Quantum thermal transistor in superconducting circuits
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Logical devices based on electrical currents are ubiquitous in modern society. However, digital logic does have some drawbacks such as a relatively high power consumption. It is therefore of great interest to seek alternative means to build logical circuits that can either work as stand-alone devices or in conjunction with more traditional electronic circuits. One direction that holds great promise is the use of heat currents for logical components. In the present paper, we discuss a recent abstract proposal for a quantum thermal transistor and provide a concrete design of such a device using superconducting circuits. Using a circuit quantum electrodynamics Jaynes-Cummings model, we propose a three-terminal device that allows heat transfer from source to drain, depending on the temperature of a bath coupled at the gate modulator, and show that it provides similar properties to a conventional semiconductor transistor.

I. INTRODUCTION

An inevitable requirement for logical computational devices is the ability to control signals. The most well-known case is that of classical electronic integrated circuits that are based on (semiconductor) transistors, a component capable of transmitting or blocking the flow of current based on whether a gate voltage is in the on- or off-state. While electronics has great advantages, other means of signal transport are under study to extend the versatility and applications of future technologies. A promising path for developing alternative logical devices is to use controlled heat currents (phonon transport) to develop thermal components [1–4]. Some prominent results of this pursuit are thermal diodes [5–10], thermal transistors [11, 12], and related designs [13–17]. In particular, quantum spin systems coupled to thermal baths have shown promise for the realization of these components [18–21].

A way to realize two-level (spin) systems is to use so-called artificial atoms based on superconducting circuits [22–25]. In the present work, we present a quantum thermal transistor design that is based on superconducting circuits. Our proposal is inspired by the recent work of Guo, Liu, and Yu [12] in which an abstract model of such a transistor is proposed and discussed. A key ingredient in the model of [12] is the presence of both two- and three-level systems coupled to heat baths. Since superconducting circuits realize non-linear oscillators with several levels, it is possible to realize couplings between qubits and qutrits in such systems [26–29]. Here we propose a concrete realization of a superconducting circuit that can perform the tasks of a thermal transistor. This requires modifications to the original abstract proposal of [12] that we will discuss below. The transistor is realized as a thermal transistor where the exchanged signal between the two transistor terminals will be in the form of heat. Specifically, the heat will be exchanged between two thermal baths, a source and a drain, through a three-level system (qutrit) and modulated by a third terminal. The third terminal is implemented as a qubit whose population is dictated by a thermal bath. By controlling the temperature of the modulating bath, one may effectively switch on and off the heat current between the source and drain terminals. The effect of amplification of the heat signal is also investigated. Specifically, the degree to which heat signals may be amplified through the transistor turns out to critically depend on the anharmonicity of the superconducting artificial atoms. Thus, with current state-of-the-art transmons as used in this article, the relatively low anharmonicities weaken the degree of amplification, as will be demonstrated. The analysis of the thermal transistor will be as follows. The first step is to understand the dynamics of the coupled qubit/qutrit superconducting circuit (dubbed main circuit). This will be done using elementary circuit analysis. From this point, we will investigate the coupling between the main circuit and the three thermal baths described perturbatively using the theory of open quantum systems within the Lindblad formalism. This allows for the calculations of the heat currents between the source and drain terminals using quantum thermodynamics. Throughout the article, we will use natural units such that $\hbar = c = k = 1$, where $\hbar$ is Planck’s constant, $c$ is the speed of light in vacuum and $k$ is Boltzmann’s constant, respectively.

II. MAIN CIRCUIT HAMILTONIAN

The key mechanism of the transistor is the qubit/qutrit coupling which may be conceptually understood as follows. The source reservoir is tuned in resonance with the first excitation level of the qutrit. With the drain reservoir being in resonance with the second excitation level of the qutrit, heat only flows if the qutrit is fully excited. By coupling the qutrit to a qubit, the qubit may be
tuned into resonance with the second level of the qutrit. By controlling the qubit population through the temperature of the modulator bath, one may control the second excitation population of the qutrit and hence the flow of heat signals between the source and drain terminals. In the following, we demonstrate how such an interaction may be engineered in a superconducting circuit architecture.

The thermal transistor circuit may be divided into two subcircuits, the main circuit and the thermal baths, see figure 1. In the following, we will analyze the main circuit dynamics and demonstrate its equivalence to the desired dynamics of the abstract thermal transistor Hamiltonian, as presented in [12]. The main circuit will be composed of two anharmonic circuits [30] connected through a resonator, through which they may interact through photonic exchange [24]. The anharmonic circuits are represented as a combination of capacitors and Josephson junctions with the resonator represented as an LC circuit in its lumped element representation. By tuning the capacitive and Josephson energies appropriately, we may enter the so-called transmon regime [30]. Hence, these circuits will in the following be referred to as transmons. Following the conventional procedure of quantum electromagnetic circuit analysis [31], we define the generalized flux coordinate \( \phi(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{t} V(t') dt' [32] \) as a generalized parameter governing the dynamics of the circuit, with \( V(t) \) denoting the potential across the circuit element in question. One may find that \( \phi_1 , \phi_2 \) and \( \phi_3 \) sufficiently describe the main circuit dynamics as illustrated in figure 1. Each flux describes the degree of freedom for the lower transmon, the resonator and the upper transmon, respectively. Using the detailed circuit analysis presented in appendix A, we obtain a quantized, step operator Hamiltonian of the main circuit,

\[
H = \alpha_1 \left( a_1^\dagger a_1 + \frac{1}{2} \right) - \beta_1 \left( a_1 + a_1^\dagger \right)^4 + \alpha_3 \left( a_3^\dagger a_3 + \frac{1}{2} \right) - \beta_3 \left( a_3 + a_3^\dagger \right)^4 + \omega_r \left( b_r^\dagger b_r + \frac{1}{2} \right) - g_1 \left( a_1^\dagger b_r + a_1 b_r - a_1^\dagger b_r - a_1 b_r \right) - g_3 \left( a_3^\dagger b_r + a_3 b_r - a_3^\dagger b_r - a_3 b_r \right),
\]

with \( \alpha_1 = \sqrt{8E_{C1}E_{J1}} , \beta_1 = \frac{E_{J1}}{E_{C1}} , \alpha_3 = \sqrt{8E_{C3}E_{J3}} , \beta_3 = \frac{E_{J3}}{E_{C3}} , \omega_r = 4\sqrt{E_{C2}E_{L2}} , g_1 = C_{12}^{-1} \left( \frac{gE_{J1}E_{L2}}{E_{C1}E_{C2}} \right)^{1/4} \) and \( g_3 = C_{23}^{-1} \left( \frac{gE_{J3}E_{L3}}{E_{C2}E_{C3}} \right)^{1/4} \) with circuit parameters described in figure 1. Operators \( a_i , i \in \{1, 3\} \) parametrize the lower and upper transmons, respectively, and \( b_r \) parametrizes the resonator.

