Nonadiabatic Control of Geometric Pumping
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We study nonadiabatic effects of geometric pumping. With arbitrary choices of periodic control parameters, we go beyond the adiabatic approximation to obtain the exact pumping current. We find that a geometrical interpretation for the nontrivial part of the current is possible even at the nonadiabatic regime. The exact result allows us to study how to control the geometric current. Using the method of shortcuts to adiabaticity, we introduce an assisted field and examine how it enhances the current.

Introduction. In 1983, Thouless discovered a phenomenon called geometric pumping. In electron systems, a slow periodic variation of control parameters gives a nontrivial current without bias [1,2]. The mechanism is described by the geometric Berry phase [3], which shows that it is a topological phenomenon. While the original study was applied to a one-dimensional system with a lattice potential, we can also find the same phenomenon in mesoscopic quantum dot systems [4], and in stochastic systems described by the classical master equation [5–13] and by the quantum master equation [14–20]. The experimental verification can be seen in many works [21–28]. The system is of interest from a viewpoint of stochastic thermodynamics. In small systems with appreciable fluctuations, by using the notion of full counting statistics [29–31], we can examine the fluctuation theorem [32–35].

Although the phenomenon is a purely dynamical one, the theoretical description relies on the static picture. The use of the adiabatic approximation is crucial not only for theoretical analysis but also for establishing the geometrical picture. Since the adiabatic approximation is justified only at the limit where the parameter change is sufficiently slow, it is important to ask how much the adiabatic description makes sense for nonideal fast manipulations. It is known that the geometric phase for nonadiabatic systems is still useful [36–38], but we have not fully understood the corresponding phenomenon for the geometric pumping. A breakdown of the fluctuation theorem in the adiabatic regime was reported in [39–41], which implies a considerable nonadiabatic effect to the phenomenon. While nonadiabatic effects in the geometric pumping have been studied in many works [42–46], we need a reliable analytical method to obtain a clear picture of the nonadiabatic pumping. Establishing the nonadiabatic description is important not only to find the fundamental properties but also to realize efficient controls of systems in applications.

In this letter, we treat the stochastic master equation to study the nonadiabatic effect. We propose a method incorporating the effect to the solution of the equation. We find that a geometrical interpretation is still possible for the pumping current under the operation with arbitrary speed, which allows us to discuss controlling the nontrivial contributions of the current. To find an efficient control we use the idea from shortcuts to adiabaticity (STA) [47–52].

Master equation. The system we treat in this letter is coupled to several reservoirs to provide a particle transfer. The process is stochastic and the time evolution of the system is described by the master equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} |p(t)\rangle = W(t) |p(t)\rangle. \quad (1)$$

$|p(t)\rangle$ is represented as $|p(t)\rangle = (p_1(t), p_2(t), \ldots)^T$ where the subscript denotes the microscopic state of the system and each component represents the probability. $W(t)$ is a transition-rate matrix with each component $W_{ij}(t)$ representing the transition rate from the state $j$ to the state $i$ at $t$. The system is coupled to the reservoirs and $W(t)$ is decomposed as $W(t) = \sum_\nu W^{(\nu)}(t)$ where $\nu$ represents the label of the reservoirs. $W^{(\nu)}(t)$ is defined in a similar way. The off-diagonal components of $W^{(\nu)}(t)$ are nonnegative and the diagonal components are determined by the condition $\sum_i W^{(\nu)}_{ii}(t) = 0$. In the problem of the geometric pumping, to find a nontrivial contribution of current, we operate the system periodically without bias between the left ($\nu = L$) and right ($\nu = R$) couplings.

Assuming that the transition-rate matrix is diagonalizable, we represent the solution of the master equation by an orthonormal set of the instantaneous left and right eigenstates of $W(t)$, denoted as $\{ |\phi_\eta(t)\rangle, |\phi_\sigma(t)\rangle \}$ with the eigenvalues $\{ \epsilon_\eta(t) \}$. We write

$$|p(t)\rangle = \sum_\eta C_\eta(t) e^{\int_0^t dt' \epsilon_\eta(t')} |\phi_\eta(t)\rangle, \quad (2)$$

$$|\dot{\phi}_\eta(t)\rangle = e^{-\int_0^t dt' \epsilon_\eta(t')} [\phi_\eta(t)] |\phi_\eta(t)\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where the dot denotes the time derivative. $|\dot{\phi}_\eta(t)\rangle$ represents the eigenstate with a geometric “phase” which is an analogue of the Berry phase, or the Aharonov–Anandan phase, in quantum mechanics [36–38]. This state vector has a good property

$$\langle \dot{\phi}_\sigma(t) | \dot{\phi}_\eta(t) \rangle = 0 \quad (\eta \neq \sigma).$$

|
of the gauge invariance, that is the invariance under the transformation \( (\phi_a(t), |\phi_b(t)\rangle) \rightarrow (\phi_a(t)R_c^{-1}(t), R_c(t)|\phi_b(t)\rangle) \) with \( R_c(0) = 1 \). To find the geometric current, we use the adiabatic approximation that the time dependence of the coefficient \( C_a(t) \) is neglected. The physical meaning of this approximation is that the system follows an instantaneous eigenstate of the system when the time variation of \( W(t) \) is small. To examine effects of fast driving, we need to treat mixing between different eigenstates.

