchange of the system only happens in the isothermal processes $AB$ and $CD$.

5 CONCLUSIONS

The efficiency of two QHEs were computed, each engine operates with different quantum critical systems, corresponding to the anisotropic LMG model in one case and the full Dicke model in the other, where the thermodynamic cycles are of Stirling type. For both models, we show numerical results for low temperatures, where optimization of the efficiency value (reaching the Carnot limit at some particular cases) was observed, it happens when during the cycle process the model undergoes a QPT.

A faster efficiency grow is obtained when the interaction term in the LMG model is more anisotropic than isotropic, and in the Dicke model when the interaction posses the rotating and counter-rotating terms equally balanced. It means that, the rotating wave approximation (i.e. when the counter-rotating term is eliminated), is not appropriated to have a faster efficiency grow. Such behavior is related to symmetries of the models, since the symmetries rule the existence of level crossings in the spectrum of the systems.

Is observed that the Carnot and the studied cycles are equivalents at some particular values of the model parameters, where in such cases, there are heat transference only in the isothermal processes of the cycles.

Is important to mention that the thermodynamics of the models studied here, correspond to indistinguishable particles in a two level system. For this situation, the Hilbert space of the set of $N$ particles is $N$-dimensional, and thermodynamic quantities are not extensive. A different behavior is observed for the distinguishable cases, which correspond to a set of $N$ two-level atoms. In such case the Hilbert space is $2^N$-dimensional, and the thermodynamic quantities are extensive. In the last case thermal phase transitions are observed, nevertheless in the indistinguishable cases do not, where only appears QPT (at least for the Dicke model in the ultrastrong-coupling regime). An interesting extension of this work could be the analysis of QHEs when the substance corresponds to the same models studied in this work but in the distinguishable cases.
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