### A. Truncation of the Hamiltonian

The Hamiltonian in equation (1) describes a system of three coupled oscillators: two anharmonic oscillators with a fourth-order perturbation and a harmonic oscillator (resonator). Thus, the dimension of the Hilbert space governing this Hamiltonian is infinite. In order to obtain the desired dynamics, we must truncate the system to the desired degrees of freedom. Specifically, the lower transmon will act as a qubit (two-level system) and the upper transmon as a qutrit (three-level system). By truncating equation (1) to these levels, we obtain the Jaynes-Cummings (JC) Hamiltonian. We now turn our attention to the spectrum of the oscillators. Define \( \omega_1 \) as the qubit excitation energy, \( \omega_2 \) as the first excitation energy of the qutrit and \( \omega_3 \) the second excitation energy. Since the second excitation level of the qutrit must be dictated by the population of the modulating qubit, we require these two energies to be resonant. For the constraint in question to be fulfilled, we require the resonant condition \( \omega_1 + \omega_2 = \omega_3 \).

In the truncation procedure, we first consider the qubit terms of equation (1). Since the qubit exhibits two degrees of freedom, it may be represented by a two-dimensional Hilbert space. By using a qubit eigenvector representation \( |0\rangle_T^T = [1, 0] \) and \( |1\rangle_T^T = [0, 1] \), we calcu-
late matrix representations of \( a_1^\dagger a_1 \), and the anharmonic operator, \((a_1 + a_1^\dagger)^4\). The qubit energy becomes

\[
\omega_1 = \alpha_1 - 12\beta_1. \tag{2}
\]

Analogously, the qutrit exhibits three degrees of freedom and may be parametrized by three orthonormal states denoted \( |0\rangle_T^2 = |1, 0, 0\rangle, |1\rangle_T^2 = |0, 1, 0\rangle \) and \( |2\rangle_T^2 = |0, 0, 1\rangle \). The qutrit matrix representations are presented explicitly in appendix C due to their more complicated nature compared to the two-level qubit. With a ground state energy of zero, the qutrit energies are

\[
\begin{align*}
\omega_2 &= 6\beta_3 + \sqrt{(\alpha_3 - 18\beta_3)^2 + 72\beta_3^2} \quad \text{(First excited state)} \\
\omega_3 &= 2\sqrt{(\alpha_3 - 18\beta_3)^2 + 72\beta_3^2} \quad \text{(Second excited state)}.
\end{align*}
\tag{3}
\]

These energy level definitions are depicted in figure 2. Note that equation (1) still contains counter-rotating terms. In the rotating wave approximation (RWA), these terms approximately vanish. The total Hamiltonian now reads, in the RWA,

\[
\begin{align*}
H &= \omega_1 |1\rangle_1 \langle 1|_1 \otimes 1 + \sum_{i=2}^3 \omega_i (1 \otimes |i - 1\rangle_2 \langle i - 1|_2) \\
&\quad + \omega_r b_r^\dagger b_r + g_1 (a_1^\dagger b_r + h.c.) + g_3 (a_3^\dagger b_r + h.c.). \\
&\quad + g_1 (a_1^\dagger b_r + h.c.) + g_3 (a_3^\dagger b_r + h.c.). \\
&\quad + g_1 (a_1^\dagger b_r + h.c.) + g_3 (a_3^\dagger b_r + h.c.). \\
&\quad + g_1 (a_1^\dagger b_r + h.c.) + g_3 (a_3^\dagger b_r + h.c.).
\end{align*}
\tag{4}
\]

The truncated Hilbert space is a tensor product between the qubit and qutrit spaces, i.e. \( \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{qubit}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{qutrit}} \), yielding a total dimension of six. The eigenstates are likewise tensor product states such that \(|ij\rangle = |i\rangle_1 \otimes |j\rangle_2 \) denotes the combined state of the qubit/qutrit system[33]. From now on, the identity operators in equation (4) are omitted for simplicity. Finally, we write the interaction term step operators in the representation of the transmon eigenkets. By expanding the interaction term in the transmon eigenkets representation, we obtain

\[
H_{\text{int}} = \sum_{ik} g_{i,i+1}^{(k)} (b_r |i + 1\rangle_k \langle i|_k + b_r^\dagger |i\rangle_k \langle i + 1|_k) \tag{5}
\]

where \( g_{i,i+1}^{(k)} = g_k \sqrt{1 + T} \) represents the coupling constant between nearest neighbour transitions for \( k = 1, i = 0 \) (qubit) and \( k = 3, i \in \{0, 1\} \) (qutrit). By truncation to the relevant energy levels of the qubit/qutrit, the following Hamiltonian is obtained

\[
\begin{align*}
H &= \omega_1 |1\rangle_1 \langle 1|_1 \langle 1|_1 \langle 1|_1 + \sum_{i=2}^3 \omega_i |i - 1\rangle_2 \langle i - 1|_2 + \omega_r b_r^\dagger b_r \\
&\quad + g_{00}^{(1)} (b_r |1\rangle_1 \langle 0|_1 + h.c.) \\
&\quad + g_{00}^{(2)} (b_r |1\rangle_2 \langle 0|_2 + h.c.) \\
&\quad + g_{12}^{(2)} (b_r |2\rangle_2 \langle 1|_2 + h.c.).
\end{align*}
\tag{6}
\]

The dynamics of this Jaynes-Cummings Hamiltonian is as follows. The two transmons may exchange energy in terms of photons through a dipole interaction mediated by the resonator. This effectively realizes a coherent transfer of photons between the two transmons [34].

### B. Dispersive Jaynes-Cummings Hamiltonian

In order to obtain a direct state-swapping interaction, one may utilize the dispersive Jaynes-Cummings regime in which the transmon frequencies are sufficiently detuned from the resonator such that \( \Delta_i \equiv \omega_i - \omega_r \) is the transmon-resonator detuning and \( g \) is the corresponding nearest neighbour coupling constant. In this regime, the resonator frequency will be shifted according to the state of the transmons through a Lamb and AC Stark shift, analogously to what one would expect from quantum optics, and the interaction becomes a virtual exchange of photons through the resonator[35]. As a result, resonator-induced loss of photons is avoided since the interaction is virtual.

The dispersive Hamiltonian is obtained by unitarily transforming the resonant Hamiltonian and expanding to second order using the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff expansion such that [36]

\[
\begin{align*}
H_{\text{dispersive}} &= \omega_1 |1\rangle_1 \langle 1|_1 + \omega_2 |1\rangle_2 \langle 1|_2 + \omega_3 |2\rangle_2 \langle 2|_2 + \omega_r b_r^\dagger b_r \\
&\quad + \frac{g_{00}^{(1)} g_{00}^{(2)} (\Delta_0 + \Delta_1)}{2\Delta_0 \Delta_1} (|01\rangle \langle 10| + h.c.) \\
&\quad + \frac{g_{10}^{(1)} g_{12}^{(2)} (\Delta_0 + \Delta_2)}{2\Delta_0 \Delta_2} (|11\rangle \langle 02| + h.c.).
\end{align*}
\tag{7}
\]

The interaction term does no longer directly contain resonator degrees of freedom and hence the interaction serves to directly state-swap the transmons. The shifted resonator frequency, \( \omega_r' \), is not discussed further since the resonator only acts as a mediator for the interaction. We therefore omit this term from now on. Clearly, the coupling is strongly dependent on the relative detuning between the two transmons, being largest when the transmons are in resonance, i.e. \( \Delta_i = \Delta_j \). With
\( \omega_1 + \omega_2 = \omega_3 \), the first interaction \(|01\rangle \rightarrow |10\rangle\) will be suppressed by conservation of energy. The final Hamiltonian of the main circuit (MC) in the dispersive regime reads

\[
H_{MC} = \omega_1 |1\rangle\langle1| + \omega_2 |1\rangle\langle2| + \omega_3 |2\rangle\langle2| + g \left( |11\rangle\langle02| + h.c. \right)
\]

(8)

with \( g = \frac{\omega_0}{\Delta} \) where \( \Delta = \omega_1 - \omega_r \).

