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Understanding heat transfer between a quantum system and its environment is of grave importance if reliable quantum devices are to be constructed. Here, the heat transfer between the system and bath in non-Markovian open quantum systems in the process of adiabatic speedup is investigated. Using the quantum state diffusion equation method, the heat current, energy current and the power are calculated during the free evolution and under external control of the system. While the heat current increases with increasing system-bath coupling strength and bath temperature, the non-Markovian nature of the bath can restrict the heat current. Without pulse control, the heat current is nearly equal to energy current. However, with pulse control, the energy current is nearly equal to the power. We show that more non-Markovian baths can be used to better approximate an adiabatic evolution and have a smaller heat current. Our results reveal that the non-Markovian nature of the bath significantly contributes to both the heat transfer rate as well as the effective adiabatic speedup.

PACS numbers:

Introduction.— Understanding dissipation phenomena in condensed matter physics is the key to producing reliable nano-scale devices. It has therefore been intensively studied in order to describe the heat exchange and/or energy exchange between a system and its environment. This is a central issue of nonequilibrium statistical physics \cite{1}. One key development was the spin-boson model, which provides a clear physical picture for exploring quantum dissipation effects. This model includes an impurity two-level system (referred to as a spin) coupled to a thermal reservoir (of bosons) and displays a rich phase diagram near equilibrium \cite{2, 3}. The utility of the model has been shown by a number of papers that have extended the model. For example, quantum transport was investigated using a subsystem coupled to two thermal reservoirs in metal-molecule-metal junctions \cite{4}, dielectric-molecule-dielectric systems \cite{5}, electric spin-nuclear spin interfaces \cite{6} and metal-superconductor junctions \cite{7}. Also, the steady-state heat current in the nonequilibrium spin-boson model was studied and the effects of sampling initial conditions of the thermal baths on the heat current was found to play an important role \cite{8}. Exact dynamics of a class interacting two-qubit systems immersed in separate thermal reservoirs or within a common reservoir has also been studied \cite{9}. Dynamics of the two-spin spin-boson model in the presence of Ohmic and sub-Ohmic baths was investigated \cite{10}. Theoretical investigations about heat transport in a many-body interaction system often use approximation methods, such as a master equation \cite{11}, or a Born-Oppenheimer method \cite{12}, et al. Recently an exactly solvable model was proposed to investigate quantum energy transfer between a nonlinearly coupled bosonic bath and a fermionic chain \cite{13}.

Quantum information processing tasks should be completed as soon as possible due to the detrimental effects of the bath on the system, such as decoherence. For the device design, such as in molecular devices, people also need to consider the scaling of the energy current with system size and time in order to prevent the devices from disintegrating \cite{14, 15} due to excess heat build-up during operation. For example, quantum heat engines require operation within the coherence time of the corresponding platform, which might be very short \cite{16}. Thus it is crucial to investigate the heat transfer to and from its surroundings, because the performance of quantum devices depends on the optimization control protocols aimed at minimising dissipation \cite{17, 18, 19}. Furthermore, the relaxation process will cause a certain degree of irreversibility, which can be quantified by entropy production, sometimes also called dissipated availability, or excess work \cite{20}. Energy production limits the thermodynamic efficiency of the process \cite{21}. Enhancement of the efficiency of heat engines by reinforcement learning approach was recently studied \cite{22} and successful control of the nonequilibrium quantum process was realized.

Currently, a well-known quantum control scheme, so-called shortcut to adiabaticity (STA), has been discussed in detail in Ref. \cite{22}. The STA, or adiabatic speedup refers to find a finite-time process with the same final state that would result from infinitely slow, adiabatic driving. Possible application of STA to nonequilibrium
quantum thermodynamics has been explored \[24\]. Also, the thermodynamic control can be extended to other issues, e.g., quantum annealing \[25\]. However, heat transfer in an open system is usually a difficult problem, especially when the bath is non-Markovian \[26\] so that memory effects of the bath can not be neglected. Different methods have been used to calculate the heat transfer problems in hybrid quantum systems, including hierarchical equations of motion approach \[27\], Redfield theory \[28, 29\], the non-equilibrium Green’s function method \[30\], and time-evolving matrix product operators \[31\], etc. In this letter, we deal with open systems that can be treated using the quantum state diffusion equation (QSD) method \[32\] in the study of nonequilibrium thermodynamics of quantum adiabatic speedup process. In particular, we use the acceleration of cutting off one spin chain as an example and derive a general control condition for zero-area sine pulse control. Specifically, we obtain a simple relation between heat current and the system’s reduced density matrix, which allows us to study the relation between adiabaticity and the heat current. Our letter provides a significant contribution to the development of nonequilibrium thermodynamics of quantum open systems, by showing how to control the process of adiabatic speedup.

