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Environment-assisted quantum transport (ENAQT) is a unique situation where environmental noise can, counterintuitively, enhance the transport of an open quantum system. In this Letter, we investigate how the presence of a one-dimensional single-particle mobility edge can generate strong ENAQT. For this purpose, we study the energy current of a generalized Aubry-André-Harper (AAH) tight binding model coupled at its edges to spin baths of differing temperature and dephasing noise along the system. We find that the ENAQT increases by orders of magnitude and depends on the number of localized eigenstates and disorder strength nonmonotonically. We show that this enhancement is the result of the cooperation between population uniformization and localization.

Introduction.—Understanding and controlling the quantum transport of charge and energy are at the forefront of research in the field of quantum chemistry and thermodynamics. One particular phenomenon which has attracted considerable attention, both theoretically [1–13] and experimentally [14–18], are the environment-assisted quantum transport (ENAQT) where moderate dephasing noise can enhance transport efficiency. Fueled by the quest for sustainable energy, several studies has exploited the potential benefit from the interplay between coherence and dissipation in quantum devices such as to enhance the power of solar cells or quantum heat engines [19–22]. These operation devices may rely on mobility edge, which is the energy threshold separating the localized and extended wavefunctions in a lattice. However, the effect of mobility edge to ENAQT is far from clear.

ENAQT may be explained by different mechanisms: initially its origin is understood from the destruction of Anderson localization [23]—which hinders transport—by dephasing in disordered systems [1–4, 24] such as in photosynthetic complexes [24–40], in which the role of quantum effects is currently under debate. In this context, ENAQT attempts to elucidate the subject. Yet, it persists even in ordered systems, where localization does not play role, and in fact it is impossible only for transport in ordered chains [6]. Thus, it relies on beneficial competition between coherent and incoherent dynamics which results in higher population entering the sink. In some specific cases, momentum rejuvenation [7], line-broadening [8], and superradiance [35] may additionally explain the high efficiency. Moreover, exposing the system to a periodic driving may increase the efficiency even further [11, 12]. It is only revealed recently that the uniformity of steady state population plays more universal role in ENAQT [10]. Dephasing noise leads to decoherence in site basis, which in turn reduces fluctuation and thereby uniformize the population and brings more particle to the sink. For end-to-end transport, the population spread is already maximized; dephasing will only reduce the current unless static disorder or localized eigenstate exists.

The interesting consequence of Anderson localization is the quantum phase transition between extended (metallic) and localized (insulating) states as a function of disorder strength. In one and two dimensions, all eigenstates are localized for a random (uncorrelated) disorder of any strength independent of energy while in three dimensions the localization transition occur in a critical disorder strength forming a sharp mobility edge. Yet if we replace the random disorder with a quasiperiodic potential such as the paradigmatic Aubry-André-Harper (AAH) model [41, 42], which has been realized in recent ultracold atom experiments with interacting and noninteracting particles [43–45], the localization transition occurs even in one dimension. Interestingly, by introducing nonlocal hopping terms or deforming the on-site potential, the model can manifest an exact mobility edge [10–49].

In this Letter, we show that a model with single particle mobility edge (SPME) can manifest a strong ENAQT, measured by comparing the energy current to the one without dephasing. Note that we do not intend to extend the understanding of the biological light harvesting in vivo. Instead, we aim to demonstrate the transport enhancement brought by ME, which may be implemented in state-of-the-art experiments. We investigate the role of population uniformization mechanism together with the ME localization parameters to the ENAQT. We will show that the maximum ENAQT varies nonmonotonically with the ME deformation parameter and disorder strength. The enhancement also can be tuned further by varying the phase and the dephasing temperature. To isolate the ENAQT from the enhancement due to interference effects at the exit site, we consider an end-to-end transport.