We now review the validity of the approximated solutions. One must take into account that the transmon-resonator detuning cannot exceed a value which disallows the rotating wave approximation of equation (4), but must also be large enough to justify the expansion of the Hamiltonian to second order in equation (7). In principle, we may get a more concrete handle on potential experimental parameters by further analysis of the concrete layout of the circuit design, and hence testing for which regimes our approximations will hold. However, noting that such an interaction has been experimentally realized [37], we leave this for future studies. Note that the interaction term in the Hamiltonian allows the qubit to excite the upper level of the qutrit, provided the qutrit is excited to its first level. Thus, we may control the population of the second excited state of the qutrit by modulating the qubit population. This modulation will be realized by adjusting a thermal bath temperature. Thus, the dynamics of equation (8) are equivalent to the desired dynamics presented in the abstract thermal transistor model[12]. Now that we understand the dynamics of the main circuit, we will discuss the thermal baths.

III. COUPLING OF THE MAIN CIRCUIT TO THE THERMAL BATHS

The coupling of the main circuit to the thermal baths will be described perturbatively within the theory of open quantum systems with the nature of the interaction modelled as electromagnetic noise from the baths. We may therefore naturally decompose the total Hamiltonian into three terms, such that

\[
H = H_{MC} + H_B + H_{MCB}
\]

(9)

with \( H_{MC} \) given by equation (8) (main circuit Hamiltonian), \( H_B \) being the thermal bath Hamiltonians and \( H_{MCB} \) being the interaction term between the main circuit and the thermal baths. Define the total density operator of the open quantum system as

\[
\rho_{\text{total}} \equiv \rho_{MC} \otimes \rho_B
\]

(10)

where \( \rho_{MC} \) is the main circuit density operator and \( \rho_B \) is the bath density operator. Since we are only interested in the dynamics of the main circuit under the influence of the baths, we trace out the bath dynamics. Let therefore \( \rho = \text{tr}_B(\rho_{\text{total}}) \) denote the traced density operator of the main circuit. The time evolution of the traced density operator is then given by the Lindblad equation in diagonal form

\[
\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{i}[H_{MC}, \rho] + \sum_i \gamma_i \left( L_i \rho L_i^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \left( L_i^\dagger L_i, \rho \right) \right)
\]

(11)

The Born-Markov approximation is justified since, as will be discussed later, the interaction is designed to be weak and the baths may be designed such that they are much larger than the main circuit itself. In the derivation of the Lindblad master equation, one applies the secular approximation in which fast-oscillating terms are neglected, much like the RWA. The secular approximation is justified since the wavelengths of the noise generated by the thermal baths will be band-passed around the resonant frequencies of the main circuit, to be elaborated later. To understand the coupling to the thermal baths, we now consider a conceptual model of the thermal baths in order to motivate the actual form of the Lindblad equation, specifically the collapse operators, for the thermal transistor.

A. Resistor model of the thermal baths

Each thermal bath will be modelled as an LC circuit coupled to a noisy resistor. A formal treatment of such a model is presented in reference [39]. The noisy resistor is modelled as a noiseless resistor coupled to a fluctuating voltage source as illustrated in figure 1. The system will generate a continuous spectrum of electromagnetic noise due to the thermal agitation of Cooper pairs, whose origin is described by the fluctuation-dissipation theorem of statistical mechanics. The theorem formally states that any dissipative process has a related reverse thermal fluctuation in detailed balance, i.e. an equilibrium in which any elementary process in the system is countered by its reverse process. For the thermal bath, the resistor serves to dissipate the electrical energy of the Cooper pairs by Joule heating. By the fluctuation-dissipation theorem, the Cooper pairs will counter this process by thermal fluctuations, converting the Joule heating energy into electrical energy [40]. This type of electronic noise is known as Johnson-Nyquist noise and is described by a Hamiltonian of bosonic modes,

\[
H_B = \sum_k \omega_k \left( b_k^\dagger b_k + \frac{1}{2} \right)
\]

(12)

The population of these modes are dictated by temperature. Despite the fact that the fluctuating voltage generates a wide spectrum of noise, the range of transmitted noise is restricted due to the impedance of the RLC circuit. For the noise to interact with the main circuit, it must pass the LC circuit. Denoting the resonant frequency of the LC circuit \( \Omega \), only noise signals whose frequencies are in the vicinity of \( \Omega \) will be transmitted.
through the LC circuit and participate in the main circuit interaction. This leads to the interpretation of the LC circuit being a band-pass filter, allowing only frequencies of noise around its resonant frequency. This is illustrated in the following. From the formal treatment of the resistor model in reference [39], one may derive the spectral density of the thermal bath circuit. The spectrum of the content of energy in a given noise signal as function of energy reads

\[ S(\omega) = \frac{1}{1 + Q^2 \left( \frac{\omega}{Q} - \Omega \right)^2} \frac{2R\omega}{1 - e^{-\omega/T}}, \tag{13} \]

where \( T \) is the temperature of the bath, \( Q \) is the LC circuit quality factor and \( R \) is the resistance of the circuit resistor, a parameter fitted in experiments and effectively serves to scale the spectral densities [41]. The front factor appears from the RLC circuit impedance and restricts the noise frequencies around \( \Omega \) with its Lorentzian shape, depending on the Q-factor. This allows for suppressing unwanted transitions in the coupling with the main circuit. This is illustrated in figure 3, with the spectral density peaking around \( \Omega \). A simulation temperature \( T/\Omega = 1 \) is chosen. The higher the quality factor of the circuit, the sharper the peak will be. A further interpretation of the spectral density is the following. For negative frequencies, i.e. \( S(-\omega) \), the system emits a photon with frequency \( \omega \) and conversely, for \( S(\omega) \), the system is excited with a photon of the corresponding frequency [39]. This interpretation will play a role in the Lindblad equation, to be discussed below. This model is conceptually depicted in figure 4, where the resistor acts as a generator of white noise with a constant spectrum of photon wavelengths. As is depicted, the noise from the generator (resistor) will be restricted to a given resonant frequency by the harmonic oscillator (LC circuit). The quality of the bandpass filter is dictated by the quality factor of the LC circuit.
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**FIG. 3.** Spectral density of the thermal bath for a range of quality factors. The spectral density is given in units of the circuit quality factor and \( R \) is the resistance of the circuit resistor, a parameter fitted in experiments and effectively serves to scale the spectral densities [41]. The front factor appears from the RLC circuit impedance and restricts the noise frequencies around \( \Omega \) with its Lorentzian shape, depending on the Q-factor. This allows for suppressing unwanted transitions in the coupling with the main circuit. This is illustrated in the following, with the spectral density peaking around \( \Omega \).
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**FIG. 4.** Conceptual model of the thermal baths. The Johnson-Nyquist noise is generated by a noisy resistor, generating a broad spectrum of photonic wavelengths. Depending on the LC circuit quality factor, \( Q \), the noise spectrum will be enveloped by a Lorentzian profile around the LC circuit resonance frequency, \( \Omega \).