The master equation has, at least, one stationary state with zero eigenvalue. For simplicity, we assume that there is the unique stationary state denoted with the label \( n = 1 \). Then, \( C_1(t) = 1 \) and the other states with \( n \neq 1 \) have negative eigenvalues \( e_n(t) < 0 \). The equation for \( C_n(t) \) with \( n \neq 1 \) is given by

\[
\frac{dC_n(t)}{dt} + \sum_{m \neq n} C_m(t)e^\delta t e^{s_n(t)}(\langle \phi_m(t)|\phi_n(t)\rangle) = 0.4(4)
\]

When we consider a slow modulation, we expect that the time evolution does not make transition to different eigenstates. This means that the overlap in the second term on the left hand side of Eq. (4), \( \langle \phi_m(t)|\phi_n(t)\rangle = \langle \delta(t)|W(t)|\phi_n(t)\rangle/(e_m(t) - e_n(t)) \) with \( m \neq n \), is negligible in the adiabatic approximation. In addition, in systems described by the master equation, we have an exponentially-decaying factor \( e^\delta t e^{s_n(t)} \) for \( m \neq 1 \), which further justifies the approximation. The factor is absent for \( m = 1 \) with \( e_1(t) = 0 \) and it is reasonable to keep this term. Then, neglecting the contributions with \( m \neq 1 \), we obtain a nonadiabatic approximate solution

\[
|p(t)\rangle \approx |\phi_1(t)\rangle + \sum_{n \neq 1} (\delta_n(t) + C_n e^\delta t e^{s_n(t)})|\phi_n(t)\rangle,
\]

where \( C_n \) is a constant determined from the initial condition, and

\[
\delta_n(t) = -\int_0^t dt' \langle \phi(n(t'))|\phi_1(t')\rangle e^\delta t e^{s_n(t')}.
\]

See Supplemental Material (SM) for details of the derivation. The adiabatic approximation for \( |p(t)\rangle \) is obtained by setting \( \delta_n(t) = 0 \). As we see from the explicit form in Eq. (S28), \( \delta_n(t) \) depends on the whole history of the time evolution and represents nonadiabatic effects. This function is not periodic in \( t \) even when \( W(t) \) is periodic. However, it rapidly falls into a periodic behavior at large-\( t \), which can be understood from the differential equation

\[
\frac{d\delta_n(t)}{dt} = e_n(t) - \frac{\langle \phi_m(t)|\phi_n(t)\rangle}{\delta_n(t)}.
\]

This equation has a single stationary fixed point \( \langle \phi_m(t)|\phi_n(t)\rangle/\delta_n(t) \), where the right hand side tends to zero. \( \delta_n(t) \) is attracted to this point since the coefficient \( e_n(t) \) is negative throughout the time evolution. \( \delta_n(t) \) follows the fluctuating fixed point with some delay. \( \delta_n(t) \) falls into the same trajectory after transient evolutions at first several periods (See SM).

**Pumping current.** Using the solution of the master equation (1), Eq. (5), we can evaluate the current through the system. Formally, it can be defined by introducing a counting field \( \phi \). To make the discussion concrete, we treat the two-state case where the number of the components of \( |p(t)\rangle \) is two and Eq. (5) becomes the exact solution. When we set that the first (second) component of \( |p(t)\rangle \) represents the probability that the system is empty (filled), the average current through the system from the left to right reservoirs is given by

\[
J = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T dt W_{12}(t)p_2(t) - W_{21}(t)p_1(t) \quad \text{(See SM)}.
\]

In this expression, the long-time averaged current is independent of the initial condition and of the last term in the bracket of Eq. (5). This implies that we can calculate the exact current by using the approximated state in Eq. (5) even if we go beyond the two-state case. The neglected term in Eq. (4) incorporates an exponentially-decaying factor and does not contribute to the current after the second modulation cycle.

In the adiabatic approximation for the current, \( J \) is given by the sum of the dynamical part \( J_d \) and the geometric part \( J_{nad} \). The former is given by the dynamical “phase” term and the latter by the geometric term \( J_{nad} \). In the present treatment, the dynamical part is the same and the geometric part is separated into the adiabatic part and the nonadiabatic part \( J_g = J_{ad} + J_{nad} \).

The explicit form of each part is respectively given by

\[
J_d = \frac{1}{T_0} \int_0^{T_0} dt \frac{k_{in}(t)}{k_{out}(t)} - \frac{k_{out}(t)}{k_{in}(t)}, \quad \text{(8)}
\]

\[
J_{ad} = \frac{1}{T_0} \int_0^{T_0} dt \frac{\rho(t)}{k_{out}(t)}, \quad \text{(9)}
\]

\[
J_{nad} = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T_0} \int_0^{T_0} dt \frac{\rho(t)}{k_{out}(t)} \frac{d}{dt} \delta(t), \quad \text{(10)}
\]

where we put \( W_{12}(t) = k_{out}(t) = k_{in}(t) + k_{out}(t), W_{21}(t) = k_{in}(t) + k_{out}(t) + k_{out}(t), \) and \( \rho(t) = k_{in}(t) + k_{out}(t) \). Here, \( k_{out} \) represents the incoming rate and \( k_{out} \) the outgoing rate, and the superscript denotes the coupling to the left or right reservoir. We consider the case where each parameter is represented as a function of \( \omega t \) with the period \( T_0 = 2\pi / \omega \). The dynamical part is independent of \( \omega \) and is negligible for no-biased pumping. \( J_{ad} \) is represented by using the geometric term and is proportional to \( \omega \). Therefore, within the adiabatic approximation, the current is enhanced by increasing \( \omega \), though the expression is only valid in the limit \( \omega \to 0 \). This behavior is interfered by the presence of \( J_{nad} \). We stress that the above form of the current is exact. By knowing the explicit form of the nonadiabatic part, we can optimize the current as we discuss in the following. It is a straightforward task to find a similar expression of the current in general multilevel systems.

