

# Pumping current in a non-Markovian two-state model

Ville M. M. Paasonen\* and Hisao Hayakawa

*Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University*

*Kyoto, 606-8502, Japan*

(Dated: July 13, 2020)

A simple periodically modulated two-state model whose dynamics is governed by a master equation is extended to have memory, leading to a time-convoluted generalized master equation. It is shown that this non-Markovian master equation can be reduced to a single ordinary differential equation, which allows the solution to be obtained easily. The behavior of this model is investigated, and in particular, the cycle-averaged pumping current is calculated. It is found that non-Markovianity leads to negative values of the current at low modulation frequencies, i.e., that the memory effect prevails even in the adiabatic limit. Furthermore, at moderate frequencies a significant increase in the peak pumping current is observed, even for short relaxation times.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Master equations (MEs) are widely used in non-equilibrium statistical mechanics to model the time evolution of a range of classical and quantum mechanical systems. The mathematical foundation of MEs is the differential Chapman-Kolmogorov equation of stochastic analysis [1], and in its basic form, it only describes systems that carry no memory of their past: this property is referred to as Markovianity. It is known however that due to a number of physical reasons, real systems do usually possess memory of their past evolution to a greater or lesser extent. An archetypal example of this is the fluctuation-dissipation relation [2], which shows that any time nonlocal correlations in the environment necessarily lead to memory effects. Theoretically, non-Markovianity has been attracting attention in classical mechanics as a link between continuous-time random walks and time convoluted MEs was discovered [3, 4]. In quantum physics, the connection between the flow of information and non-Markovian processes, as well as quantum measurements of Markovianity have received considerable research effort [5–7]. Furthermore, advancements in experimental techniques have made it possible to directly measure non-Markovianity in the context of classical [8] and quantum [9, 10] systems.

Modulating control parameters such as rate constants, bath temperatures or gate voltages of a physical system out of equilibrium can lead to net flow of a physical current, e.g. flow of product, heat flow or flow of electrons, even in the absence of a net bias of the control parameters [11]. This pumping current was shown to have its origins in the Berry-Sinitsyn-Nemenman (BSN) phase, which was originally discovered in the context of quantum systems [12–14]. It has been coined geometrical current, as it is essentially a geometrical quantity of the control parameter space when the modulation speed of the parameters is sufficiently slow, i.e., in the adiabatic limit. For thermodynamical systems the BSN phase has been

shown to have a significant impact on quantum transport [15, 16], and it has been shown that it leads to path-dependent geometrical entropy [17, 18]. The effects of the BSN phase have been extensively studied in the context of the quantum mechanical spin-boson model [19]. Over the recent years, effects of finite speed modulation, i.e. non-adiabatic effects, have also been investigated for this model [20]. Furthermore, it has been shown that the presence of the BSN phase engenders non-Gaussianity of the system fluctuations, leading to a modified form of the fluctuation theorem for geometrical pumping [21, 22].

The essential features of this geometrical effect have also been shown to exist in classical systems, such as the Sinitsyn-Nemenman (SN) model of reaction kinetics [13, 14]. Recently, the adiabatic result has been extended to the non-adiabatic regime also for this model [23]. It was found that after an initial linear increase with the modulation frequency, the pumping current reaches a peak and eventually decays as the inverse of the modulation frequency in the asymptotic limit. Finite modulation speed means that the pumping current can no longer be expressed using strictly geometrical quantities, but it was shown that a formally geometrical expression in terms of a line integral in parameter space is still possible. Furthermore, the effect of non-adiabaticity on the fluctuation theorem has been investigated in the context of the SN model [24]. Motivated by the attention attracted by these recent results, in the present paper a non-Markovian generalisation of the SN model will be presented as a natural extension of the aforementioned research, and its adiabatic and non-adiabatic behavior will be investigated numerically and analytically.

The structure of this paper is as follows: In Sec. II, the time-convoluted ME and the generalized SN model associated with it will be introduced and analyzed. Numerical results for the pumping current will be presented. In Sec. III, where the non-Markovian SN model will be treated perturbatively using Riccati theory. By performing a further perturbation expansion in the modulation frequency, analytical results for the pumping current are obtained and compared with the numerical results of the previous section. In Sec. IV, the results obtained and their physical implications are discussed, and a conclu-

---

\* E-mail: ville.paasonen@yukawa.kyoto-u.ac.jp

sion is presented in Sec. V. Supplementary information and details of the various calculations in the main text will be presented in the Appendices.

## II. NON-MARKOVIAN SINITSYN-NEMENMAN MODEL

For the sake of completeness, a brief review of the Markovian SN model will be presented first. Further details and relevant results for this model can be found in Appendix A. Originally proposed by Sinitsyn and Nemenman in the context of reaction kinetics [13], a range of two-state systems interacting with two environments can be conceptualized as shown in Fig. 1. The hopping rates are assumed to be controlled by an external agent. This can be realised for instance by controlling the temperatures or chemical potentials of the environments. In the following, they will be assumed to undergo cyclic modulation in time. Although we can discuss a system coupled to many environments, we follow the original simple setup of Ref. [13] which has only two environments coupled to the system. In this case it is easy to see that mathematically, the system can be described by the time-local master equation

$$\dot{\mathbf{p}}^{(0)}(t) = W(t)\mathbf{p}^{(0)}(t), \quad (1)$$

where  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} := d\mathbf{x}/dt$ ,

$$\mathbf{p}^{(0)}(t) := \begin{bmatrix} p_1^{(0)}(t) \\ p_2^{(0)}(t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

$$W(t) := \begin{bmatrix} -k_{\text{in}}(t) & k_{\text{out}}(t) \\ k_{\text{in}}(t) & -k_{\text{out}}(t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

and we split the rate coefficients as

$$\begin{aligned} k_{\text{in}}(t) &:= k_{\text{in}}^L(t) + k_{\text{in}}^R(t), \\ k_{\text{out}}(t) &:= k_{\text{out}}^L(t) + k_{\text{out}}^R(t). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here,  $p_1^{(0)}(t)$  and  $p_2^{(0)}(t) = 1 - p_1^{(0)}(t)$  are the probabilities of the system being found in state 1 (empty) and state 2 (full) at time  $t$ , respectively. We have introduced the superscript (0) to denote the solution of the Markovian ME. The left and right environments can be viewed as containers of reactant and product, respectively, whence the terminology of “in” and “out” for the rate coefficients.




FIG. 1. Diagram showing the Markovian Sinitsyn-Nemenman (SN) model.