### B. Lindblad equation of the thermal transistor

In the following, we will introduce the main circuit-bath interaction terms phenomenologically. We assume that the system-bath coupling constant will be adequately small such that the main circuit eigenstates remain unperturbed, justifying the use of the Born approximation. Additionally, this ensures the avoidance of correlations between the main circuit and the baths. We denote the capacitive coupling strength between the baths and the main circuit \( \alpha \), and assume that it is equally strong for all baths.

By tuning the bath band-pass filters, governed by equation (13), we restrict the interactions such that the source serves to excite/de-excite the lower state in the qutrit, the modulator to excite/de-excite the qubit and the drain to excite/de-excite the upper state in the qutrit to its ground state, see figure 2. Thus, the resonant frequencies of the thermal baths will be, respectively, \( \Omega_S = \omega_2 \), \( \Omega_M = \omega_1 \) and \( \Omega_D = \omega_3 \). This is illustrated in the interaction term,

\[
H_{MCB} = \sum_k \alpha \left( b_{Sk}^\dagger |0\rangle_2 \langle 1|_2 + h.c. \right) + \sum_k \alpha \left( b_{Mk}^\dagger |0\rangle_1 \langle 1|_1 + h.c. \right) + \sum_k \alpha \left( b_{Dk}^\dagger |0\rangle_2 \langle 2|_2 + h.c. \right) \tag{14}
\]

where \( k \) is the bath summation index. \( b_{\mu k}, b_{\mu k}^\dagger \) represent the bath creation/annihilation operators with \( \mu \in \{ S,M,D \} \), letting \( S, M \) and \( D \) (source, modulator and drain) refer to each thermal bath, according to figure 1. Note that in the weak coupling limit, \( \alpha \ll g \). Since \( T_S > T_D \), with \( T_D \) being the drain temperature and \( T_S \) being the source temperature, we expect the heat to only flow in the direction from the source to the drain. It
is crucial that the upper level of the qutrit is only excited due to the interaction with the qubit, i.e. through the interaction in equation (8), since otherwise unwanted heat currents would pass. Hence, interactions such as $\sum_k \alpha \left(b_{Dk}^\dagger \left|0\right>_2 \left(1\right)_2 + h.c.\right)$ and $\sum_k \alpha \left(b_{Sk}^\dagger \left|0\right>_2 \left(2\right)_2 + h.c.\right)$ must be suppressed. Following the procedure of the abstract transistor model [12], the interaction term may be written in a more compact form using a decomposition into eigenoperators of the main circuit Hamiltonian. These eigenoperators will act much like a step operator in a harmonic oscillator, but in this case they will serve to transition energy eigenstates of the main circuit Hamiltonian. Let $H_{MC} = \sum_i^6 E_i \left|E_i\right\rangle \left\langle E_i\right|$ denote the diagonal main circuit Hamiltonian with energies $E = \{\omega_1 + \omega_3, \omega_3 - g, \omega_1, \omega_3 + g, \omega_2, 0\}$ and eigenstates $\left|E_i\right\rangle$. This allows us to use a more convenient basis rather than $\{(00), (01), (02), (10), (11), (12)\}$. There exists nine eigenoperators for the main circuit which encapsulate the interactions of equation (14), three for each bath. Define the eigenoperators as

$$A_{\mu l}(\omega) = \sum_{E_i - E_j = \omega_{\mu l}} \Pi(E_j) D_{\mu l} \Pi(E_i)$$

(15)

for a fixed $\omega_{\mu l}$, with $l \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ denoting the three eigenoperators for each bath, $\mu$. $\Pi(E_i)$ denotes a projection operator onto the eigenspace belonging to eigenvalue $E_i$. $D_{\mu}$ denotes main circuit operators in the interaction terms of equation 14 and $\mu$ denotes the bath responsible for the transition. All eigenoperators are given in appendix D. In the diagonal representation, the interaction term reads

$$H_{MC} = \sum_{\mu,l,k} \alpha \left(b_{\mu l}^\dagger A_{\mu l}(\omega_{\mu l}) + h.c.\right), \quad \mu \in \{S, M, D\}, \quad l \in \{1, 2, 3\}.$$  

(16)

It would be reasonable to use the eigenoperators of $H_{MC}$ as collapse operators in the Lindblad formalism due to their operation on energy eigenkets. We must therefore calculate the corresponding transition frequency for each collapse operator. This frequency will be the sum of all transition frequencies for all the transitions the collapse operator may be responsible for. Each transition rate between two states, $\left|E_i\right\rangle$ and $\left|E_j\right\rangle$, will be calculated using Fermi’s golden rule, given by

$$\Gamma_{ij} = 2\pi \left|\left\langle E_j | \alpha A_{\mu l}(\omega_{\mu l}) | E_i\right\rangle\right|^2 S(\omega_{\mu l})$$

(17)

where $A_{\mu l}(\omega_{\mu l})$ is the collapse operator responsible for the transition between the two energy eigenkets and the spectral density plays the role of the density of states. This is very reasonable, since the spectral density describes the distribution of noise from the thermal baths. All transition rates are given in appendix D. From equation (11), using the collapse operators of appendix D, the Lindblad equation reads

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = \frac{i}{\hbar}[H_{MC}, \rho] + \sum_{\mu l} \left[\Gamma_{\mu l}(\omega_{\mu l}) \left[2A_{\mu l}(\omega_{\mu l}) \rho A_{\mu l}^\dagger(\omega_{\mu l}) - \{A_{\mu l}(\omega_{\mu l}) A_{\mu l}^\dagger(\omega_{\mu l}), \rho\}\right] + \Gamma_{\mu l}(-\omega_{\mu l}) \left[2A_{\mu l}^\dagger(\omega_{\mu l}) \rho A_{\mu l}(\omega_{\mu l}) - \{A_{\mu l}(\omega_{\mu l}) A_{\mu l}^\dagger(\omega_{\mu l}), \rho\}\right]\right].$$

(18)

Since the spectral densities depend on temperature, it is possible to control the dynamics of the main circuit through temperature modulation of the thermal baths. Equipped with the Lindblad equation, we now move on to calculate the heat currents exchanged between the baths and the main circuit.

\section*{IV. HEAT CURRENTS AND TRANSISTOR MECHANISMS}

Thermodynamics and heat are in principle classical concepts and we must incorporate these into the theory of quantum mechanics, dubbed quantum thermodynamics. In the following, we will perceive the exchanged energy between the baths and the main circuit as a somewhat classical heat current, although the interaction may, in principle, be reduced to many individual photonic exchanges.