**Geometrical picture.** The nonadiabatic part, Eq. (10), has a similar form to the adiabatic part, Eq. (9), which leads to a geometrical interpretation. Suppose that we control the system by using two time-dependent periodic parameters \( k(t) = (k_1(t), k_2(t)) \). The adiabatic current \( J_{ad} \) arises only when the
orbit of \( \mathbf{k} \) encloses a finite area. The adiabatic current is represented by using the flux penetrating the surface. This geometrical picture is also applied to the nonadiabatic part. We extend the parameter space and introduce the third axis \( k_3 \). Although \( \delta_2 \) is a function of \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \), we leave it independent for the moment and use the relation after the calculation. In the extended space \( \tilde{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3) \), \( J_\tilde{g} \) is written as

\[
J_\tilde{g} = \oint_{\tilde{C}} \mathbf{A}(k) \cdot d\tilde{k},
\]

where \( \tilde{C} \) represents the closed contour in the \( \tilde{k} \)-space and \( \mathbf{A}(k) \) is the “gauge field”:

\[
\mathbf{A}(k) = \frac{\omega}{2\pi} \begin{pmatrix}
p^{(R)} & \partial_1 p^\text{out} \\
p^{(R)} & \partial_2 p^\text{out} \\
p^{(R)} & \partial_3 p^\text{out}
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

This vector function is independent of \( k_3 \). The adiabatic part is represented by the first and second components of \( \mathbf{A} \) and the nonadiabatic part is by the third component. We can introduce the corresponding “magnetic field”

\[
\mathbf{B}(k) = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}(k) = \frac{\omega}{2\pi} \begin{pmatrix}
\partial_2 p^\text{out} - \partial_3 p^\text{out} \\
\partial_1 p^\text{out} - \partial_3 p^\text{out} \\
\partial_1 p^\text{out} - \partial_2 p^\text{out}
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

In this representation, the third (first and second) component corresponds to the adiabatic (nonadiabatic) part. Using the Stokes theorem, we obtain the geometrical representation

\[
J_\tilde{g} = \oint_{\tilde{C}} d\tilde{S}(\tilde{k}) \cdot \mathbf{B}(k).
\]

The integral represents a surface integral where the surface \( \tilde{S} \) is defined by using the closed contour \( \tilde{C} \). This is pictorially represented as in Fig. 2. This surface is not unique and we can consider a convenient choice. This geometrical representation does not mean that the result is independent of the control speed. \( \mathbf{B} \) is written in terms of purely geometric variables \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \), but the third axis is determined by the dynamics.

**Nonadiabatic effects on geometric current.** A typical behavior of the current is shown in Fig. 2. We use a similar protocol as used in Ref. [9]. Since we use a no-biased protocol, the dynamical part is negligibly small. At small-\( \omega \), the contribution of the adiabatic part is dominant in which the current is proportional to \( \omega \) and we see a linear growing of the current. It is considerably disturbed by the nonadiabatic effects at large-\( \omega \). The total current approaches zero as \( 1/\omega \), as is evaluated by the Floquet–Magnus expansion [53, 54]. Thus, the nonadiabatic effect inhibits the linearity to \( \omega \) of the geometric current.

The behavior of the current is understood from the geometrical picture. Since the third component of the flux determines the adiabatic current, the geometric current coincides with the adiabatic current if the trajectory \( \tilde{C} \) is parallel to the \((k_1, k_2)\)-plane. In Fig. 2 we see that, as the frequency increases, the trajectory is distorted from a flat plane to cancel out the adiabatic part.

In Fig. 3 we plot the current when the trajectory \( \tilde{C} \) is slightly deformed while keeping the dynamical current invariant (See SM for details). We still observe nonadiabatic effects against the linear growing. To keep the adiabatic current, we need to design the protocol so that the plane is kept parallel to the \((k_1, k_2)\)-plane. Since we cannot choose the trajectory \( \tilde{C} \) arbitrary, it is a difficult problem in general.

**Assisted adiabatic pumping.** To obtain a desirable enhancement of the geometric current, we use the method of STA. We
introduce the counterdiabatic term to the original transition matrix so that the adiabatic state of the original matrix becomes the exact solution. Although the idea is implemented for the Schrödinger equation for isolated quantum systems, the generalization to other equations such as the master equation and the Fokker–Planck equation is a straightforward task. We can find several applications in previous studies [55–58].

In the master equation, the transition-rate matrix is diagonalized as \( W(t) = \sum_n \epsilon_n(t)|\phi_n(t)\rangle\langle\phi_n(t)| \) and the adiabatic state is defined by Eq. (2) with time-independent coefficients \( \{C_n\} \). We modify the transition-rate matrix \( W(t) \rightarrow W(t)+W_{\text{CD}}(t) \) so that the solution of the modified master equation is given by the adiabatic state. The counterdiabatic term \( W_{\text{CD}}(t) \) is given by

\[
W_{\text{CD}}(t) = \sum_{m,n,m\neq n} |\phi_m(t)\rangle\langle\phi_n(t)| \phi_n(t)\rangle\langle\phi_m(t)|. \tag{15}
\]

For the two-state case, \( W_{\text{CD}}(t) \) can be explicitly written as

\[
W_{\text{CD}}(t) = \frac{d\rho_{\text{out}}(t)}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{16}
\]

We see that the addition of the counterdiabatic term is obtained by replacements \( k_{\text{in}}(t) \rightarrow k_{\text{in}}(t) - \dot{\rho}_{\text{out}}(t) \) and \( k_{\text{out}}(t) \rightarrow k_{\text{out}}(t) + \dot{\rho}_{\text{out}}(t) \). Since these variables represent the transition rates, \( |\dot{\rho}_{\text{out}}(t)| \) cannot be large and the method fails for rapid changes of parameters.