Model.—We study a one-dimensional generalized AAH (GAAH) model [49] of N bosonic modes with nearest-neighbor hopping described by the Hamiltonian

\[
H_S = -t \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (a_n^\dagger a_{n+1} + \text{H.c.}) + \sum_{n=1}^{N} V_n a_n^\dagger a_n, \tag{1}
\]

\[a_n^\dagger a_n \quad \text{and} \quad a_n^\dagger a_{n+1} \]
where $a_n(a_n^\dagger)$ is the usual bosonic annihilation (creation) operator at site $n$, $t$ is the tunneling rate, which sets our energy unit. We consider zero and single-excitation manifolds given by the states $|0\rangle$ and $|n\rangle = a_n^\dagger|0\rangle$, so that the local modes $a_n = |0\rangle/|n\rangle$. The on-site potential is

$$V_n = \Lambda + 2\lambda - \cos(2\pi \beta n + \phi),$$

(2)

Here $\lambda$ sets the average disorder strength and the offset is chosen to be $\Lambda = 2$ to avoid negative eigenvalues. We consider the mobility edge parameter $\alpha \in (-1, 1)$, which can be tuned to represent several limiting cases: $\alpha = -1$ corresponds to an ordered chain, $\alpha = 0$ is the original (scaled) AAH model, and $\alpha = 1$ contains singular potential. We set $\beta = (\sqrt{2} - 1)/2$ for a quasiperiodic modulation. This model has a SPME at $E_{\text{ME}} = 2\text{sgn}(\lambda)|\langle l | - |l\rangle|/\alpha + \Lambda$. In the following, we use units for which $h = k_B = 1$, and $t = 1$ as the unit of energy.

The chain is coupled to two different environments: pair of thermal baths of noninteracting spins $|\sigma_{\mu,i}\rangle$ at different temperatures to its edges $l = \{1, N\}$ ($B_1$), which induces current, and local dephasing noise due to spin bath coupled to all sites $n = \{1, \ldots, N\}$ ($B_2$). We explicitly consider the dynamics of the current heat baths and the interactions using the global master equation [30, 51] to guarantee a thermodynamically consistent model [52]—in contrast to models where particle is initiated in one site and transferred to an irreversible sink. The method is valid for environmental rates much smaller than $t$ and systems without quasiresonant levels. The total Hamiltonian is $H = H_S + \sum_{l=1}^{2} (H_{B_l} + H_{SB_l})$, where $H_{B_l} = \sum_{l,\mu} \epsilon_{\mu,l} \sigma_{\mu,l}^z$, $H_{SB_l} = \sum_{m,\mu} \epsilon_{\mu,m} \sigma_{\mu,m}^z$, and the interactions

$$H_{SB_1} = \sum_{l,\mu} g_{l1}(a_{l1} + a_{l1}^\dagger)(\sigma_{\mu1}^+ + \sigma_{\mu1}^-),$$

(3)

$$H_{SB_2} = \sum_{n,\mu} g_{n2} a_{n2}^\dagger a_n(\sigma_{\mu,n}^+ + \sigma_{\mu,n}^-).$$

(4)

We choose spin baths because current rectification, which we expect to increase transport directivity, is possible if the system and bath have different statistics [33, 54]. Nevertheless, bosonic baths will also produce similar but smaller energy current.

The derivation of the Lindblad master equation [55, 56] is most readily done using the eigenspectra method [57, 58]; see Supplemental Material for more detailed derivation [59]. In the eigenbasis $|\eta_k\rangle = \sum_n S_{nk}|n\rangle$, the system Hamiltonian becomes $H_S = \sum_k \epsilon_k |\eta_k\rangle\langle\eta_k|$ and the local mode is $a_n = \sum_k S_{nk}\eta_k$, where $\epsilon_k$ is the $k$-th energy (arranged in increasing order) and $\eta_k, \eta_k^\dagger$ being its eigenoperators. In terms of the eigenspectra of $H_S$, we can write for each interaction $H_{SB_{1,2}} = \sum_{\omega, k} A_{i,k}(\omega) \otimes B_i$ where $i = \{l, n\}$ is the site index for $SB_1$ and $SB_2$ baths, respectively. Here the decomposed operator $A_{i,k}(\omega) = \sum_{\epsilon' - \epsilon = \omega} \Pi(\epsilon) A_{i,k} \Pi(\epsilon')$ acts on the system, where $\Pi(\epsilon)$ is the projector onto eigenspace belonging to the eigenvalue $\epsilon$ of $H_S$, and $B_i$ acts on the bath. The operator $A_{i,k}(\omega)$ is chosen to satisfy $[H, A_{i,k}(\omega)] = -\omega A_{i,k}(\omega)$. It follows that, for the respective baths,