Now, let us extend Eq. (1) to include memory effects by introducing a time convolution integral. The most general form of the resulting non-Markovian master equation (nMME) is

$$\dot{\mathbf{p}}(t) = \int_0^t dt' M(t, t') \mathbf{p}(t'), \quad (5)$$

where  $M(t, t')$  expresses the non-Markovian memory kernel. For studying cyclic modulation, we choose

$$M(t, t') = f_\tau(t - t') W(t) = \frac{1}{\tau} e^{-\frac{t-t'}{\tau}} W(t), \quad (6)$$

where  $W(t)$  has the same form as before and  $\tau$  is the memory time of the system, i.e., the relaxation time of the environment. In general, the memory kernel  $M(t, t')$  is described by a multiple exponential function. Therefore, the choice in Eq. (6) can be regarded as the simplest one for describing memory effects. As will be shown, this exponential memory kernel is equivalent to a model which contains another set of environmental (hidden) variables coupled with  $\mathbf{p}(t)$ . Introducing a finite set of environmental variables reduces the memory kernel to a multiple exponential function. Indeed, it is generally known in the literature on Markovian embedding of non-Markovian processes that a simple exponential memory kernel is the easiest case to treat analytically [25, 26]. Physically, the dynamics of  $\mathbf{p}(t)$  is allowed to depend on its history, but as the time dependence of  $W(t)$  originates solely from external parameter modulation, it is not involved in the convolution integral. The memory kernel has the important property that on the positive  $t$ -axis, it approaches the Dirac delta distribution:

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} f_\tau(t - t') = \delta(t - t'), \quad t - t' > 0, \quad (7)$$

so we can recover the original Markovian ME, Eq. (1) by taking the limit  $\tau \rightarrow 0$ . Next, we will demonstrate that the above nMME is equivalent to coupled Markovian master equations, which means that the problem can be reduced to a single second order time-local ODE (see Appendix B).

We note here that it is well-known that the non-Markovian master equation described by Eqs. (5) and (6) can lead to negative probabilities and thus nonphysical results [27]. However, in the case of the present model, we can safely use this model if the modulation is not fast and the memory time  $\tau$  is not too large, in which case the probabilities  $p_1(t)$  and  $p_2(t)$  remain non-negative, as is shown in Appendix C. There we also present a condition for the probability to remain positive.

Let us consider the the time-local coupled equations

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{p}}(t) = W(t)\mathbf{q}(t), \\ \tau \dot{\mathbf{q}}(t) = -\mathbf{q}(t) + \mathbf{p}(t), \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathbf{q}(t)$  can be regarded as environmental degrees of freedom adjacent to the reduced system, which vanish

when the environments are in equilibrium and not coupled to the reduced system, as in this case the second equation in Eq. (8) reduces to simple exponential decay. This simple exponential decay can be regarded as originating from the smallest gap in the Liouvillian spectrum of the environments. Physically, we have here a model where the reduced system is linearly coupled (with time dependent couplings) to the deviation from equilibrium of the adjacent environments. The adjacent environments are in turn driven out of equilibrium by back reaction from the reduced system. We note that since the form of  $W$  is retained, it readily follows from the first equation of Eq. (8) that  $p_1(t) + p_2(t) = 1$  for all time. Solving the second equation of Eq. (8) using an integrating factor we obtain

$$\mathbf{q}(t) = e^{-\frac{t}{\tau}}\mathbf{q}(0) + \int_0^t ds \frac{1}{\tau} e^{-\frac{t-s}{\tau}} \mathbf{p}(s), \quad (9)$$

so that, as the first term can be ignored for long times ( $t \gg \tau$ ), we obtain Eq. (5) by substituting Eq. (9) into the first equation of Eqs. (8). From this conversion it is easy to see that more complicated memory kernels can be dealt with if we include many variables instead of  $\mathbf{q}(t)$  by replacing the second equation of Eq. (8). This generalization would correspond to including more degrees of freedom in the adjacent environments, thus leading to multiple relaxation time scales instead of only one  $\tau$  introduced here.

To make the model concrete, we choose [23]

$$\begin{aligned} k_{\text{in}}^{\text{L}}(t) &= k_0(1 + \frac{1}{2} \cos \Omega t), \\ k_{\text{in}}^{\text{R}}(t) &= k_0(1 + \frac{1}{2} \sin \Omega t), \\ k_{\text{out}}^{\text{L}}(t) &= k_0, \\ k_{\text{out}}^{\text{R}}(t) &= k_0. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Namely, we assume the rate coefficients controlling the inflow into the reduced system to be sinusoidally modulated, with a phase difference of  $\pi/2$  between the left and the right reservoir. The outflow rates are assumed to have constant rates. This choice is motivated by the fact that in the space of the rate coefficients, the protocol trajectory must enclose a finite area for finite pumping current to be observed in the adiabatic limit [23]. A circle parametrized by trigonometric functions represents a particularly simple such choice. We will indeed demonstrate in Appendix D that the above choice of phase difference results in maximal pumping current in the Markovian case.

Anticipating the perturbative treatment of the next section, we also introduce the dimensionless memory parameter

$$\eta := k_0\tau, \quad (11)$$

to characterise the strength of the non-Markovian effect.

There are a number of alternative ways to deal with nMMEs that have been explored in the literature. The

most straightforward is to transform into Laplace space and solve the resulting algebraic equation there. However, it often happens that  $M(t, t')$  does not depend only on the time difference (as is the case here), so that the convolution theorem cannot be utilized. This issue can be circumvented by performing a Taylor expansion of  $M(t, t')$  around one of the time variables so as to create terms only dependent on the difference  $t - t'$  [28]. While this allows transformation into Laplace space, it is generally difficult to perform the inverse transformation explicitly. Furthermore, the resulting solution is in the form of an infinite series instead of the closed-form approach of the present paper.

A more general approach to deal with nMMEs is based on the Nakajima-Zwanzig projection operator technique [29–31]. Essentially one first eliminates the environment dynamics to obtain a nMME, and then performs an expansion in the system-environment coupling to achieve a time-covolutionless (TCL) equation of motion for the system [32–34]. Again however, while a number of refined expansion protocols have been developed over the recent years [35], a closed-form time-local equation cannot be derived using this approach.

As in the case of the Markovian SN model, we are interested in the net current flowing from the system into one of the reservoirs, here chosen to be the right reservoir. Using the same expression for the instantaneous current as in the Markovian case, Eq. (A3),

$$J(t) = k_{\text{out}}^{\text{R}}(t) - [k_{\text{in}}^{\text{R}}(t) + k_{\text{out}}^{\text{R}}(t)]p_1(t), \quad (12)$$

we take the one-period average according to

$$\langle J \rangle = \frac{2\pi}{\Omega} \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + \frac{2\pi}{\Omega}} J(t) dt. \quad (13)$$

Here  $t_0$  should be sufficiently large for the system to have relaxed into the steady state. Figure 2 shows the pumping current against the dimensionless frequency  $\epsilon$ , is defined as

$$\epsilon := \Omega/k_0, \quad (14)$$

which depends on the memory parameter  $\eta$ , obtained by numerically solving the equivalent second order ODE, Eq. (B8). It was found that while the current for lower frequencies converged within less than 10 cycles, to obtain complete convergence for the whole range of frequencies considered in this paper,  $t_0 \sim 70\pi/\Omega$  was necessary. It is seen that the peak value of the pumping current increases as the memory parameter  $\eta$  increases. Moreover, the value of the peak current is considerably higher than in the Markovian case, even for relatively small values of  $\eta$ .