The inclusion of the counterdiabatic term ensures that the exact solution of the master equation is given by the adiabatic state of the original transition-rate matrix. \( k_{\text{in}}(t) \) and \( k_{\text{out}}(t) \) are, respectively, represented by the sum of the left and right parts and we still have degrees of freedom to implement the counterdiabatic term. We can use them to keep the dynamical part of the current invariant and to set that the geometric part of the current is given by the adiabatic part of the original current before assist (See SM).

Although the above procedure works in principle, we do not have any intuitive reason why it works. In addition, the manipulation is restricted in realistic situations and we cannot control each component in the transition-rate matrix independently. In our choice in the above examples, we set that \( k_{\text{out}} \) is time independent. The introduction of the counterdiabatic term inevitably breaks this condition. To keep the time independence of \( k_{\text{out}} \), we can consider the scaling. After the introduction of the counterdiabatic term, we write the transition-rate matrix as

\[
W(t) + W_{\text{CD}}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \frac{\dot{\rho}_{\text{out}}(t)}{k_{\text{out}}} & -1 - \frac{\dot{\rho}_{\text{out}}(t)}{k_{\text{out}}} & k_{\text{in}}(t) & -k_{\text{out}} \\ 1 + \frac{\dot{\rho}_{\text{out}}(t)}{k_{\text{out}}} & 1 + \frac{\dot{\rho}_{\text{out}}(t)}{k_{\text{out}}} & k_{\text{in}}(t) & -k_{\text{out}} \\ -1 - \frac{\dot{\rho}_{\text{out}}(t)}{k_{\text{out}}} & 1 + \frac{\dot{\rho}_{\text{out}}(t)}{k_{\text{out}}} & k_{\text{in}}(t) & -k_{\text{out}} \\ -1 - \frac{\dot{\rho}_{\text{out}}(t)}{k_{\text{out}}} & 1 + \frac{\dot{\rho}_{\text{out}}(t)}{k_{\text{out}}} & k_{\text{in}}(t) & -k_{\text{out}} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{17}
\]

The prefactor of the right-hand side is positive and is scaled out by the redefinition of the time scale as \( dt' = dt(1 + \dot{\rho}_{\text{out}}(t)/k_{\text{out}}) \). We still have a degree of freedom to decompose the new component \( k_{\text{in}}(t) \) to the left and right parts and use it to keep the dynamical current invariant. In this case, the geometric current is not equal to the adiabatic current in the original system and is not proportional to the frequency. However, we confirm that the deviation is not so large and the geometric current can be kept growing as a function of the frequency. The result is shown in Fig. 4 (See SM for details). The obtained protocol indicates that we need to apply the assisted field earlier than the original to prevent the deviation. The required field becomes larger when we consider a faster driving and the assist fails at some frequency where \( |\dot{\rho}_{\text{out}}(t)| \) exceeds the threshold.

In Fig. 4 we also plot the current fluctuation that is deceas-
ing by the introduction of the assisted field. Generally, the counterdiabatic term leads to an increase of the energy cost characterized by the fluctuation and a broadening of the work distribution [59, 60]. This expectation i.e. the increment of the fluctuation for the geometric part under the assisted field is verified as can be seen in the bottom right panel of Fig. [4] Although we cannot control the dynamical part of the fluctuation as we did for the average, we find a decrease of the total fluctuation as a result of the decrease of the dynamical fluctuation.
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SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

MASTER EQUATION

Improved adiabatic approximation

We want to solve the master equation
\[ \frac{d}{dt}|p(t)\rangle = W(t)|p(t)\rangle. \] (S1)

We assume that the matrix is diagonalizable. Then, the instantaneous eigenstates of \( W(t) \) are prepared as
\[ W(t)|φ_n(t)\rangle = ε_n(t)|φ_n(t)\rangle, \] (S2)
\[ ⟨φ_n(t)|W(t)|φ_m(t)⟩ = ⟨φ_n(t)|ε_m(t)|φ_m(t)⟩. \] (S3)

We have the orthonormal relations and the resolution of unity:
\[ ⟨φ'_m(t)|φ_n(t)⟩ = δ_{mn}, \] (S4)
\[ \sum_n |φ_n(t)⟩⟨φ_n(t)| = 1. \] (S5)

The left and the right eigenstates are not a simple conjugate with each other. We also assume that \( n = 1 \) represents the stationary state and the other states represent decaying contributions, which means that the eigenvalues satisfy
\[ ε_1(t) = 0, \] (S6)
\[ ε_n(t) < 0 \quad (n \neq 1). \] (S7)

Although it is difficult to find a specific form of the eigenstates in general, \( ⟨φ_1(t)⟩ \) has a simple form as
\[ ⟨φ_1(t)⟩ = \begin{vmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \end{vmatrix} = |1⟩, \] (S8)
due to the property of the transition-rate matrix \( \sum_j W_{ij}(t) = 0 \).