$$A_{i,k}(\omega) = S_lk \eta_k \delta_{\omega,+\epsilon_k} + S_{k1}^* \eta_k^\dagger \delta_{\omega,-\epsilon_k},$$

$$A_{n,k}(\omega) = S_{nk} S_{nk'}^* \delta_{\omega,\epsilon_{k,k'}}.$$
where $D_N$ is the sum of $SB_1$ superoperators acting on the exit site $N$.

**Results.**—To capture both ENAQT and mobility edge features, we choose a relatively short chain of $N = 22$ so that dephasing does not completely suppress the current, but still large enough to pronounce the mobility edge. ENAQT magnitude, defined by $J/J_0$, is measured by comparing a current $J$ relative to the one without dephasing, $J_0 = J(\gamma = 0)$: ENAQT is achieved when $J/J_0 > 1$. This quantity is chosen to give a fair comparison of the current enhancement over $J/J_0 > 1$. This quantity is chosen to give a fair comparison of the current enhancement over $(\alpha, \lambda)$ variation since for large $\alpha$ or $\lambda$, in which localized eigenstates may exist, the undephased current is already relatively tiny.

Before discussing about the uniformization mechanism, which gives rise to ENAQT, we need to assess a couple of population spreading measures exist in the literature, $\Delta_{ne} = 1 - \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_n n_1 \right)^2$ [10] and $\Delta_n = 1 - \frac{1}{N} \sum_i (n_i - \bar{n})^2$ [13], where $n_{ext} = \sum_k |SB_k|^2 p_k$ is the (site basis) exit site population, and $p_k = \langle \eta^\dagger_k \eta_k \rangle$ is the eigenbasis population. Fig. 1 compares the current $J$ and its relative value $J/J_0$ to both measures, along with their relative values. Apparently, in our case the spread with respect to the exit site, $\Delta_{ne}$, correlates better with $J$ than the population variance $\Delta_n$, albeit for $\alpha > 0.8$ it does not fully sensitive to the change in current since its relative spread, $\Delta_{ne}/\Delta_{n0}$ (subscript 0 means the value for $\gamma = 0$), does not properly contain the secondary $J/J_0$ peak in the high $\alpha$ regime. For other value of $\lambda$ that contains only one ENAQT peak, $\Delta_{ne}/\Delta_{n0}$ fits well to estimate the peak location while $\Delta_n/\Delta_{n0}$ does not.

The parameter region in which ENAQT exists is illustrated more clearly in Fig. 2(a). For $\alpha = -1$ (uniform chain), $J/J_0$ is always decreasing monotonically. This behavior is expected because for an end-to-end transport, ENAQT does not exist unless static disorder is introduced. Meanwhile, for $-1 < \alpha < 0$ ENAQT exists although minuscule in magnitude. The emergence of global peak at $\alpha = 0.46$ (and secondary peak at $\alpha = 0.76$) is connected to the existence of localized eigenstates due to mobility edge, which we will elaborate below. For larger disorder strength $\lambda$, the number of localized eigenstates grows for $\alpha \geq 0$ and the secondary peak becomes the primary. Eventually, there will be only one peak when $\lambda$ is nearer to 1. In thermodynamic limit, $N \rightarrow \infty$, the ENAQT peak will be shifted to $\gamma \rightarrow 0$, meaning that the current vanishes due to dephasing.

To understand the role of the mobility edge, we study the relative current together with localization properties of the GAAH model. This is simply revealed by the fraction of localized eigenstates $f_{loc}$. A state is localized if its cross section.

**FIG. 1.** Comparison between (a) current $J$ (in logarithmic scale), (b) population spread w.r.t. the exit site, $\Delta_{ne}$, (c) inverted population variance, $\Delta_n$, and their relative values (d)-(f) which is normalized by their undephased value ($\gamma = 0$). Horizontal and vertical lines indicates the position of $\max(J/J_0)$, and dashed lines separate the region where the respective relative quantity, (d)-(f), is above 1. Here $\lambda = 0.5$, $\phi = \pi/3$, $T_h = 10^3$, $T_c = 10^{-1}$, and $T_\gamma = 10^{-2}$.