To obtain an expression for the heat current exchanged between the baths, we use the Heisenberg equation of motion of open quantum systems to calculate the change of main circuit energy as

$$\frac{d\left\langle H_{MC}\right\rangle}{dt} = \frac{dE}{dt} = \left(\frac{\partial H_{MC}}{\partial t}\right)_{\text{Work}} + \sum_{\mu} \left\langle L_{\mu}^*(H_{MC})\right\rangle$$

(19)

where $L_{\mu}^*(A)$ is the complex conjugate of the Lindblad dissipator[42]. This equation is interpreted as the first law of thermodynamics in quantum thermodynamics. Physically, the first term is interpreted as the work done...
by the main circuit on the environment and the latter sum as the heat current in or out of the main circuit (depending on the sign). This relation is equivalent to the classical first law of thermodynamics, namely \( dU = dQ - dW \), with \( dU \) being the change in internal energy, \( dQ \) the heat current and \( dW \) the work done on the system. Hence, we define the heat current as

\[
J_{\mu} \equiv \langle L_{\mu}^*(HMC) \rangle. \tag{20}
\]

### A. Transistor heat currents

We may now proceed to calculate the heat currents exchanged between the source and qutrit, drain and qutrit, and modulator and qubit which all depend on the density matrix elements. Since the Lindblad equation is unidirectional, it takes any state to the invariant steady state, satisfying \( \frac{d\rho}{dt} = 0 \). Hence, we use the steady state density matrix elements to compute the heat currents, since these are invariants of the Lindblad equation of motion [43].

#### 1. Steady state solution of the Lindblad equation

In the steady state, all off-diagonal elements of the density matrix vanish since the off-diagonal coherences will decay exponentially to zero [12]. This motivates the introduction of the vectorization of the density matrix, analogously to what is done in the abstract transistor article [12], such that it is represented as a column vector with all diagonal elements as entries, yielding \( \rho = [\rho_{11}, \ldots, \rho_{66}]^T \). The Lindblad equation may then be perceived as an operator equation where \( \frac{d\rho}{dt} = \mathcal{L} \rho \) with \( \mathcal{L} \) being the so-called Lindblad superoperator. The objective is then to solve the eigenvalue equation \( \mathcal{L} \rho = 0 \) by diagonalization of \( \mathcal{L} \). With the first term in equation (18) being zero in the steady state, the remainder of the Lindblad equation reads

\[
\sum_{\mu l}(\alpha_{\mu l} \left[ 2A_{\mu l}(\omega_{\mu l})\rho A_{\mu l}^*(\omega_{\mu l}) - \{A_{\mu l}^*(\omega_{\mu l})A_{\mu l}(\omega_{\mu l}),\rho \} \right] + \beta_{\mu l} \left[ 2A_{\mu l}(\omega_{\mu l})\rho A_{\mu l}(\omega_{\mu l}) - \{A_{\mu l}^*(\omega_{\mu l})A_{\mu l}^*(\omega_{\mu l}),\rho \} \right] = 0 \tag{21}
\]

with \( \alpha_{\mu l} \equiv \Gamma_{\mu l}(\omega_{\mu l}) \) and \( \beta_{\mu l} \equiv \Gamma_{\mu l}(-\omega_{\mu l}) \). The matrix representation may then be calculated by inserting the collapse operators of appendix D into the above equation, yielding the matrix equation given by equation (E1). In principle, the matrix in equation (E1) could be diagonalized analytically. However, with the spectral densities used in this article, the characteristic polynomial becomes considerably tedious and complicated and hence the process of diagonalization was done numerically. Specifically, the module NumPy in Python was used. This module has a linear algebra library with a numerical eigenvalue and eigenvector routine [44].

### B. Heat currents and amplification

By the heat current definition, equation (20), we explicitly calculate the source terms as

\[
J_S = \langle L_S^*(HMC) \rangle = \text{tr}(HMC L_S(\rho)) = \sum_{i=1}^{6} \sum_{j=1}^{6} \langle i | HMC | j \rangle \langle j | L_S(\rho) | i \rangle
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{6} E_i \langle i | L_S(\rho) | i \rangle
\]

\[
= (E_3 - E_2)(\alpha s_{1}\rho_{22} - \beta s_{1}\rho_{33})
\]

\[
+ 2(E_6 - E_5)(\alpha s_{2}\rho_{55} - \beta s_{2}\rho_{66})
\]

\[
+ (E_3 - E_4)(\alpha s_{3}\rho_{44} - \beta s_{3}\rho_{33}) \tag{22}
\]

where \( HMC | i \rangle = E_i | i \rangle. \) The heat currents of the modulator and drain are given in appendix F. As mentioned in the introduction of the article, amplification is a key ingredient to a transistor. A reasonable measure of amplification of heat signals would be

\[
\alpha_{S,D} = \frac{\partial J_{S,D}}{\partial J_M} \tag{23}
\]

motivated from [12]. For a given change in the modulating heat current, one would obtain amplification effects if \( \alpha > 1 \). It is crucial to note the dependence of the energy level differences in the qubit/qutrit on the amplification. Since the heat currents depend linearly on the energy differences of the qubit/qutrit, the degree of amplification depends naturally on the anharmonicity. This is numerically demonstrated in the following.

C. Numerical simulation

Typical first excitation energies of state-of-the-art transmons are on the order of \( \omega_{01}/2\pi \sim 5 \) GHz. A rough scale of transmon second excitation energy would be \( \omega_{12}/2\pi \sim 4.8 \) GHz with an anharmonicity of 200 MHz [30]. Therefore, we use relative parameters \( \omega_1 = (\omega_3 - \omega_2), \omega_2 = 5.0 \Omega \) and \( \omega_3 = (10 - \lambda) \Omega \) where \( \lambda \) is the anharmonicity. \( \Omega \) defines the energy scale of the system (in the GHz regime for transmons). The internal coupling constant is chosen to be \( g = 0.01 \omega_1 \) and a small bath coupling constant, \( \alpha = 0.01 g \), is chosen such that \( \alpha \ll g \) to satisfy the weak-coupling limit of the Lindblad equation. All thermal baths are assumed to have quality factors \( Q = 100 \), which is a relatively high quality factor compared to what has been used in similar configurations [45]. The source and drain baths have temperatures \( T_S = 2\Omega \) and \( T_D = 0.2\Omega \), respectively. Following the discussion in section IV B, we will demonstrate the effect of anharmonicity on the amplification. All constant simulation parameters are summarized in table I. Since \( E_i \propto \Omega \) and \( \alpha_{\mu l} \propto \Omega^3 \), we divide the numerical heat currents by \( \Omega^3 \) to obtain unitless quantities [46]. The heat current is furthermore divided by the
bath resistance, $R$, which is equal for all baths, serving only to scale the spectral density and in an experimental setting is a fitting parameter. First, we present the heat currents for a given anharmonicity, namely $\lambda = 4.0$. These are depicted in figure 5. As can be seen, heat flows from the source into the drain reservoir for a given modulating heat current. Physically, when $T_M/\Omega$ increases, the thermal population of photons in the modulator at the qubit energy is increased and hence the qubit population rises. As a result, the qutrit is excited at a higher rate and hence heat flows between the source and drain terminals of the transistor, since this flow requires the qutrit to occupy its highest energy level, restricted by the qubit population. The sum of all three heat currents equals 0, as it must by conservation of energy, which may be verified analytically and is also reflected in the numerical results. For an anharmonicity of $\lambda = 4.0$, the amplification effect seems evident from the simulation. The rates of change of source/drain heat currents are considerably larger as compared to the modulating heat current. Second, we present heat currents for four different anharmonicities as depicted in figure 6, namely $\lambda = 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0$, to illustrate the effect of anharmonicity on amplification. As can be seen, decreasing the anharmonicity, i.e. toward more realistic transmon values, increases the modulating heat current. Physically, this effect may be understood as follows. The transferred heat current is blocked due to the constraint that the modulating qubit must excite the second level of the qutrit. The more identical the qutrit levels become, the more likely the modulating qubit will excite the levels of the qutrit and hence the heat current from the modulating bath becomes stronger. Using equation 23, we illustrate in figure 7 the amplification factors for each anharmonicity as function of the modulating temperature. The amplification factors are normalized relative to the amplification factor of the lowest anharmonicity and only the amplification factors of the source reservoir are calculated (one could equivalently calculate those for the drain reservoir). The amplification factor for the highest anharmonicity is observed to be around four times that of the more realistic anharmonicity. Thus, the effect of amplification is greatly reduced due to anharmonicity.