Interestingly, a closeup of the low frequency regime plotted in Fig. 3 shows that for sufficiently large values of the memory parameter  $\eta$ , negative pumping currents are observed for low modulation frequencies. These findings will be explored further in the next section.




FIG. 2.  $\langle J \rangle$  as a function of the dimensionless modulation frequency for different values of the memory parameter  $\eta = k_0\tau$  obtained by solving Eq. (B8) numerically.




FIG. 3. A closeup plot of the low-frequency behavior of  $\langle J \rangle$  obtained by solving Eq. (B8) numerically.

We have also plotted the pumping current as a function of the memory parameter  $\eta$  for selected values of  $\epsilon$ , shown in Fig. 4. It can be seen that the overall behavior is relatively complex: low frequencies show negative currents for a wide range of values of  $\eta$ , whereas for larger frequencies, a peak shifting to higher values of  $\eta$  as  $\epsilon$  increases is observed. Nevertheless, as we will demonstrate in the next section, the peak current increases monotonically with  $\eta$  (see Fig. 8).

### III. PERTURBATIVE ANALYSIS

In this section, perturbation theory will be employed to obtain an analytical expression for  $\mathbf{p}(t)$  to first order in  $\eta$  to explore the low frequency behavior of the pumping current. The details of the perturbation calculations




FIG. 4. Plots of the pumping current  $\langle J \rangle$  as a function of non-Markovian memory parameter  $\eta$  for different values of modulation frequency  $\epsilon$ , obtained by solving Eq. (B8) numerically.

are given in Appendix E for Riccati perturbation theory [36] and Appendix F for the simple perturbation theory, respectively.

We begin by expanding  $\mathbf{p}(t)$  in powers of  $\eta$ ,

$$\mathbf{p}(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \eta^n \mathbf{p}^{(n)}(t). \quad (15)$$

As we are only interested in the long time steady state behavior of the system, or the limit cycle, we will only need to consider the slow part of the perturbation series, which simplifies the perturbation expansion considerably. We note that the zeroth order term  $\mathbf{p}^{(0)}$  indeed satisfies Eq. (A11) and thus, by uniqueness, is identical to the Markovian probability distribution. For the  $O(\eta^1)$  correction, we find from Eqs. (E11), (E12), (E13), and (E14)

$$\dot{\mathbf{p}}^{(1)} = W(t)\mathbf{p}^{(1)} - \frac{1}{k_0}W^2(t)\mathbf{p}^{(0)}(t). \quad (16)$$

Probability conservation in the Markovian case implies that the correction terms should sum to zero at each order, so that the above equation is easily decoupled. Denoting the first component of  $\mathbf{p}^{(n)}$  by  $p_1^{(n)}$  we obtain the scalar equation

$$\dot{p}_1^{(1)} + k(t)p_1^{(1)} = \frac{k_{\text{out}}(t)k(t)}{k_0} - \frac{k^2(t)}{k_0}p_1^{(0)}(t), \quad (17)$$

which is solved by

$$p_1^{(1)}(t) = \frac{1}{k_0} \int_0^t ds e^{-\int_s^t ds' k(s')} \times \left[ k_{\text{out}}(t)k(t) - k^2(t)p_1^{(0)}(t) \right], \quad (18)$$

where we have neglected exponentially decaying terms.




FIG. 5. Comparison the pumping current  $\langle J \rangle$  obtained by solving Eq. (B8) numerically (solid circles and crosses), and by numerical integration of Eq. (18) (lines) for small memory times. The Markovian result (black line), obtained by analytically solving and numerically integrating Eq. (A11), is shown for reference.

So up to first order in  $\eta$ , we have

$$p_1(t) \simeq p_1^{(0)}(t) + \eta p_1^{(1)}(t). \quad (19)$$

Using the above expression, the current can be computed with the help of Eq. (12); the result is plotted in Fig. 5. It is seen that while the agreement is good for extremely low values of the memory parameter, the perturbative result quickly diverges from the numerical solution, especially for high modulation frequencies. However, as shown in the closeup of Fig. 6, the agreement is reasonably good for a larger range of memory times at low frequencies. Furthermore, since it is the low frequency regime that has been studied most extensively in the literature, we will focus on it here as well.

The first order ODE, Eq. (17), can be used as a starting point for a further perturbative expansion, presented for the general case in Appendix F. We begin by transforming the time variable according to  $t \mapsto \theta := \Omega t$ . Equation (17) is transformed into

$$\epsilon p_1^{(1)'}(\theta) = -\frac{k(\theta)}{k_0} p_1^{(1)}(\theta) - \frac{k^2(\theta)}{k_0^2} p_1^{(0)}(\theta) + \frac{k_{\text{out}}(\theta)k(\theta)}{k_0^2}, \quad (20)$$

where the prime denotes derivative with respect to  $\theta$ . Next, we will perform a perturbation expansion in  $\epsilon$ :

$$p_1^{(n)}(\theta) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \epsilon^m p_1^{(n,m)}(\theta). \quad (21)$$

Substituting this into Eq. (20), and matching at each order, the problem reduces to an algebraic recursion relation. The details of this calculation can be found in Appendix F.




FIG. 6. Low-frequency plots of  $\langle J \rangle$  obtained by solving Eq. (B8) numerically (solid circles), by Riccati perturbation theory for  $\eta$  only (open triangles), and by also treating  $\epsilon$  perturbatively (solid lines, see Eq. (22)).

With the present choice of the form of the rate coefficients, Eqs. (10), a direct calculation to first order in  $\eta$  and second order in  $\epsilon$  gives

$$\frac{\langle J \rangle}{k_0} \simeq a\epsilon - b\eta\epsilon + c\eta\epsilon^2, \quad (22)$$

where

$$a = \frac{1}{31\sqrt{62}}, \quad b = \frac{4\sqrt{62}}{31} - 1, \quad c = \frac{1}{31\sqrt{62}}. \quad (23)$$

This approximate analytical form of the pumping current is plotted together with the numerically calculated current in Fig. 6 for low modulation frequencies. Upon computing higher order terms, we found that the  $\eta^2\epsilon^2$ -term vanishes, so to improve the above approximation, we would need to compute the  $O(\epsilon^3)$ -terms. However, as seen from Fig. 2, the peak of the pumping current occurs at frequencies too high to be captured by this perturbative approach, so adding higher order terms in  $\epsilon$  does not give further physical insight.