**FIG. 2.** (a) Contour plot of relative current $J/J_0$ as a function of $\alpha$ and $\gamma$. The dashed line corresponds to $J/J_0 = 1$ and thus separates the regions with and without ENAQT. (b) Fraction of localized eigenstates $f_{loc}$ for each $\alpha$ values. The shaded areas highlight the transition points at which $f_{loc}$ varies significantly. (c) Relative spreading, $\Delta_{ne}/\Delta_{n0}$, as a function of $\gamma$ for several important $\alpha$’s. The shaded area highlights the location where ENAQT is maximized. The parameters are the same as in Fig. 1.
max(\(I_k\))

Figure 3 shows the current \(J\) versus phase \(\phi\) (a) and the delocalized regime (red \(\diamond\); left y axis) and \(\alpha = 0.9, \gamma = 1\) (blue \(\odot\); right y axis): (a) current \(J\) versus phase \(\phi\), (b) maximum of coupling between two eigenmodes in presence of dephasing \(C_{ik}\), (c) spread \(\eta\) as a function of \(\phi\), and (d) average inverse participation ratio (IPR). Other parameters are the same as in Fig. 1. Shaded areas highlight the correlations between the quantities (see text).

The feature of ENAQT in this model can be explored further by varying the phase \(\phi\). This can be achieved in experiments typically by shifting the phase of bichromatic laser field. The phase does not vary the number of localized states, \(N_{f_{loc}}\), but it alters the spectrum \(S_{nk}\). Consequently, the position of the localized states and and the coupling between two modes \(C_{ik}\) in Eq. 9 are changing, resulting a substantial change in ENAQT and localization strength. To study the sensitivity of localization to the dephasing we calculate the average inverse participation ratio (IPR) \(\langle I \rangle = \sum I_k p_k\) where \(I_k = \sum_n |S_{nk}|^2\) is the IPR for an individual eigenstate.

Equation (3) shows \(J\) as a function of \(\phi\) for two contrasting cases: \(\alpha = 0.1, \gamma = 6 \times 10^{-3}\) as the example for maximum ENAQT in the delocalized regime (red \(\diamond\); \(f_{loc} = 0\)), and \(\alpha = 0.9, \gamma = 1\) (blue \(\odot\); \(f_{loc} \approx 0.6\)) for the localized regime. Note that here we do not normalize \(J\) or \(\Delta_{ne}\) as they are plotted for specific \((\alpha, \gamma)\). Both currents peak at different \(\phi\)'s but are suppressed in overlapping ranges, i.e., around \(\phi = \pi/2\) and \(\phi = 3\pi/2\). For the delocalized regime, the peak be explained solely by the maximum \(I_k\). Turning our attention into the red \(\diamond\) line in Fig. 3(b), we see that the \(J\) is maximized whenever \(\max(I_k)\) is small. Proceeding to the blue \(\odot\) line, here the maximum eigenstate IPR in Fig. 3(b) is no longer sensitive to \(\phi\), since there is always at least a localized state with IPR near unity for this case. The corresponding population spread, Fig. 3(c), correlates well with both currents, while the average IPR in Fig. 3(d) determines the \(J\) peak only for the localized regime.