![FIG. 5. Numerical heat currents of the transistor circuit.](image)

![FIG. 6. Heat currents as function of different values of anharmonicity.](image)

![FIG. 7. Amplification factors for each anharmonicity as function of the modulating temperature.](image)

### D. Switch mechanism

Other than the effect of amplification, we describe the switch mechanism of the transistor. As mentioned in the introduction of the article, a transistor must exhibit the ability to control the flow of signal between its terminals. In the case of the thermal transistor, the signal is the heat current between the source and drain terminals. In order to obtain a switch mechanism, two distinguishable on/off states must be defined. Thus, two modulating temperatures must be chosen for which the difference in heat currents is substantial enough to regard the transistor in an off state (vanishing heat current) at the lowest temp-
temperature and in an on state at the upper temperature. As an example, we consider the configuration in figure 5. We define $T_M/\Omega = 0.25$ as an off state of the transistor, since the exchanged heat currents are practically vanishing, and $T_M/\Omega = 0.50$ as an on state. From these considerations, the switch mechanism is evident: we have demonstrated that one may control the state of the transistor by adjusting the temperature of the modulator, realizing the ability to control heat flow signals.

V. CONCLUSION, REFLECTIONS AND OUTLOOKS

Starting from the abstract thermal transistor model of [12], we provide a blueprint of an implementation in a superconducting circuit using circuit quantum electrodynamics. The main circuit, through which the heat flows from the source to the drain, was designed by utilizing the dispersive coupling regime of the Jaynes-Cummings model. By implementing the thermal baths as RLC circuits, the heat flow from the source to the drain is realized and shown to be adjustable by a third modulating bath. Effectively, this provided a switch mechanism between an off- and on-state of the transistor, depending on the temperature of the modulating terminal. For experimental implementation, one would have to consider the detailed manufacturing and design of the resonator, transmon circuits and thermal baths in order to achieve the couplings and dynamics desired. A potential way to realize the baths is to voltage-bias a pair of SINIS (superconductor-insulator-normal metal-insulator-superconductor) elements, which are NIS junctions in a series configuration. These elements would allow for temperature control of thermal baths and have been reported in a heat valve mechanism much like the switch mechanism presented here, although in a slightly different setting [1, 45]. The amplification effect was demonstrated to decrease as function of decreasing anharmonicity, although not affecting the switch mechanism. Further improvements on this blueprint would be to consider the implementation of flux qubits which exhibit much higher anharmonicities[47]. Theoretically, further improvements on the model could include a more thorough treatment of the thermal baths. Having a more detailed description of the spectral density and other physical properties of the thermal baths allows for the use of the Redfield master equation which in turn would yield a more in depth, microscopic understanding of the circuit dynamics. Furthermore, the effect of external electromagnetic field noise was not taken into account. In practice, the circuit will be subject to noise from its surroundings, giving rise to unwanted excitations and decays of the qubit or qutrit in the main circuit. External noise would obviously lead to unwanted heat currents to pass (or not to pass) and hence decreasing the efficiency of the transistor mechanism. However, state-of-the-art superconducting circuits now have extended lifetimes so that a proof-of-principle experiments should be possible with a near-term device. Another aspect is potential cross-talk between the thermal baths and related dissipative effects which would be present when considering the heat currents. These are topics for future investigations.
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Appendix A: Main circuit analysis

In this appendix, we present a circuit analysis of the main circuit depicted in figure 1. By perceiving the capacitive and inductive energies of a circuit as kinetic and potential energies, one may write down a Lagrangian of the system[31]. With the flux nodes defined in section II, we ease notation by introducing matrix/vector notation such that $\phi \equiv [\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3]^T$. The Lagrangian reads

$$L = \frac{1}{2} \dot{\phi}^T \begin{bmatrix} C + C_1 & -C & 0 \\ -C & 2C + C_C & -C \\ 0 & -C & C + C_3 \end{bmatrix} \dot{\phi} - \frac{1}{2L_c} \dot{\phi}_2^2 + E_{J1} \cos \left(2\pi \frac{\phi_1}{\Phi_0}\right) + E_{J1} \cos \left(2\pi \frac{\phi_3}{\Phi_0}\right)$$

where $C$ is the capacitance matrix. The above circuit parameters are depicted in figure 1. By writing out the ca-
capacitive terms explicitly, one may verify the equivalence of what would be obtained through the usual application of the Kirchhoff circuit rules. A quick procedure on how to write down the capacitance matrix easily is given in reference [48]. Using a Legendre transformation, define the conjugate momentum as \( \bar{p} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\phi}} \) and, by noting the invertibility of the capacitance matrix[48], the Hamiltonian reads

\[
H = \frac{1}{2} \bar{p}^2 C^{-1} \bar{p} + \frac{1}{2Lc} \phi_2 - E_{J1} \cos \left( \frac{2\pi}{\Phi_0} \phi_1 \right)
\]

By writing out the matrix terms explicitly, the kinetic term reads

\[
T = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{3} C^{-1}_{ii} p_i^2 + C^{-1}_{12} p_1 p_2 - E_{J2} \cos \left( \frac{2\pi}{\Phi_0} \phi_3 \right).
\]

(A2)

where \( C^{-1}_{ij} \) denotes the inverse capacitance matrix elements given by equation B1. We may consider the first sum as momentum terms, the next two terms as couplings between the transmons and the resonator and the latter term as a cross-coupling between the transmons. By using experimentally realistic parameters for a transmon-resonator-transmon system such as this, one finds \( C^{-1}_{12} \approx 1/114 \ll 1 \) such that the direct cross-coupling between the transmons approximately vanishes[49]. Note that each component in the electronic circuit may have its own isolated energy. When combined in a circuit, however, the effective energies at the nodes change according to the circuit configuration. Hence the circuit Hamiltonian is conveniently expressed in terms of the effective quantities. The conventional notation is obtained through \( C^{-1} \rightarrow \frac{8}{(2\pi)^2} C^{-1}, E_{Ci} \equiv C^{-1}_{ii} \) and \( E_{Li} \equiv \frac{1}{2L_i} \), with \( e \) being the elementary charge. Capacitive terms then reduce to \( 4E_{Ci} \left( \frac{p_i}{2e} \right)^2 \) where \( E_{Ci} \) will be the effective energy at the \( i \)th node in the circuit and \( p_i/2e \) will denote the number of Cooper pairs stored at the corresponding flux node[48]. Finally, the flux and its conjugate momentum are converted to dimensionless entities by letting \( \frac{2e}{\Phi_0} = 1 \) which leads to \( 2e = 1 \), letting the charge of the Cooper pairs equal unity. Capacitance and inductance then obtain units of inverse energy, yielding a Hamiltonian in units of energy. Using these conventions, equation A1 reads

\[
H = 4E_{C1} p_1^2 - E_{J1} \cos(\phi_1) + 4E_{C3} p_2^2 - E_{J3} \cos(\phi_3)
+ 4E_{C2} p_2^2 + E_{L2} \phi_2^2 + 8C_{12}^{-1} p_1 p_2 + 8C_{23}^{-1} p_1 p_3.
\]