Taking the adiabatic limit of Eq. (22), we find

$$\langle J \rangle \simeq \left[ \frac{1}{31\sqrt{62}} - \left( \frac{4\sqrt{62}}{31} - 1 \right) \eta \right] \Omega. \quad (24)$$

This means that for sufficiently large  $\eta$ , memory effects lead to negative currents, even in the adiabatic limit. Let us explore this behavior quantitatively. From the above expression we see that the current for slow modulation becomes negative when

$$\tau > \tau_c := \frac{a}{bk_0} = \frac{1}{248 - 31\sqrt{62}} \frac{1}{k_0} \approx 0.256 \frac{1}{k_0}, \quad (25)$$

which is indeed confirmed by Fig. 7. It is further seen




FIG. 7. Plot of the nontrivial solution of  $\langle J \rangle = 0$  for a range of different values of  $\eta$  (dots) obtained numerically. It was found that  $\eta_c = (0.2565 \pm 0.0005)$ . The analytical low frequency approximation, Eqn. (26), is also plotted (line).




FIG. 8. A plot of the value of the peak current,  $\langle J \rangle_{\max}$  as a function of  $\eta$ , obtained by numerically solving Eq. (B8) (dots) and by Riccati perturbation theory to first order in  $\eta$  (line).

that the frequency at which the pumping current vanishes, denoted by  $\Omega_0$ , is given in the adiabatic limit by

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_0 &\simeq -\frac{a}{c} \frac{1}{\tau} + \frac{b}{c} k_0 \\ &= -\frac{1}{\tau} + (248 - 31\sqrt{62})k_0 \approx -\frac{1}{\tau} + 3.096k_0, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

which is also plotted in Fig. 7. It is clear that our analytic theory captures the onset of negative current and the behavior around this critical point (Fig. 7).

Numerical calculations of the location of the peak value of  $\langle J \rangle$ , denoted by  $\langle J \rangle_{\max}$ , and peak frequency, denoted by  $\Omega_{\max}$ , as functions of  $\eta$  are shown in Figs. 8 and 9, respectively. Due to the peak occurring at  $\epsilon > 1$ , accurate




FIG. 9. A plot of the frequency  $\Omega_{\max}$  at which the current attains its peak value,  $\langle J \rangle_{\max}$ , as a function of  $\eta$ , obtained by numerically solving Eq. (B8) (dots) and by Riccati perturbation theory to first order in  $\eta$  (line).

analytical expressions for the peak height or position cannot be obtained with the present approach for any of the  $\eta$ -values considered here. Instead, to investigate the validity of Riccati perturbation theory on its own, plots of  $\Omega_{\max}$  and  $\langle J \rangle_{\max}$  to first order in  $\eta$  obtained by numerical integration of Eq. (18) are shown. It is seen that in both cases, perturbation theory works well for  $\eta \lesssim 0.05$ . In this region the maximum current can be approximately expressed as  $\langle J \rangle_{\max} \approx 0.033\eta + 0.0079$ , as shown in Fig. 8. We note that in addition to increasing monotonically with  $\eta$ ,  $\langle J \rangle_{\max}$  seems to behave linearly even for high  $\eta$ . This implies that  $O(\eta)$  perturbation theory may be used to obtain accurate results even in this regime, although the simple perturbation theory cannot capture this behavior. We also see from Fig. 9 that, while the position of the current peak initially shifts to higher frequencies as  $\eta$  is increased, for larger memory parameters, it decreases with increasing  $\eta$ .

#### IV. DISCUSSION

The most striking features of the non-Markovian pumping current obtained above are (i) significant increase in the height of the peak current even for relatively short relaxation times, and (ii) appearance of negative pumping currents at low modulation frequencies when the memory time is sufficiently long.

In contrast to the increase in the value of the peak current brought about by the finite memory time, the non-Markovian effect on the pumping current in the adiabatic limit is to decrease it, even to negative values for sufficiently large  $\eta$ . This is not entirely unprecedented however: there has been a recent report of non-Markovian effects leading to reversed spin current [37]. It would be interesting to explore the connection between the two

findings further.

It has been previously shown that in a limited sense, a geometrical formulation of the pumping current is possible even beyond the adiabatic limit in the Markovian case [23]. While the perturbative approach presented in this paper successfully describes the behavior of the pumping current for short relaxation times, or small  $\eta$ , and facilitates computation of correction terms to arbitrary order in the modulation frequency, it does not admit such a geometrical interpretation. However, it seems possible, at least in the adiabatic limit, to apply the eigenvector decomposition method of Ref. [23] to Eq. (8). Nevertheless, when going beyond the adiabatic limit, the calculations using the eigenvector decomposition become lengthy, so from a practical viewpoint, the perturbation theory of the present paper is easier and faster to use. Furthermore, the presence of an exceptional point in the non-Markovian case may result in additional complications when calculating the higher-order corrections. Indeed, detailed analysis of this problem is one of our future goals.

## V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, the Sinitsyn-Nemenman (SN) model, a periodically modulated two-state system, was generalized to include memory effects. It was shown that this non-Markovian SN model, governed by a non-Markovian master equation (nMME) which includes a time convolution integral, can be reduced to a single time-local ordinary differential equation. Thus a method of solving the system dynamics at least numerically without needing to resort to any perturbative expansions was presented, yielding an approach to deal with this type of nMMEs which is in principle exact. In addition to solving the governing ODE of the model numerically, a perturbative approach utilizing Riccati theory was also presented. The pumping current of this system was computed, analyzed, and compared with the Markovian pumping current. It was found that the pumping current is greatly amplified by the presence of memory effects for moderate modulation frequencies, while at low frequencies negative currents are observed for sufficiently large memory times.

Prospects of further research into this problem include the following: exploration of the possibility of a geometrical formulation of the non-Markovian pumping current; detailed microscopic derivation of the nMME in the framework of the present model; studying how the fluctuation theorem is affected by memory effects; applying the method developed here to periodically driven quantum mechanical models. In particular, it would be interesting to see whether the dynamically modelled environment could be interpreted as the diagonal part of the density matrix of a two-state quantum system, thus leading to a connection between quantum coherence and non-Markovian time evolution.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Kazutaka Takahashi, Kazunari Hashimoto, Yuki Hino, and Hiroyasu Tajima for fruitful discussions. This work is partially supported by a Japanese Government (Monbukagakusho: MEXT) scholarship and ISHIZUE 2020 of Kyoto University Research Development Program.