The eigenstates have degrees of freedom as
\[ |φ_n(t)⟩ \rightarrow R_n(t)|φ_n(t)⟩, \] (S9)
\[ ⟨φ_n(t)| \rightarrow ⟨φ_n(t)|R_n^†(t), \] (S10)
where \( R_n(t) \) is an arbitrary function with \( R_n(0) = 1 \). To remove this arbitrariness, we introduce
\[ |φ'_n(t)⟩ = e^{-\int_{t_0}^{t} dr′ ε_n(r′)}|φ_n(t)⟩, \] (S11)
\[ ⟨φ'_n(t)| = ⟨φ_n(t)|e^{\int_{t_0}^{t} dr′ ε_n(r′)}⟩. \] (S12)

These eigenstates are invariant under the transformation of \( R_n(t) \). We note that the transformation does not change the properties in Eqs. (S4) and (S5). We also have for any \( n \)
\[ ⟨φ'_n(t)|φ'_m(t)⟩ = 0. \] (S13)

We expand the solution of the master equation with respect to \( |φ'_n(t)⟩ \) as
\[ |p(t)⟩ = \sum_n C_n(t)e^{\int_{t_0}^{t} dr′ ε_n(r′)}|φ'_n(t)⟩. \] (S14)

\( C_1(t) \) is determined from the normalization as
\[ C_1(t) = ⟨φ_1(t)|p(t)⟩ = ⟨1|p(t)⟩ = 1. \] (S15)

To solve the other components, we substitute the representation \( |φ'_n(t)⟩ \) to the master equation and multiply \( ⟨φ_n(t)⟩ \) from the left. We obtain
\[ \sum_{m(\neq 1)} C_m(t)e^{\int_{t_0}^{t} dr' ε_m(r')}⟨φ_1(t)|φ_m(t)⟩ = 0, \] (S16)
\[ \frac{dC_m(t)}{dt} = -\sum_{n(\neq 1)} C_m(t)e^{\int_{t_0}^{t} dr' ε_m(r')}⟨φ_n(t)|φ_m(t)⟩. \] (S17)

In the second equation, the contribution of \( m = 1 \) is separated from the sum.

As we mention in the main body of the paper, we neglect the third term in Eq. (S17). Then, we obtain
\[ C_n(t) = C_n(0) - \int_{t_0}^{t} dr' ⟨φ_n(t')|φ_1(t')⟩e^{-\int_{t_0}^{t} dr' ε_1(r')} \] (S18)

The solution of the master equation is approximated to
\[ |p(t)⟩ ≃ |φ_1(t)⟩ + \sum_{m(\neq 1)} ⟨φ_n(t)|φ_1(t')⟩e^{-\int_{t_0}^{t} dr' ε_1(r')} |φ_m(t')⟩, \] (S19)
where \( C_n(0) \) is a constant and
\[ δ_n(t) = -\int_{t_0}^{t} dr' ⟨φ_n(t')|φ_1(t')⟩e^{-\int_{t_0}^{t} dr' ε_1(r')} \] (S20)

Exact solution for two-state system

To obtain an explicit form of the state, we examine the two-state case. The transition-rate matrix is generally written as
\[ W(t) = \begin{bmatrix} -k_{in}(t) & k_{out}(t) \\ k_{in}(t) & -k_{out}(t) \end{bmatrix}, \] (S21)
where \( k_{in}(t) \) and \( k_{out}(t) \) are arbitrary nonnegative functions. The instantaneous eigenstates of \( W(t) \) are given by
\[ \{|φ'_n(t)⟩\}_{n=1,2} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{m(\neq 1)} δ_{m,n} + C_n e^{\int_{t_0}^{t} dr' ε_m(r')} \\\n\end{bmatrix}, \right\}, \] (S22)
\[ \{⟨φ'_n(t)|⟩\}_{n=1,2} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\\n\end{bmatrix}, \right\}, \] (S23)
where
\[ p_{out}(t) = \frac{k_{out}(t)}{k_{in}(t) + k_{out}(t)}. \] (S24)

The corresponding eigenvalues are \( \{ε_n(t)\}_{n=1,2} = \{0, -(k_{in}(t) + k_{out}(t))\} \). The component \( n = 1 \) represents the instantaneous stationary state. In this case, the geometric phase is zero in each level and we have \( |φ'_n(t)⟩ = |φ_n(t)⟩ \) and \( ⟨φ'_n(t)| = ⟨φ_n(t)| \).

Now we expand the solution as in Eq. (S14). Using the master equation, we obtain
\[ \frac{dC_1(t)}{dt} = 0, \] (S25)
\[ \frac{dC_2(t)}{dt} = -C_1(t)e^{\int_{t_0}^{t} dr' (ε_1(r') - ε_2(r'))} ⟨φ_2(t)|φ_1(t)⟩. \] (S26)
The first equation shows that $C_1$ is independent of $t$, and the second equation can be solved simply by integrating the equation. With the initial condition $|p(0)| = (p_0, 1 - p_0)^T$, we obtain the exact result:

$$|p(t)| = \begin{pmatrix} p_{\text{out}}(t) + \delta(t) \\ 1 - p_{\text{out}}(t) - \delta(t) \end{pmatrix} + (p_0 - p_{\text{out}}(0)) e^{- \int_0^t dt' (k_{\text{out}}(t') + k_{\text{out}}(t')) \left( 1 \atop -1 \right)}.$$

where

$$\delta(t) = - \int_0^t dt' p_{\text{out}}(t') e^{- \int_0^{t'} dt'' (k_{\text{in}}(t'') + k_{\text{out}}(t''))}.$$

$\delta(t)$ is equivalent to $\delta_n(t)$ in Eq. (S20) with $n = 2$. The dependence of the initial condition is only in the last term of Eq. (S27). This term decays exponentially as a function of $t$. Combining with the property of $\delta(t)$ discussed below, we can conclude that the system rapidly approaches a periodic behavior which is independent of the initial condition and the pumping current is independent of the second term of Eq. (S27).