(A3)

When operated in the transmon regime with \( E_C/E_J \ll 1 \), we may perform a perturbative expansion of the cosine terms in equation A3 since a large Josephson energy restricts the flux, \( \phi \), to be localized around zero[30]. We obtain

\[
H \approx \frac{E_{J1}}{2} \phi_1^2 - \frac{E_{J1}}{24} \phi_1^4

\]

Transmon 1

\[
+ 4E_{C3} p_2^2 - \frac{E_{J3}}{2} \phi_3^2 - \frac{E_{J3}}{24} \phi_3^4 + 4E_{C2} p_2^2 + E_{L2} \phi_2^2

\]

Resonator

\[
+ 8C_{12}^{-1} p_1 p_2 + 8C_{23}^{-1} p_1 p_3

\]

Couplings

(A4)

(A5)

neglecting constant terms of the Josephson tunnelling energy, \( E_{Ji}, i \in \{1, 3\} \). We may interpret the above Hamiltonian as follows. The first two collected terms are perceived as two harmonic oscillators with an anharmonic perturbation, the third collected term as a harmonic oscillator and the last collected terms as mutual couplings between the transmons and the resonator. Due to the presence of the fourth order transmon terms, the energy spacing in the spectrum of the transmons will not be even. Therefore, it will ease the process of addressing specific states in the spectrum of the device. Based on the harmonic oscillator interpretations, we will build a quantized Hamiltonian inspired by the usual quantization of a harmonic oscillator.

1. Quantization of the main circuit

With the above physical interpretations, the main circuit is canonically quantized by introducing the operators \( p_i \rightarrow \hat{p}_i \) and \( \phi_i \rightarrow \hat{\phi}_i \) with canonical commutation relation \( [\hat{p}_i, \hat{\phi}_j] = i \delta_{ij}\[50] \) Furthermore, we introduce step operators defined by[51]

\[
\hat{a}_i = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{E_{Li} + E_{Ci} \phi_i}{E_{Li} + E_{Ci} \phi_i} \right)^{1/4} \hat{\phi}_i + i \left( \frac{E_{Ci}}{E_{Li} + E_{Ci} \phi_i} \right)^{1/4} \hat{p}_i
\]

(A6)

\[
\hat{a}_i^\dagger = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{E_{Li} + E_{Ci} \phi_i}{E_{Li} + E_{Ci} \phi_i} \right)^{1/4} \hat{\phi}_i - i \left( \frac{E_{Ci}}{E_{Li} + E_{Ci} \phi_i} \right)^{1/4} \hat{p}_i
\]

(A7)

which simply are combinations of the flux and momentum operators. This leads to bosonic commutation relations, \( [\hat{a}_i, \hat{a}_j^\dagger] = \delta_{ij} \). From now on, we assume the operator nature of \( a \) and \( b \) are implied such that we lose the hat-notation. By introducing the operators into the Hamiltonian, equation A5, we obtain, after some algebra,

\[
H = a_1 \left( \frac{i a_1^\dagger a_1 + 1}{2} \right) - \beta_1 \left( a_1 + a_1^\dagger \right)^4 + a_3 \left( a_3^\dagger a_3 + \frac{1}{2} \right)
- \beta_3 \left( a_3^\dagger a_3 + \frac{1}{2} \right)
- \beta_1 \left( a_1^\dagger a_1 + a_1 + a_1^\dagger \right)
- \omega_r \left( a_1^\dagger b_1^\dagger + a_1 b_1 + a_1^\dagger b_1 - a_1 b_1^\dagger \right)
- \omega_r \left( a_3^\dagger b_3^\dagger + a_3 b_3 + a_3^\dagger b_3 - a_3 b_3^\dagger \right).
\]

(A8)

with \( \alpha_1 = \sqrt{8E_{C1}E_{J1}}, \beta_1 = \frac{E_{C1}^2}{12}, \alpha_3 = \sqrt{8E_{C3}E_{J3}}, \beta_3 = \frac{E_{C3}^2}{12}, \omega_r = 4 \sqrt{E_{C2}E_{L2}}, g_1 = C_{12}^{-1} \left( \frac{E_{L1}E_{L2}}{E_{C1}E_{C2}} \right)^{1/4} \) and
\[ g_3 = C_{23}^{-1} \left( \frac{8E_{12}E_{13}}{E_{23}E_{C3}} \right)^{1/4} \]. Operators \( a_i, i \in \{1, 3\} \) belong to the lower and upper transmons, respectively, and \( b_r \) belongs to the resonator.

**Appendix B: Inverse circuit analysis matrix elements**

The inverse matrix elements are given by

\[
\begin{align*}
C^{-1}_{11} &= \frac{C^4 + (2C + C_C) ((C + C_3) ((C + C_1)(2C + C_C) - C^2) - C^2 (C + C_1))}{\lambda ((C + C_1)(2C + C_C) - C^2)} \\
C^{-1}_{22} &= \frac{C^2 (C + C_1)^2 + (C + C_1) ((C + C_3) ((C + C_1)(2C + C_C) - C^2) - C^2 (C + C_1))}{\lambda ((C + C_1)(2C + C_C) - C^2)} \\
C^{-1}_{33} &= \frac{(C + C_1)(2C + C_C) - C^2}{\lambda} \\
C^{-1}_{12} &= C^{-1}_{21} = \frac{C(C + C_3)}{\lambda} \\
C^{-1}_{23} &= C^{-1}_{32} = \frac{C(C + C_1)}{\lambda} \\
C^{-1}_{13} &= C^{-1}_{31} = \frac{C^2}{\lambda} \\
\end{align*}
\]

with \( \lambda = (C + C_3) ((C + C_1)(2C + C_C) - C^2) - C^2 (C + C_1) \). Since the inverse capacitance matrix is symmetric, \( C^{-1}_{ij} = C^{-1}_{ji} \) and hence the above equations encapsulate all matrix elements. Using experimentally realistic parameters for the circuit capacitances, the cross-coupling term, \( C^{-1}_{13} \), approximately vanishes.