## Appendix A: Markovian SN Model

In this Appendix, further details regarding the Markovian SN model will be presented. Firstly, we note here that while the notation is that of chemical reaction kinetics, this description of a two-state system is general, and can be applied to many quantum systems. Provided there is no coupling between the diagonal and off-diagonal elements of the density matrix, the full quantum ME reduces to an equation exactly in the form of Eq. (1), where the components of  $\mathbf{p}^{(0)}(t)$  are given by the diagonal elements of the density matrix. For example, in the case of the spin-boson model, the rate coefficients are given in terms of the equilibrium Bose distributions of the reservoirs: [22]

$$\begin{aligned} k_{\text{in}}^{\text{L}}(t) &= \gamma_{\text{L}}(t)n_{\text{L}}(t), \\ k_{\text{in}}^{\text{R}}(t) &= \gamma_{\text{R}}(t)n_{\text{R}}(t), \\ k_{\text{in}}^{\text{L}}(t) &= \gamma_{\text{L}}(t)[1 + n_{\text{L}}(t)], \\ k_{\text{in}}^{\text{R}}(t) &= \gamma_{\text{R}}(t)[1 + n_{\text{R}}(t)], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where the  $\gamma$  factors express the coupling strengths of the reservoirs. In the case of bosons, each  $n$  is given as

$$\begin{aligned} n_{\text{L}}(t) &= \frac{1}{e^{\beta_{\text{L}}(t)\hbar\omega_0} - 1}, \\ n_{\text{R}}(t) &= \frac{1}{e^{\beta_{\text{R}}(t)\hbar\omega_0} - 1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

where  $\beta^{\text{L}}(t)$  and  $\beta^{\text{R}}(t)$  are the (possibly time-dependent) inverse temperatures of the left and the right reservoir, respectively.

Now turning to the Markovian SN model, the method of full counting statistics [38] can be used to obtain the generating function of the pumping current, which gives access to all of its moments. For the first moment, or the average current, FCS gives the intuitively obvious expression [19]

$$\begin{aligned} J(t) &= k_{\text{out}}^{\text{R}}(t)[1 - p_0(t)] - k_{\text{in}}^{\text{R}}(t)p_1^{(0)}(t) \\ &= k_{\text{out}}^{\text{R}}(t) - [k_{\text{in}}^{\text{R}}(t) + k_{\text{out}}^{\text{R}}(t)]p_1^{(0)}(t), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

where the first term on the first line gives the flux into the right reservoir, while the second term corresponds to the flux flowing out of the right reservoir. However, we are interested in transport phenomena under periodic modulation, so the quantity of interest is not the current



itself but rather its average value over a full cycle, which is given by

$$\langle J \rangle = \frac{2\pi}{\Omega} \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + \frac{2\pi}{\Omega}} J(t) dt, \quad (\text{A4})$$

as was already noted in the main text. It can be shown using the method of Shortcuts to Adiabaticity [39] that this current can be split into three components as follows: [23]

$$\langle J \rangle = \langle J_d \rangle + \langle J_g \rangle = \langle J_d \rangle + \langle J_{\text{ad}} \rangle + \langle J_{\text{nad}} \rangle, \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$\langle J_d \rangle = \frac{2\pi}{\Omega} \int_0^{\frac{2\pi}{\Omega}} \frac{k_{\text{in}}^{\text{L}}(t)k_{\text{out}}^{\text{R}}(t) - k_{\text{out}}^{\text{L}}(t)k_{\text{in}}^{\text{R}}(t)}{k_{\text{in}}(t) + k_{\text{out}}(t)} dt, \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$\langle J_{\text{ad}} \rangle = \frac{2\pi}{\Omega} \int_0^{\frac{2\pi}{\Omega}} \frac{k_{\text{out}}^{\text{R}}(t) + k_{\text{in}}^{\text{R}}(t)}{k_{\text{in}}(t) + k_{\text{out}}(t)} \dot{w}(t) dt, \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$\langle J_{\text{nad}} \rangle = \lim_{t_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2\pi}{\Omega} \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + \frac{2\pi}{\Omega}} \frac{k_{\text{out}}^{\text{R}}(t) + k_{\text{in}}^{\text{R}}(t)}{k_{\text{in}}(t) + k_{\text{out}}(t)} \dot{\delta}(t) dt, \quad (\text{A8})$$

where

$$w(t) := \frac{k_{\text{out}}}{k_{\text{in}}(t) + k_{\text{out}}(t)}, \quad (\text{A9})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(t) &:= -e^{-\int_0^t ds [k_{\text{in}}(s) + k_{\text{out}}(s)]} \\ &\times \int_0^t e^{-\int_0^s ds' [k_{\text{in}}(s') + k_{\text{out}}(s')]} \dot{w}(s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A10})$$

The first, so-called dynamical term, vanishes in the absence of net parameter bias, while the remaining two terms are the origin of the pumping current in the absence of average bias. The second, adiabatic term gives the current in the limit of slow modulation. It can be expressed solely in terms of geometrical quantities of the parameter manifold, whence the name ‘geometrical’. The third term is the correction to the adiabatic term in the non-adiabatic regime of finite modulation speed.

Finally we note here that the Markovian ME, Eq. (1), can be solved analytically. Due to conservation of probability, this system of equations decouples, giving

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{p}_1^{(0)}(t) &= k_{\text{out}}(t) - [k_{\text{in}}(t) + k_{\text{out}}(t)]p_1^{(0)}(t) \\ &:= k_{\text{out}}(t) - k(t)p_1^{(0)}(t), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A11})$$

which can indeed be solved exactly using an integrating factor.

## Appendix B: Equivalent forms of the non-Markovian Master Equation

Here we outline the procedure to reduce Eq. (8) to a single scalar second order ODE. First, differentiating the second equation in Eq. (8), and substituting for  $\dot{\mathbf{p}}$  from the first one, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tau \ddot{\mathbf{q}} &= -\dot{\mathbf{q}} + \dot{\mathbf{p}} \\ &= -\dot{\mathbf{q}} + W(t)\mathbf{q}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B1})$$

Noting that the structure of the transition matrix is assumed to be

$$W(t) = \begin{bmatrix} -k_{\text{in}}(t) & k_{\text{out}}(t) \\ k_{\text{in}}(t) & -k_{\text{out}}(t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{B2})$$

the equations (B1) can be written out explicitly as

$$\tau \ddot{q}_1 + \dot{q}_1 + k_{\text{in}}(t)q_1 - k_{\text{out}}(t)q_2 = 0, \quad (\text{B3})$$

$$\tau \ddot{q}_2 + \dot{q}_2 - k_{\text{in}}(t)q_1 + k_{\text{out}}(t)q_2 = 0, \quad (\text{B4})$$

and are easily decoupled by considering the sum and the difference of the two components of  $\mathbf{q}(t)$ . First, taking the sum  $\Sigma(t) := q_1 + q_2$ , we obtain

$$\tau \ddot{\Sigma} + \dot{\Sigma} = 0, \quad (\text{B5})$$

which is readily solved by

$$\Sigma(t) = C_2 e^{-t/\tau} + \int_0^t ds C_1 e^{-\frac{t-s}{\tau}}, \quad (\text{B6})$$

where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are constants of integration. We can choose the initial condition  $q_1(0) = q_2(0) = 0$ , which means that  $\tau[\dot{q}_1(0) + \dot{q}_2(0)] = [p_1(0) + p_2(0)] = 1$ , and further that  $\tau[\dot{q}_2(0) - \dot{q}_1(0)] = p_2(0) - p_1(0) = 1 - 2p_1(0)$ . Thus requiring  $\Sigma(0) = q_1(0) + q_2(0) = 0$  and  $\tau\dot{\Sigma}(0) = p_1(0) + p_2(0) = 1$  (conservation of probability), we obtain

$$\Sigma(t) = (1 - e^{-t/\tau}). \quad (\text{B7})$$

Next, considering the difference  $\Delta(t) := q_2 - q_1$ , we obtain

$$\tau \ddot{\Delta} + \dot{\Delta} + [k_{\text{out}}(t) + k_{\text{in}}(t)]\Delta + [k_{\text{out}}(t) - k_{\text{in}}(t)]\Sigma = 0, \quad (\text{B8})$$

which, together with the initial conditions  $\Delta(0) = 0$  and  $\dot{\Delta}(0) = [1 - 2p_1(0)]/\tau$ , can easily be solved numerically.