More generally, the time evolution operator between two states, defined as $|p(t_2)\rangle = U(t_2, t_1)|p(t_1)\rangle$, is given by

$$U(t_2, t_1) = |\phi_1(t_2)\rangle \langle 1| + \delta(t_2) |2\rangle \langle 1| + e^{-\int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt (k_{\text{in}}(t) + k_{\text{out}}(t))} \langle 2| \langle \phi_2(t_1)\rangle - \delta(t_1) |2\rangle \langle 1|, \quad (S29)$$

where $|2\rangle = |\phi_2(t)\rangle$ is independent of $t$. In Sec. , we use this form to calculate the current fluctuations.

**ON THE BEHAVIOR OF $\delta(t)$**

The nonadiabatic effects are determined by $\delta_n(t)$ in Eq. (S20). Since the structure of the function is unchanged for any choice of $n$, we study the two-state case with $n = 2$. $\delta(t) = \delta_2(t)$ defined in Eq. (S28) satisfies the differential equation

$$\frac{d\delta(t)}{dr} = -(k_{\text{in}}(t) + k_{\text{out}}(t)) \left( \delta(t) + \frac{p_{\text{out}}(t)}{k_{\text{in}}(t) + k_{\text{out}}(t)} \right). \quad (S30)$$

We see that $\delta(t) = \delta^{(0)}(t)$ with $\delta^{(0)}(t) := -p_{\text{out}}(t)/(k_{\text{in}}(t) + k_{\text{out}}(t))$ represents the stationary point. This point is stable against the deviation. Therefore, if $p_{\text{out}}(t)$ changes very slowly, $\delta(t) \approx \delta^{(0)}(t)$ becomes a good approximation.

To improve the approximation, we consider the derivative expansion. Equation (S30) is rewritten as

$$\delta(t) = \delta^{(0)}(t) - \frac{1}{k_{\text{in}}(t) + k_{\text{out}}(t)} \frac{d}{dr} \delta^{(0)}(t). \quad (S31)$$

Solving the equation recursively, we obtain

$$\delta(t) = \delta^{(0)}(t) + \left( -\frac{1}{k_{\text{in}}(t) + k_{\text{out}}(t)} \frac{d}{dr} \right) \delta^{(0)}(t) + \cdots. \quad (S32)$$

When each parameter is written as a function of $\omega t$, this is a series expansion of $\omega$ for a fixed $\omega t$. The first term is the first order in $\omega$, the second term is the second order, and so on.

We plot $\delta(t)$ in Fig. 5. We consider the following periodic driving:

$$k_{\text{in}}^{(L)}(t) = k_0 \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2} \cos \omega t \right), \quad (S33)$$

$$k_{\text{in}}^{(R)}(t) = k_0 \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sin \omega t \right), \quad (S34)$$

$$k_{\text{out}}^{(L)}(t) = k_0, \quad (S35)$$

$$k_{\text{out}}^{(R)}(t) = k_0. \quad (S36)$$

$k_0$ represents a constant. As we see in the figure, $\delta(t)$ is almost periodic in $t$ for any choice of parameters. It can be approximated to the stationary value $\delta^{(0)}(t)$ at small-$\omega$. The deviation is described by the expansion in Eq. (S32).

In the opposite limit where $\omega$ is large, $\delta(t)$ is approximated to $-\frac{1}{2} (p_{\text{out}}(t) - p_{\text{out}}(0))$. This is obtained by neglecting $\delta(t)$ in the right hand side of Eq. (S30). The $1/\omega$-correction can be evaluated by using the Floquet–Magnus expansion.

**COUNTING FIELD AND CURRENT DISTRIBUTIONS**

**Counting field**

The current distribution function is calculated by introducing the counting field $\chi$ to the transition-rate matrix as $W(t) \rightarrow W(t; \chi)$. The explicit form is given by

$$W(t; \chi) = \begin{pmatrix} -k_{\text{in}}^{(L)} & k_{\text{out}}^{(L)} e^{i \chi} \\ k_{\text{in}}^{(L)} + k_{\text{in}}^{(R)} e^{-i \chi} & -k_{\text{out}}(t) \end{pmatrix}.$$

(S37)

Using the solution of the master equation $|p(t; \chi)\rangle$ with the modified matrix $W(t; \chi)$, we write

$$\langle 1| p(t; \chi) \rangle = \exp \left(i \chi n(t) - \frac{\chi^2}{2} n_2(t) + \cdots \right), \quad (S38)$$

and the average current and the fluctuation is given by

$$\langle J \rangle = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} n(T), \quad (S39)$$

$$\langle J^2 \rangle = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} n_2(T). \quad (S40)$$