We continue the discussion by including the effect of localization transition. In Fig. 4(a) we plot the maximum ENAQT (achieved at certain \(\alpha_{opt}\) and \(\gamma_{opt}\)) with \(\lambda\). It is possible to obtain \(J/J_0 \approx 400\) at \(\lambda \approx 2.1\) for \(\gamma_{opt} \approx 10^{-5}\). However, further increase in disorder strength reduces the maximum ENAQT as all eigenstates are maximally localized as indicated by \(\langle I \rangle_{opt} \equiv \langle I \rangle(\alpha_{opt}, \gamma_{opt})\) near unity in Fig. 4(c) and the fact that all eigenstates are localized for \(\lambda \gg 1\) and positive \(\alpha\). The localization transition from \(\lambda = 1\) to \(\lambda = 1.5\) is followed by a steep increase in the system sensitivity to dephasing by orders of magnitude, whereas giving a sharp transition for the maximum ENAQT. In addition, small increments in Fig. 4(b) for \(\lambda = 0\) to \(\lambda = 1\) is followed by a series of local maxima in \(\max(J/J_0)\). The maximum ENAQT along each \(\gamma_{opt}\) plateau occurs at \(\alpha\) near the \(f_{loc}\) transition. Interestingly, for \(\gamma = 0\) the current may be enhanced in presence of disorder. This is in agreement with the result from Ref. [13]; see Supplemental Material for details [59].
FIG. 5. (a) Current and (b) average IPR versus dephasing rate $\gamma$ for various dephasing temperature. (c) Current as a function of dephasing temperature. Parameters are $\lambda = 0.4$, $\alpha = 0$, $\gamma = 0.3$, $T_h = 10^3$, and $T_c = 10^{-1}$.

Conclusions.—We have studied how the presence of dephasing noise in a model with SPME coupled to spin baths can manifest strong ENAQT. The peaks of ENAQT correlates with the fraction of localized eigenstates due to mobility edge and the maximum population spreading. Strong ENAQT emerges due to the existence of localized eigenstates that are effectively suppressed by dephasing by virtue of the population uniformization mechanism. The enhancement can be improved further by tuning the phase (the location of localized eigenmodes), disorder strength, and dephasing temperature.

It should be noted that the current is actually higher in the low $\alpha$ regime—with less fraction of localized eigenmodes. However, if disorder or mobility edge are unavoidably present, or if in an engineered system the mobility edge is desired, the intermediate dephasing regime provides the best performance. We briefly note that if particle interaction is included, ENAQT features should similarly persist since many-body localization occurs in the Hamiltonian.
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I. DERIVATION OF THE MASTER EQUATION AND ITS STEADY STATE

For the microscopic derivation of the master equation, we use the Born-Markov and secular approximation to trace out the bath and write the Lindblad dissipator. This is most readily done using the eigenoperators method [S1, S2]. We first write the interaction Hamiltonians in eigenbasis \( \eta_k \) where \( a_i = \sum_k S_{ik} \eta_k \) \((i = \{l, n\})\) and \( S \) is the \( N \times N \) unitary matrix obtained by diagonalizing \( H_S \),

\[
H_{SB1} = \sum_{l, \mu, k} g^{(1)}_\mu (S_{lk} \eta_k + S^*_{kl} \eta^*_k)(\sigma^+_{\mu,l} + \sigma^-_{\mu,l}),
\]

\[
H_{SB2} = \sum_{n, \mu, k, k'} g^{(2)}_\mu |S_{nk}|^2 \eta^*_k \eta_{k'} (\sigma^+_{\mu,n} + \sigma^-_{\mu,n}).
\]

In terms of the eigenoperators of \( H_S \), we can write for each interaction \( H_{SB1,2} = \sum_{\omega, \epsilon} A_{i,k}(\omega) \otimes B_i \). Here the decomposed operator \( A_{i,k}(\omega) \equiv \sum_{\epsilon - \omega = \epsilon} \Pi(\omega) A_{i,k} \Pi(\epsilon) \) acts on the system, where \( \Pi(\epsilon) \) is the projector onto eigenspace belonging to the eigenvalue \( \epsilon \) of \( H_S \), and \( B_i \) acts on the bath. The operator \( A_{i,k}(\omega) \) is chosen to satisfy

\[
[H, A_{i,k}(\omega)] = -\omega A_{i,k}(\omega).
\]

It follows that, for the respective baths, these eigenoperator will be

\[
A_{l,k}(\omega) = S_{lk} \eta_k \delta_{\omega, +\epsilon_k} + S^*_{kl} \eta^*_k \delta_{\omega, -\epsilon_k},
\]

\[
A_{n,k}(\omega) = S_{nk} S_{nk'} \eta^*_k \eta_{k'} \delta_{\omega, \epsilon_{k'} - \epsilon_k}.
\]

while \( B_i = \sum_\mu g^{(1,2)}_\mu (\sigma^+_{\mu,i} + \sigma^-_{\mu,i}) \) for both \( i = \{l, n\} \) [see Eq. (S1)]. Intuitively speaking, the coupling \( (\eta_k + \eta_k^* \eta_{k'} - \epsilon_k) \) to the bath induces transitions in the system with the allowed energies \( \omega \).