## Appendix C: Behavior of the non-Markovian probability

In this section we explore the time dependence of the non-Markovian probability and demonstrate that it remains non-negative for the parameter ranges used in this paper. Indeed, in Ref. [27], where a similar form of nMME was discussed, it was shown that a bound for the memory length exists to guarantee the non-negativity of the probability. However, due to the differences in the detailed form of the time convolution, we do not expect this result to be valid for our model.

Note that due to the form of  $W$ ,  $p_1(t) + p_2(t) = 1$  for all  $t$ , as can be seen from the first equation in Eq. (8), so for the state vector  $\mathbf{p}(t)$  to remain non-negative, it is sufficient to show that  $0 \leq p_1(t) \leq 1$ .

We begin by presenting an estimation of the magnitude of the maximum and minimum values of  $p_1(t)$  to support the numerical calculations shown in the plots below. In






FIG. 10. Plot of the time dependence of  $\Delta(t)$  for different values of the memory parameter  $\eta$ , with modulation frequency  $\epsilon = 3$ .




FIG. 11. Plot of the time dependence of  $p_1(t)$  for different values of the memory parameter  $\eta$ , with modulation frequency  $\epsilon = 3$ .

terms of the quantities introduced in Appendix B, the probability  $p_1(t)$  is given as

$$p_1(t) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \left[ \tau \dot{\Delta}(t) + \Delta(t) \right]. \quad (\text{C1})$$

We are interested in the maximum and minimum values of this probability, given by

$$\frac{1}{2} - \Delta_{\max} \leq p_1(t) \leq \frac{1}{2} - \Delta_{\min}, \quad (\text{C2})$$

since at the extrema we must have  $\dot{\Delta} = 0$ . At an extremum of  $\Delta$ , denoted by subscript ex below, from Eq. (B8) we must also have

$$\tau \ddot{\Delta}_{\text{ex}} + [k_{\text{out}}(t_{\text{ex}}) + k_{\text{in}}(t_{\text{ex}})] \Delta_{\text{ex}} + k_{\text{out}}(t_{\text{ex}}) - k_{\text{in}}(t_{\text{ex}}) = 0, \quad (\text{C3})$$




FIG. 12. Diagram showing the parameter range of the dimensionless memory parameter  $\eta$  and the dimensionless frequency  $\epsilon$  for which the non-Markovian probability remains positive (red dots) and attains negative values (blue crosses).

for sufficiently large times. Rescaling time as  $\tilde{t} := t/\tau$ , this can be rewritten as

$$\Delta_{\text{ex}} = -\frac{k_{\text{out}}(\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}}) - k_{\text{in}}(\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}})}{k_{\text{out}}(\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}}) + k_{\text{in}}(\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}})} - \frac{d^2 \Delta(\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}}) / d\tilde{t}^2}{\tau [k_{\text{out}}(\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}}) + k_{\text{in}}(\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}})]}. \quad (\text{C4})$$

Since  $\Delta(t)$  obeys a sinusoidally driven ODE, we may assume that  $\Delta(\tilde{t})$  also has a sinusoidal form, with a slowly modulated amplitude:

$$\Delta(\tilde{t}) = A(\epsilon^\alpha \tilde{t}) \sin(\Omega \tau \tilde{t} + \varphi), \quad (\text{C5})$$

where  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\varphi$  is an arbitrary phase shift. Differentiating twice, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2 \Delta}{d\tilde{t}^2} &= [\epsilon^{2\alpha} A'' - (\eta \epsilon)^2 A] \sin(\Omega \tau \tilde{t} + \varphi) \\ &\quad - 2\eta \epsilon^{\alpha+1} A' \cos(\Omega \tau \tilde{t} + \varphi) \\ &= -(\eta \epsilon)^2 \Delta(\tilde{t}) + O(\epsilon^{\alpha+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C6})$$

Hence, up to  $O(\epsilon^\alpha)$ , we have

$$\Delta_{\text{ex}} \simeq -\frac{k_{\text{out}}(\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}}) - k_{\text{in}}(\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}})}{k_{\text{out}}(\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}}) + k_{\text{in}}(\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}})} + \eta \epsilon^2 \frac{\Delta_{\text{ex}} k_0}{k_{\text{out}}(\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}}) + k_{\text{in}}(\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}})}, \quad (\text{C7})$$

or

$$\Delta_{\text{ex}} \simeq -\frac{k_{\text{out}}(\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}}) - k_{\text{in}}(\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}})}{k_{\text{out}}(\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}}) + k_{\text{in}}(\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}})} \left[ 1 - \frac{\eta \epsilon^2 k_0}{k_{\text{out}}(\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}}) + k_{\text{in}}(\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}})} \right]^{-1} \quad (\text{C8})$$

Considering our choice of modulation protocol as given in Eq. (10), we see that  $k(t) = 4k_0 + \frac{k_0}{\sqrt{2}} \cos(\Omega t - \pi/4)$ , so that

$$-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{8 - \sqrt{2}} \leq \frac{k_{\text{out}} - k_{\text{in}}}{k_{\text{out}} + k_{\text{in}}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{8 + \sqrt{2}} \quad (\text{C9})$$

and

$$\frac{1}{4k_0 + k_0/\sqrt{2}} \leq \frac{1}{k_{\text{out}} + k_{\text{in}}} \leq \frac{1}{4k_0 - k_0/\sqrt{2}}. \quad (\text{C10})$$

Thus,  $\Delta$  can be bounded as

$$\Delta_{\text{min}} \leq \Delta(t) \leq \Delta_{\text{max}}, \quad (\text{C11})$$

where

$$\Delta_{\text{min}} := -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{8 - \sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{1 - \eta\epsilon^2/(4 - 1/\sqrt{2})} \quad (\text{C12})$$

and

$$\Delta_{\text{max}} := \frac{\sqrt{2}}{8 + \sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{1 - \eta\epsilon^2/(4 - 1/\sqrt{2})} \quad (\text{C13})$$

Hence, for the probability we have

$$\frac{1}{2} - \Delta_{\text{max}} \leq p_1(t) \leq \frac{1}{2} - \Delta_{\text{min}}, \quad (\text{C14})$$

so we see that  $0 \leq p_1 \leq 1$  at least when  $\epsilon$  and  $\eta$  are relatively small, or more precisely, when  $\eta\epsilon^2 < 1.88$ . A restriction of this type is expected, since in Eq. (C6) higher order terms in  $\epsilon$  were neglected.