We note that $J_2$ represents the second-order cumulant $\langle \hat{J}^2 \rangle - \langle J \rangle^2$. 
To calculate the current distributions, we expand the matrix $W(t; \chi)$ as

$$W(t; \chi) = W(t) + i \kappa V_1(t) - \frac{\chi^2}{2} V_2(t) + \cdots,$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{(S41)}

$$V_1(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \kappa^{(R)}_{\text{out}}(t) \\ -\kappa^{(R)}_{\text{in}}(t) & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{(S42)}

$$V_2(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \kappa^{(R)}_{\text{out}}(t) \\ \kappa^{(R)}_{\text{in}}(t) & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{(S43)}

### Current distributions

Using the derived formula, we find that the average current is given by

$$J = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T dt \langle \kappa^{(R)}_{\text{out}}(t) p_2(t) - \kappa^{(R)}_{\text{in}}(t) p_1(t) \rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{(S44)}

Using Eq. (S27), we have

$$J = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T dt \left[ \kappa^{(R)}_{\text{out}}(t)(1 - p_{\text{out}}(t)) - \kappa^{(R)}_{\text{in}}(t) p_{\text{out}}(t) \right]$$

\[ - \left( \kappa^{(R)}_{\text{out}}(t) + \kappa^{(R)}_{\text{in}}(t) \right) \delta(t). \]  \hspace{1cm} \text{(S45)}

Since the second term of Eq. (S27) incorporates an exponential factor, it does not contribute to the result. Then, we find that the current is independent on the initial condition. The dynamical part of the current is given by setting $\delta(t) = 0$. The decomposition of the geometric part into the adiabatic part and the nonadiabatic part can be found by using Eq. (S31). The explicit form of each part is given in the main body of the paper.

In a similar way, the fluctuation is obtained from

$$-\frac{1}{2} \left( n_2(t) + n_2'(t) \right) = -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^t dt' \langle 1|V_2(t') p(t') \rangle$$

\[ - \int_0^t dt_2 \int_0^{t_2} dt_1 \langle 1| V_1(t_2) U(t_2, t_1) V_1(t_1) | p(t_1) \rangle. \]  \hspace{1cm} \text{(S46)}

After some calculations, we obtain

$$J_2 = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T dt \left[ \kappa^{(R)}_{\text{out}}(t) p_{\text{in}}(t) + \kappa^{(R)}_{\text{in}}(t) p_{\text{out}}(t) \right]$$

\[ - \left( \kappa^{(R)}_{\text{out}}(t) - \kappa^{(R)}_{\text{in}}(t) \right) \delta(t) + 2 \left( \kappa^{(R)}_{\text{out}}(t) + \kappa^{(R)}_{\text{in}}(t) \right) \Delta(t). \]  \hspace{1cm} \text{(S47)}
where
\[ \Delta(t) = -\int_0^t \dot{r} \left[ k_{\text{out}}(r)(p_{\text{out}}(r') - \delta(r'))^2 + k_{\text{in}}(r')p_{\text{out}}(r') + \delta(r') \right] \, dr. \] (S48)

\[ (J_2)_d = \frac{1}{T_0} \int_0^{T_0} \frac{d}{dr} \left[ k_{\text{out}}^R(t)p_{\text{in}}(t) + k_{\text{in}}^R(t)p_{\text{out}}(t) - \frac{4}{T_0} \int_0^{T_0} \frac{d}{k(t)} \left[ k_{\text{out}}^R(t)\dot{p}_{\text{in}}^R(t) + \frac{k_{\text{in}}^R(t)p_{\text{out}}(t)}{k(t)} \right] \right]. \] (S49)

\[ (J_2)_d = \frac{1}{T_0} \int_0^{T_0} \frac{d}{dr} \left[ k_{\text{out}}^R(t) - k_{\text{in}}^R(t) \right] \frac{d}{dr} p_{\text{out}}(t) - \frac{4}{T_0} \int_0^{T_0} \frac{d}{k(t)} \left[ k_{\text{out}}^R(t)\dot{p}_{\text{in}}^R(t) + \frac{k_{\text{in}}^R(t)p_{\text{out}}(t)}{k(t)} \right]. \] (S50)

**DEFORMATION OF THE PROTOCOL TRAJECTORY**

The local dynamical current is given by
\[ J_d(t) = \frac{k_{\text{in}}^L(t)k_{\text{out}}^R(t) - k_{\text{in}}^L(t)k_{\text{out}}^R(t)}{k(t)}. \] (S51)

We can easily confirm that \( J_d(t) \) is invariant under the transformation
\[ k_{\text{in}}^L(t) \rightarrow k_{\text{in}}^L(t)/k(t), \]
\[ k_{\text{out}}^R(t) \rightarrow k_{\text{in}}^L(t)/k(t), \]
where \( k(t) \) is an arbitrary function.

To keep the average of \( k_{\text{in}}(t) \) over the period, the average of \( (k_{\text{in}}^L(t) + k_{\text{in}}^R(t))f(t) \) must be kept zero. The simplest choice is:
\[ f(t) = \frac{k_0}{2} x \cos \omega t + y \sin \omega t. \] (S54)

We show the protocols and the corresponding current in Fig. 3 of the main body of the paper. We set \((x, y) = (1.0, 0.0)\) for the protocol 1, \((x, y) = (0.0, 1.0)\) for 2, \((x, y) = (0.0, -1.0)\) for 3, and \((x, y) = (-1.0, 0.0)\) for 4. The dynamical current is zero in all the protocols.