**Appendix C: Qutrit matrix representations**

The matrix representations of the qutrit operators are calculated explicitly due to their slightly more complicated nature as compared to the qubit operators. Let \(|0\rangle_2^T = [1, 0, 0], |1\rangle_2^T = [0, 1, 0] \) and \(|2\rangle_2^T = [0, 0, 1] \) denote the state vectors of the qutrit. Using this representation, the number operator matrix representation reads

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & a^\dagger a & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\]

The matrix representation of the anharmonic operator, \((a_1 + a_1^\dagger)^4\), reads

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & a^\dagger a & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & a^\dagger a & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & a^\dagger a \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\]
where the last equality sign follows from the Hermitian nature of the operator. By subtracting the identity matrix three times in equation C2, we obtain

\[
\left( a_1 + a_1^\dagger \right)^4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 6\sqrt{2} \\ 0 & 12 & 0 \\ 6\sqrt{2} & 0 & 36 \end{bmatrix}.
\]

(C3)

Appendix D: Collapse operators of the Lindblad equation

The collapse operators of the Lindblad equation read[12]

\[
A_{S1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |E_3\rangle \langle E_2|, \quad \omega_{S1} = E_2 - g
\]

(D1)

\[
A_{S2} = |E_6\rangle \langle E_5|, \quad \omega_{S2} = E_2
\]

(D2)

\[
A_{S3} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |E_3\rangle \langle E_4|, \quad \omega_{S3} = E_2 + g
\]

(D3)

\[
A_{M1} = |E_6\rangle \langle E_3|, \quad \omega_{M1} = E_1
\]

(D4)

\[
A_{M2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |E_5\rangle \langle E_2| + |E_4\rangle \langle E_1| \right), \quad \omega_{M2} = E_1 - g
\]

(D5)

\[
A_{M3} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |E_5\rangle \langle E_4| - |E_2\rangle \langle E_1| \right), \quad \omega_{M3} = E_1 + g
\]

(D6)

\[
A_{D1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |E_6\rangle \langle E_2|, \quad \omega_{D1} = E_3 - g
\]

(D7)

\[
A_{D2} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |E_6\rangle \langle E_4|, \quad \omega_{D2} = E_3 + g
\]

(D8)

\[
A_{D3} = |E_3\rangle \langle E_1|, \quad \omega_{D3} = E_3.
\]

(D9)

The transition rates of the Lindblad collapse operators are calculated using Fermi’s golden rule and are given by

\[
\Gamma_{S1} = \Gamma_{23} = \pi \alpha^2 S(\omega_{S1})
\]

(D10)

\[
\Gamma_{S2} = \Gamma_{56} = 2\pi \alpha^2 S(\omega_{S2})
\]

(D11)

\[
\Gamma_{S3} = \Gamma_{43} = \pi \alpha^2 S(\omega_{S3})
\]

(D12)

\[
\Gamma_{M1} = \Gamma_{36} = 2\pi \alpha^2 S(\omega_{M1})
\]

(D13)

\[
\Gamma_{M2} = \Gamma_{25} + \Gamma_{14} = 2\pi \alpha^2 S(\omega_{M2})
\]

(D14)

\[
\Gamma_{M3} = \Gamma_{45} + \Gamma_{12} = 2\pi \alpha^2 S(\omega_{M3})
\]

(D15)

\[
\Gamma_{D1} = \Gamma_{26} = \pi \alpha^2 S(\omega_{D1})
\]

(D16)

\[
\Gamma_{D2} = \Gamma_{46} = \alpha^2 S(\omega_{D2})
\]

(D17)

\[
\Gamma_{D3} = \Gamma_{13} = 2\pi \alpha^2 S(\omega_{D3}).
\]

(D18)

Appendix E: Steady state Lindblad matrix equation

The steady state Lindblad equation reads \( \mathcal{L} \rho = 0 \) and the corresponding matrix representation of this equation reads

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\gamma_1 & \beta_{M3} & 2\beta_{D3} & \beta_{M2} & 0 & 0 \\
\alpha_{M3} & \gamma_2 & \beta_{S1} & 0 & \beta_{M2} & \beta_{D1} \\
2\alpha_{D3} & \alpha_{S1} & \gamma_3 & \alpha_{S3} & 0 & 2\beta_{M1} \\
\alpha_{M2} & 0 & \beta_{S3} & \gamma_4 & \beta_{M3} & \beta_{D2} \\
0 & \alpha_{M2} & 0 & \alpha_{M3} & \gamma_5 & 2\beta_{S2} \\
0 & 0 & \alpha_{D1} & 2\alpha_{M1} & \alpha_{D2} & 2\alpha_{S2} & \gamma_6
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\rho_{11} \\
\rho_{22} \\
\rho_{33} \\
\rho_{44} \\
\rho_{55} \\
\rho_{66}
\end{bmatrix} = 0
\]

(E1)
with
\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma_1 &= -A_{M2} - A_{M3} - 2A_{D3} \\
\gamma_2 &= -A_{S1} - A_{M2} - B_{M3} - A_{D1} \\
\gamma_3 &= -B_{S1} - B_{S3} - 2A_{M1} - 2B_{D3} \\
\gamma_4 &= -A_{S3} - B_{M2} - A_{M3} - A_{D2} \\
\gamma_5 &= -2A_{S2} - B_{M2} - B_{M3} \\
\gamma_6 &= -2B_{S2} - 2B_{M1} - B_{D1} - B_{D2}.
\end{align*}
\]
and \(\alpha_{\mu l} = S(-\omega_{\mu l})\) and \(\beta_{\mu l} = S(\omega_{\mu l})\) for \(\mu \in \{S, M, D\}\) and \(l \in \{1, 2, 3\}\).

**Appendix F: Heat currents of modulator and drain baths**

Using equation 20, we calculate the heat currents of the modulator and drain, analogously to what was done in

\[
J_M = 2(E_0 - E_2)(\alpha_{M1}\rho_{S3} - \beta_{M1}\rho_{D6}) + (E_4 - E_1)(\alpha_{M2}\rho_{A4} - \beta_{M2}\rho_{D1}) + (E_5 - E_2)(\alpha_{M2}\rho_{D2} - \beta_{M2}\rho_{M5}) \tag{F1}
\]
\[
+ (E_2 - E_1)(\alpha_{M3}\rho_{A1} - \beta_{M3}\rho_{D2}) + (E_5 - E_4)(\alpha_{M3}\rho_{D4} - \beta_{M3}\rho_{M5})
\]
and

\[
J_D = (E_0 - E_2)(\alpha_{D1}\rho_{D2} - \beta_{D1}\rho_{S6}) + (E_0 - E_4)(\alpha_{D2}\rho_{D4} - \beta_{D2}\rho_{D6}) + 2(E_3 - E_1)(\alpha_{D3}\rho_{D1} - \beta_{D3}\rho_{S3}) \tag{F2}
\]

[38] $\text{tr}_{B}(A)$ denotes the partial trace of an operator, $A$.[52].


[41] Using the conventional units presented in the circuit analysis of appendix A, capacitance and inductance have units of inverse energy. Hence, resistance is unitless and thus the unit of the spectral density becomes inverse time in natural units.

[42] Expectation values are evaluated using the traced main circuit density operator as $\langle A \rangle = \text{tr}(A\rho)$.[53].


[46] With natural units, units of capacitance and inductance being inverse energy and units of spectral densities being inverse time, heat current has unit $[J_{\mu}] = \text{time}^{-4}$. Resistance is unitless in these conventions.


[49] The experimentally realistic values used for computing the coupling term ratio are: transmon capacitance $C_{\text{transmon}} = 0.7$ pF and capacitive coupling between transmon and resonator being $C_{\text{coupling}} = 6.2$ fF.[34].

[50] Note the analogy with the position and momentum commutation relation, $[\hat{x}, \hat{p}] = i$.