To support the above calculation, the time dependence of  $\Delta(t)$  and  $p_1(t)$  for a range of memory parameter values is shown for modulation frequency  $\epsilon := \Omega/k_0 = 3$  in Figs. 10 and 11, respectively. The initial probability was set to  $p_1(0) = 0.1$ , a value far from the steady state, to demonstrate the rapidity of the initial relaxation. It is indeed seen that the positivity of the probability holds for a wider range of parameter values than the above estimation would suggest, for in the case of  $\epsilon = 3$ , obtaining  $\eta\epsilon^2 < 1.88$  would require  $\eta < 0.21$ . However, it is clearly seen from Fig. 11 that even when  $\eta = 0.6$ , giving  $\eta\epsilon^2 = 5.4$ , the probability remains positive. For brevity, we have provided only the  $\epsilon = 3$  plots as a representative example here, but the numerical calculations were performed a large range of parameter values. The results of these calculations are summarized in Fig. 12, which shows which parameter values yield completely positive time evolution of  $p_1(t)$  (red dots) and which do not (blue crosses). We see that, indeed, since all the calculations considered in this paper were for  $\eta \leq 0.6$ , the probabilities remain positive for all frequencies, thus proving the physical validity of the model. Furthermore, we see that it would in fact have been safe to use considerably higher values of  $\eta$  than the values we used in this study.

#### Appendix D: Modulation phase dependence of the Markovian pumping current

Here we investigate the dependence of the Markovian pumping current on the relative phase difference between




FIG. 13. Plot of the pumping current  $\langle J \rangle$  as a function of modulation frequency  $\epsilon$  for different values of modulation phase difference  $\phi$ , for the Markovian SN model.

the left and right reservoirs. Hence, let us consider a modified modulation protocol

$$\begin{aligned} k_{\text{in}}^{\text{L}}(t) &= k_0(1 + \frac{1}{2} \cos \Omega t), \\ k_{\text{in}}^{\text{R}}(t) &= k_0[1 + \frac{1}{2} \cos(\Omega t - \phi)], \\ k_{\text{out}}^{\text{L}}(t) &= k_0, \\ k_{\text{out}}^{\text{R}}(t) &= k_0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D1})$$

The result of using this protocol with different values of the phase  $\phi$  is shown in Fig. 13. It is readily seen that, as expected based on the arguments in the main text, the geometrical current vanishes in the absence of phase difference, gradually increases as  $\phi$  is increased, and reaches a maximal value at  $\phi = \pi/2$ , which corresponds to the original protocol used in this paper.

#### Appendix E: Riccati Theory

Here the Riccati analysis of a singular perturbative system is summarized [40]. Let us consider a general system of the form

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{x}} &= A(t)\mathbf{x} + B(t)\mathbf{y}, \\ \eta\dot{\mathbf{y}} &= C(t)\mathbf{x} + D(t)\mathbf{y}, \end{cases} \quad (\text{E1})$$

where  $\eta$  is small and  $D(t)$  is negative definite and invertible. Comparing Eq. (8) and Eq. (E1), we see that  $A(t) = 0$ ,  $B(t) = W(t)$ ,  $C(t) = k_0$  and  $D(t) = -k_0$ . We also note here that when we set  $\eta$  to zero, we obtain

$$\mathbf{y}^{(0)}(t) = -D^{-1}C\mathbf{y}^{(0)}(t), \quad (\text{E2})$$

and

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}^{(0)} = (A - BD^{-1}C)\mathbf{x}^{(0)}. \quad (\text{E3})$$

We expect the solution to have a fast, decaying part and a slow part which gives the limit cycle of the system. Based on this, we attempt a transformation to new variables, one purely slow and one purely fast:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v} &= \mathbf{y} + L(t)\mathbf{x}, \\ \mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{x} + \eta H(t)\mathbf{v}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{E4})$$

Requiring that  $\mathbf{v}$  and  $\mathbf{u}$  be given by

$$\eta \dot{\mathbf{v}} = (D + \eta LB)\mathbf{v}, \quad (\text{E5})$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}} = (A - BL)\mathbf{u}, \quad (\text{E6})$$

i.e., requiring that  $\mathbf{v}$  be purely fast and  $\mathbf{u}$  purely slow, results in the matrix Riccati equation for  $L$ ,

$$\eta \dot{L} = DL - \eta LA + \eta LBL - C, \quad (\text{E7})$$

and the following analogous equation for  $H$ :

$$\eta \dot{H} = -H(D + \eta LB) + \eta(A - BL)H - B. \quad (\text{E8})$$

It can indeed be shown that as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{u}$ , so if we are interested in the long time behavior, we only need to solve for  $\mathbf{u}$ . Expanding  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $L$  in a perturbation series,

$$\mathbf{u}(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{u}^{(n)}(t)\eta^n, \quad (\text{E9})$$

$$L(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} L^{(n)}(t)\eta^n, \quad (\text{E10})$$

we obtain the following recursion relations:

$$O(\eta^0): \quad DL^{(0)} = C, \quad (\text{E11})$$

$$O(\eta^n), n > 0: \quad DL^{(n)} = \dot{L}^{(n-1)} + L^{(n-1)}A - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} L^{(k)}BL^{(n-1-k)}, \quad (\text{E12})$$

$$O(\eta^0): \quad \mathbf{u}^{(0)}(t) = \mathbf{x}^{(0)}(t), \quad (\text{E13})$$

$$O(\eta^n), n > 0: \quad \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{(n)} = (A - BD^{-1}C)\mathbf{u}^{(n)} - B \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} L^{(n-k)}\mathbf{u}^{(k)}. \quad (\text{E14})$$

In the case of the non-Markovian SN model, we are only interested in the limit cycle of  $\mathbf{p}(t)$ , which is given by  $\mathbf{u}(t)$  in the notation of this section, so we only need to compute  $L$  and solve for  $\mathbf{u}$  to the desired accuracy.

## Appendix F: Simple Perturbation Expansion for First Order ODEs

Let us derive a simple perturbative expansion for the ODE

$$\epsilon x'(\theta) = f(\theta)x(\theta) + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} g_m(\theta)\epsilon^m, \quad (\text{F1})$$

where  $\epsilon$  is small. We first expand

$$x(\theta) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} x_m(\theta)\epsilon^m. \quad (\text{F2})$$

Substituting this into the ODE gives the simple recursion relation

$$m = 0: \quad x_0 = -\frac{g_0}{f}, \quad (\text{F3})$$

$$m > 0: \quad x_m = \frac{x'_{m-1} - g_m}{f}. \quad (\text{F4})$$

This is the expansion used for obtaining the low frequency expressions presented in Sec. III.