**ASSISTED ADIABATIC PUMPING**

**Choice of transition rates**

We obtained in the main body of the paper that the assisted adiabatic driving is achieved by using the replacement
\[ k_{\text{in}}(t) \rightarrow k_{\text{in}}(t) - \dot{p}_{\text{out}}(t), \] (S55)
\[ k_{\text{out}}(t) \rightarrow k_{\text{out}}(t) + \dot{p}_{\text{out}}(t), \] (S56)

where the dot denotes the time derivative. This does not determine the decomposition of the left and right parts of the \( \Delta(t) \) satisfies a first-order differential equation which has a similar form to that for \( \delta(t) \) and its behavior can also be understood in a similar way.

The decomposition of \( J_2 \) into dynamical, adiabatic, and nonadiabatic parts is a straightforward task and we find

\[ \text{transition rates uniquely. We show in the following that we can find the ideal driving by} \]
\[ k_{\text{in}}^L \rightarrow k_{\text{in}}^L - \frac{k_{\text{out}}^R}{k}, \]
\[ k_{\text{out}}^R \rightarrow k_{\text{in}}^L + k_{\text{out}}^R, \]
\[ k_{\text{in}}^R \rightarrow k_{\text{in}}^L + k_{\text{out}}^R, \]
\[ \dot{p}_{\text{out}}(t) \rightarrow \dot{p}_{\text{out}}(t) + \frac{\dot{p}_{\text{out}}(t)}{k(t)}. \] (S62)

We also see from the integral form in Eq. (S28) that \( \delta(t) \) is changed as
\[ \delta(t) \rightarrow \delta(t) - \int_0^t \dot{r} \frac{d}{dr} \left[ \frac{p_{\text{out}}(r')}{k(r')} \right] e^{-\int_0^r \dot{r} \, dr'} \, dr', \] (S63)

where we use the partial integration. The last term is a decaying function and does not contribute to the current. Then, we find
\[ J_g \rightarrow J_g \frac{d}{k(t)} \frac{\dot{p}_{\text{out}}(t)}{k(t)}, \] (S64)

which shows that the geometric current in the assisted system including nonadiabatic effects is equal to the adiabatic current in the original system.
Scaling

Suppose that we have a time-independent $k_{\text{out}}$ and want to keep that value after introducing the counterdiabatic term. We use the time scaling

$$\tilde{t}(t) = \int_0^t dt' \left( 1 + \frac{\dot{p}_{\text{out}}(t')}{k_{\text{out}}} \right),$$

(S65)

and have the master equation

$$\frac{d}{d\tilde{t}} |\tilde{\rho}(\tilde{t})\rangle = \tilde{W}(\tilde{t}) |\tilde{\rho}(\tilde{t})\rangle,$$

(S66)

where

$$\tilde{W}(\tilde{t}) = \begin{pmatrix} -\tilde{k}_{\text{in}}(\tilde{t}) & k_{\text{out}} \\ \tilde{k}_{\text{in}}(\tilde{t}) & -k_{\text{out}} \end{pmatrix},$$

(S67)

and

$$\tilde{k}_{\text{in}}(\tilde{t}) = \frac{1 - \frac{\dot{p}_{\text{out}}(\tilde{t})}{k_{\text{out}}}}{1 + \frac{\dot{p}_{\text{out}}(\tilde{t})}{k_{\text{out}}}} k_{\text{in}}(t).$$

(S68)

Since $\tilde{t}$ is different from $t$, the state at the new time scale $\tilde{t}$, $|\tilde{\rho}(\tilde{t})\rangle$, is the adiabatic state at the original scale $t$. We note that there is one-to-one correspondence between $t$ and $\tilde{t}$. To keep the dynamical current invariant, we can use the decomposition $\tilde{k}_{\text{in}}(t) = \tilde{k}_{\text{in}}^{(L)}(t) + \tilde{k}_{\text{in}}^{(R)}(t)$ where

$$\tilde{k}_{\text{in}}^{(L)} = \frac{k_{\text{in}} - \dot{p}_{\text{out}} k_{\text{out}}^{(L)}}{k_{\text{out}} + \dot{p}_{\text{out}}} + \frac{k_{\text{out}}^{(L)} k_{\text{out}}^{(R)} - k_{\text{out}}^{(L)} k_{\text{out}}^{(R)}}{(k_{\text{out}} + \dot{p}_{\text{out}})^2} k_{\text{out}},$$

(S69)

$$\tilde{k}_{\text{in}}^{(R)} = \frac{k_{\text{in}} - \dot{p}_{\text{out}} k_{\text{out}}^{(R)}}{k_{\text{out}} + \dot{p}_{\text{out}}} + \frac{k_{\text{out}}^{(L)} k_{\text{out}}^{(R)} - k_{\text{out}}^{(L)} k_{\text{out}}^{(R)}}{(k_{\text{out}} + \dot{p}_{\text{out}})^2} k_{\text{out}}.$$  

(S70)

The obtained protocol is shown in Fig. 6 for a slow driving and 7 for a fast driving. The obtained current is shown in Fig. 4 in the main body of the paper.

---

**FIG. 6.** Protocols before/after the assist for $\omega = 1.0$. Top: Trajectories in parameter space. Dashed lines represent trajectories of the original protocol and solid lines of protocol with assist. Bottom: Time dependence of the protocols. Bold blue lines represent the left amplitude $k_{\text{in}}^{(L)}$ and thin red lines the right amplitude $k_{\text{in}}^{(R)}$. Dashed lines represent protocols before assist and solid lines with assist.
FIG. 7. Protocols before/after the assist for $\omega = 10.0$. 