For each of the above eigenoperators, the corresponding Lindblad dissipator is

\[
\mathcal{D}[A_{i,k}] \rho = \sum_{\omega} \Gamma_i(\omega) \left[ A_{i,k}(\omega) \rho A^*_{i,k}(\omega) - \frac{1}{2} \{ A_{i,k}(\omega) A^*_{i,k}(\omega), \rho \} \right],
\]

where

\[
\Gamma_i(\omega) = \int_0^\infty dt \, e^{i\omega t} \text{Tr}_B \left[ (e^{iH_{SB} t} B_i e^{-iH_{SB} t}) B_i e^{-H_B / T_i} \right] / \text{Tr}(e^{-H_B / T_i})
\]

is the half sided Fourier transform of bath correlation functions. Thus, for \( SB_1 \) and \( SB_2 \) we get

\[
\Gamma_i(\omega) = \begin{cases} J_i(\omega)[1 - n_i(\omega)], & \text{if } \omega > 0 \\ J_i(-\omega)n_i(-\omega), & \text{if } \omega < 0 \end{cases}
\]

where \( n_i(\omega) = (e^{\beta \omega} + 1)^{-1} \) is the spin occupation number for \( SB_1 \) (\( SB_2 \)) bath coupled to site \( l \) (\( n \)), and \( J_i(\omega) = \sum_\mu \pi |g^{(1,2)}_\mu|^2 \delta(\omega - \epsilon_\mu) \) is the spectral density. for \( SB_2 \), we denote the spectral density as \( \gamma_n(\omega) \). Thus, by writing for \( \omega > 0 \) and \( \omega < 0 \) in a unified way, we can write the full dissipators as

\[
\mathcal{D}_{SB1} \rho = \sum_{l,k} |S_{lk}|^2 \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\epsilon_k} (1 - n_l(\epsilon_k)) \left( \eta_k \eta_k^* - \frac{1}{2} \{ \eta_k \eta_k^*, \rho \} \right) + n_l(\epsilon_k) \left( \eta_k \eta_k^* \eta_k - \frac{1}{2} \{ \eta_k \eta_k^*, \rho \} \right) \right),
\]

\[
\mathcal{D}_{SB2} \rho = \sum_{n, k, k'} |S_{nk}|^2 |S_{nk'}|^2 \left[ J_2(\epsilon_{k'} - \epsilon_k)(1 - n_n(\epsilon_{k'})) + J_2(\epsilon_{n} - \epsilon_k) n_n(\epsilon_{n} - \epsilon_k) + J_2(\epsilon_k - \epsilon_{k'}) n_n(\epsilon_k - \epsilon_{k'}) \right]
\]

\[
\times \left( \eta_k \eta_{k'}^* - \frac{1}{2} \{ \eta_k \eta_{k'}^*, \rho \} \right),
\]
where we set constant $J_2(\omega) = \gamma$ for $\omega > 0$ and $J_2(\omega) = 0$ elsewhere. Note that $n_n$ is identified as $n_\gamma$ in the main paper.

To find the nonequilibrium steady state (NESS), we consider the adjoint master equation, with $D_{i,k}[A_{i,k}]^\dagger O = A_{i,k}^\dagger OA_{i,k} - 1/2 \{ A_{i,k}^\dagger A_{i,k}, O \}$, by replacing $O = \eta_k^\dagger \eta_{k'}$ and solving $(dO/dt) = 0$. The solution can be found by using only the fundamental commutation relations which simplifies the adjoint dissipators considerably,

$$D_{SB_1}^\dagger (\eta_k^\dagger \eta_{k'}) = \sum_l |S_{lk}|^2 \left( n_l(\epsilon_k) \delta_{kk'} - [1 - 2n_l(\epsilon_k)]\eta_k^\dagger \eta_{k'} \right),$$