- 
- [1] C. Gardiner, *Stochastic Methods: A Handbook for the Natural and Social Sciences*, Springer Series in Synergetics (Springer, Berlin, 2009).
- [2] R. Kubo, The fluctuation-dissipation theorem, Rep. Prog. Phys. **29**, 255 (1966).
- [3] V. M. Kenkre, E. W. Montroll, and M. F. Shlesinger, Generalized master equations for continuous-time random walks, J. Stat. Phys. **9**, 45 (1973).
- [4] D. Campos and V. Méndez, Recurrence time correlations in random walks with preferential relocation to visited places, Phys. Rev. E **99**, 062137 (2019).
- [5] G. Clos and H.-P. Breuer, Quantification of memory effects in the spin-boson model, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 012115 (2012).
- [6] H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, J. Piilo, and B. Vacchini, Colloquium: Non-markovian dynamics in open quantum systems, Rev. Mod. Phys. **88**, 021002 (2016).
- [7] H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, and J. Piilo, Measure for the degree of non-markovian behavior of quantum processes in open systems, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 210401 (2009).
- [8] S. Press, J. Peterson, J. Lee, P. Elms, J. L. MacCallum, S. Marqusee, C. Bustamante, and K. Dill, Single molecule conformational memory extraction: P5ab rna hairpin, J. Phys. Chem. B **118**, 6597 (2014).
- [9] B.-H. Liu, L. Li, Y.-F. Huang, C.-F. Li, G.-C. Guo, E.-M. Laine, H.-P. Breuer, and J. Piilo, Experimental control of the transition from markovian to non-markovian dynamics of openquantumsystems, Nat. Phys. **7** (2011).
- [10] M. Gessner, M. Ramm, T. Pruttivarasin, A. Buchleitner, H.-P. Breuer, and H. Hffner, Local detection of quantum correlations with a single trapped ion, Nat. Phys. **10** (2013).

- [11] D. J. Thouless, Quantization of particle transport, *Phys. Rev. B* **27**, 6083 (1983).
- [12] M. V. Berry, Quantal phase factors accompanying adiabatic changes, *Proc. Roy. Soc. London, Series A* **392**, 45 (1984).
- [13] N. A. Sinitsyn and I. Nemenman, The berry phase and the pump flux in stochastic chemical kinetics, *EPL* **77**, 58001 (2007).
- [14] N. A. Sinitsyn and I. Nemenman, Universal geometric theory of mesoscopic stochastic pumps and reversible ratchets, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 220408 (2007).
- [15] J. Ren, P. Hänggi, and B. Li, Berry-phase-induced heat pumping and its impact on the fluctuation theorem, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 170601 (2010).
- [16] T. Yuge, T. Sagawa, A. Sugita, and H. Hayakawa, Geometrical pumping in quantum transport: Quantum master equation approach, *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 235308 (2012).
- [17] T. Sagawa and H. Hayakawa, Geometrical expression of excess entropy production, *Phys. Rev. E* **84**, 051110 (2011).
- [18] T. Yuge, T. Sagawa, A. Sugita, and H. Hayakawa, Geometrical excess entropy production in nonequilibrium quantum systems, *J. Stat. Phys.* **153**, 412 (2013).
- [19] K. L. Watanabe and H. Hayakawa, Non-adiabatic effect in quantum pumping for a spin-boson system, *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys.* **2014**, 113A01 (2014).
- [20] C. Uchiyama, Nonadiabatic effect on the quantum heat flux control, *Phys. Rev. E* **89**, 052108 (2014).
- [21] K. L. Watanabe and H. Hayakawa, Geometric fluctuation theorem for a spin-boson system, *Phys. Rev. E* **96**, 022118 (2017).
- [22] Y. Hino and H. Hayakawa, Fluctuation relations for adiabatic pumping, *Phys. Rev. E* **102**, 012115 (2020).
- [23] K. Takahashi, K. Fujii, Y. Hino, and H. Hayakawa, Nonadiabatic control of geometric pumping, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 150602 (2020).
- [24] K. Fujii, H. Hayakawa, Y. Hino, and K. Takahashi, Full counting statistics and fluctuation-dissipation relation for periodically driven systems (2020), arXiv:2003.11935.
- [25] I. Goychuk, Viscoelastic subdiffusion: From anomalous to normal, *Phys. Rev. E* **80**, 046125 (2009).
- [26] R. Kupferman, Fractional kinetics in kaczwanzig heat bath models, *J. Stat. Phys.* **114**, 291 (2004).
- [27] A. A. Budini, Stochastic representation of a class of non-markovian completely positive evolutions, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 042107 (2004).
- [28] F. Cavaliere, M. Governale, and J. König, Nonadiabatic pumping through interacting quantum dots, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 136801 (2009).
- [29] H. Breuer, F. Petruccione, and S. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, London, 2002).
- [30] S. Nakajima, On Quantum Theory of Transport Phenomena: Steady Diffusion, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **20**, 948 (1958).
- [31] R. Zwanzig, Ensemble method in the theory of irreversibility, *J. Chem. Phys.* **33**, 1338 (1960).
- [32] S. Chaturvedi and F. Shibata, Time-convolutionless projection operator formalism for elimination of fast variables. applications to brownian motion, *Zeit. Phys. B* **35**, 297 (1979).
- [33] F. Shibata, Y. Takahashi, and N. Hashitsume, A generalized stochastic liouville equation. non-markovian versus memoryless master equations, *J. Stat. Phys.* **17**, 171 (1977).
- [34] F. Shibata and T. Arimitsu, Expansion formulas in nonequilibrium statistical mechanics, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **49**, 891 (1980).
- [35] C. Timm, Time-convolutionless master equation for quantum dots: Perturbative expansion to arbitrary order, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 115416 (2011).
- [36] D. R. Smith, Decoupling and order reduction via the riccati transformation, *SIAM Review* **29**, 91 (1987).
- [37] K. Hashimoto, G. Tatara, and C. Uchiyama, Spin backflow: A non-markovian effect on spin pumping, *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 205304 (2019).
- [38] M. Esposito, U. Harbola, and S. Mukamel, Nonequilibrium fluctuations, fluctuation theorems, and counting statistics in quantum systems, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 1665 (2009).
- [39] D. Guéry-Odelin, A. Ruschhaupt, A. Kiely, E. Torrontegui, S. Martínez-Garaot, and J. G. Muga, Shortcuts to adiabaticity: Concepts, methods, and applications, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **91**, 045001 (2019).
- [40] J. Robert E., *Singular Perturbation Methods for Ordinary Differential Equations*, Springer Series in Applied Mathematical Sciences (Springer, Berlin, 2013).