$$D_{SB_2}^\dagger (\eta_k^\dagger \eta_{k'}) = \eta_k^\dagger \eta_{k'} \left[ \sum_i (C_{ik} - C_{ki}) \eta_i^\dagger \eta_i - \sum_i C_{ik} \right] + \sum_i C_{ik} \eta_i^\dagger \eta_i,$$

where

$$C_{ik} = \tilde{\gamma}_{ik} \sum_n |S_{ni}|^2 |S_{nk}|^2,$$

and $\tilde{\gamma}_{ik} = J_2(\omega)(1 + n_\gamma(\omega)) + J_2(-\omega)n_\gamma(-\omega)$ with $\omega = \epsilon_i - \epsilon_k$. The first term in the square bracket of Eq. (S12) vanishes since we only consider one particle manifold. It follows that the NESS density is obtained by solving the following system of equation,

$$A_k \langle \eta_k^\dagger \eta_k \rangle - \sum_{i=1}^N C_{ki} \langle \eta_i^\dagger \eta_i \rangle = B_k,$$

with the coefficients

$$A_k = \sum_l |S_{lk}|^2 (1 - 2n_l(\epsilon_k)) + \sum_i C_{ik}, \quad B_k = \sum_l |S_{lk}|^2 n_l(\epsilon_k),$$

which is Eq. (9) of the main paper. The reader can verify that the diagonal element of the NESS, $k \neq k'$, is zero. Once the NESS ($\langle \eta_k^\dagger \eta_k \rangle$) is found, we can proceed to calculate the energy current $J$ with a similar calculation, resulting in Eq. (10) of the main paper.

**II. THE GAAH POTENTIAL AND EFFECT OF DISORDER STRENGTH**

First we need to differentiate the role of $\alpha$ and $\lambda$ to the on-site potential $V_n$. Disorder varies the potential height without affecting the long range correlation, while the mobility edge deforms the potential which in turn creates different localization properties for different energy levels, see Fig. S1. For $\alpha \to 1$, the potential approaches singularity in some places. This typically induces errors in numerical calculation and should be avoided.

There is an interesting effect of disorder strength $\lambda$: it enhances the transport in case $\gamma = 0$. This is in line with the result in Ref. [S3]. Weak disorder can enhance the energy current nonmonotonically, meaning that the maximum current can be achieved at a finite disorder strength. As $\alpha$ grows from $-1$ to $1$, the energy current peak becomes less pronounced.
FIG. S2. Energy current $J$ as a function of disorder strength $\lambda$ for various on-site potential deformation parameter $\alpha$ without the presence of dephasing noise. Other parameters are set the same as in Fig. (1) of the main paper.

III. TEMPERATURE DEPENDENCE OF THE CURRENT

In the main paper we mainly take low dephasing temperature $T_\gamma$ and briefly discuss the effect of increasing the temperature in Fig. (5). Here in Fig. S3 we depict the temperature dependence of the ($\alpha, \gamma$) contour. Recall that there is a sharp transition in $T = O(1)$ due to the step-like behavior of $n_\gamma(\omega)$ in Fermi-Dirac statistics of the dephasing bath. As $T_\gamma$ passes the transition regime, a new high $J$ regime opens up in strong $\gamma$’s. At very high $T_\gamma$, interestingly, the maximum ENAQT is totally shifted to the high dephasing regime. Note that this result should be treated with caution because our global master equation method is in general not safe for high $\gamma$.

FIG. S3. Contour plot of $J$ as a function of $\alpha$ and $\gamma$ for (left) low $T_\gamma$, (center) $T_\gamma$ at the transition in Fig. 5(c) of the main paper, and (right) high $T_\gamma$. Yellowish contour indicates larger $J$.

[S2] For derivation of master equation in similar systems, see e.g. in the Appendix of P. H. Guimaraes, G. T. Landi, and M. J. de Oliveira, Nonequilibrium quantum chains under multisite lindblad baths, Phys. Rev. E 94, 032139 (2016).