Model.—Suppose a small system \(H_s\) is composed of \(N\) qubits and immersed in a surrounding environment. Under realistic conditions, each qubit will interact with its own heat bath (see Fig. (1)). The Hamiltonian of this open system can be written as

\[
H = H_s + H_b + V_{sb},
\]

where \(H_s\) is the system Hamiltonian and \(H_b = \sum_j^{N} H_b^{j}\) is the sum of \(N\)-independent baths Hamiltonian with \(H_b^{j} = \sum_k \omega_k^{j} b_k^{j \dagger} b_k^{j}\) is the \(j\)th bath Hamiltonian \((j = 1, 2, ..., N)\). \(\omega_k^{j}\) is the boson’s frequency of the \(k\)th mode and \(b_k^{j \dagger}, b_k^{j}\) are the bosonic creation and annihilation operators.

The interaction Hamiltonian between the system and the baths \(V_{sb}\) can be written as

\[
V_{sb} = \sum_j V_{sb}^{j} = \sum_{j,k} (g_k^{j \ast} L_k^{j \dagger} b_k^{j} + g_k^{j} L_k^{j} b_k^{j \dagger}).
\]

The operator \(L_j\) describes the coupling between the \(j\)th qubit in the system and its surrounding bath (defined as the \(j\)th bath). \(g_k^{j}\) is the coupling constant between the \(j\)th qubit and \(k\)th mode of the \(j\)th bath.

Assume that all \(N\) independent baths are in a thermal equilibrium state and the system’s Hamiltonian is in the ground state \(|\psi_0\rangle\). The density operator of the \(j\)th bath \(\rho_j (0) = e^{-\beta H_j^{c} / Z_j}\), where \(Z_j = \text{Tr}[e^{-\beta H_j^{c}}]\) is the partition function, \(\beta = 1/(k_B T_j)\) with \(T_j\) as the bath temperature. The initial density matrix operator of the whole system is then taken to be in a product state

\[
\rho(0) = \rho_s (0) \otimes \rho_0 (0) = |\psi_0\rangle \langle \psi_0| \bigotimes_{j=1}^{N} \rho_j (0),
\]

where \(\rho_s (t)\) and \(\rho_0(t)\) are the system and baths’ density matrices, respectively. The non-Markovian master equation is given by \[33\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho_s = -i[H_s, \rho_s] + \sum_j \{ [L_j, \rho_s \overline{\rho}_{w}^{j}] (t) ] - [L_j, \overline{\rho}_{w}^{j}(t) \rho_s ] \\
+ [L_j, \rho_s \overline{\rho}_{w}^{j}(t) ] - [L_j, \overline{\rho}_{w}^{j}(t) \rho_s ].
\]

with \(\overline{\rho}_{w}^{j}(t) = \int_{0}^{t} ds \alpha_{z,w}^{j}(t-s)O_{z}^{j}\) and \(\alpha_{z,w}^{j}(t-s)\) is the correlation function. The operator \(O\) is an ansatz and is assumed to be noise-independent here (see for instance \[32, 34\]).

The spectral density of the bath is needed in order to obtain the correlation function. For the Lorentz-Drude spectrum, the spectral density is \(J_{\gamma}(\omega) = \frac{\Gamma_{\gamma}}{\pi} \frac{\omega}{\omega^2 + \gamma^2}\). Here \(\Gamma_{\gamma}\) and \(\gamma\) are real parameters. \(\Gamma_{\gamma}\) represents the strength of the \(j\)th pair system-bath coupling. \(\gamma\) is the characteristic frequency of the \(j\)th bath. It controls the correlation time of the bath and decays as \(1/\gamma\). The larger \(\gamma\), the smoother the spectral function, the shorter the time the bath takes to relax to equilibrium, and the more Markovian the bath is.

If we use a Lorentz-Drude spectrum under high temperature or low frequency approximation, closed equations for the operator \(\overline{\rho}_{w}^{j}(t)\) \[33, 35\] have been derived to numerically calculate the non-Markovian master equation in Eq. (1):

\[
\frac{\partial \overline{\rho}_{w}^{j}}{\partial t} = \frac{\Gamma_{\gamma}}{2} (L_j \overline{\rho}_{w}^{j} - \overline{\rho}_{w}^{j} L_j) - \gamma \overline{\rho}_{w}^{j} - \sum_j \{ L_j \overline{\rho}_{w}^{j} L_j \overline{\rho}_{w}^{j} \},
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \overline{\rho}_{w}^{j}}{\partial t} = \frac{\Gamma_{\gamma}}{2} (L_j \overline{\rho}_{w}^{j} - \overline{\rho}_{w}^{j} L_j) - \gamma \overline{\rho}_{w}^{j} - \sum_j \{ L_j \overline{\rho}_{w}^{j} L_j \overline{\rho}_{w}^{j} \}.
\]
in Eq. 4 reduces to the Lindblad equation [33, 34],
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho_s = -i[H_s, \rho_s] + \sum_j \frac{\Gamma_j T_j}{2} \left[ (2L_j \rho_s L_j^\dagger - L_j^\dagger L_j \rho_s - \rho_s L_j^\dagger L_j) + (2L_j^\dagger \rho_s L_j - L_j L_j^\dagger \rho_s - \rho_s L_j L_j^\dagger) \right].
\]

For the definition of heat current, there are two expressions [27], one is system heat current (SHC) which is derived through consideration of the conservation of system energy. The other is bath heat current (BHC), which is derived through the consideration the rate of decrease of the bath energy. The main difference between SHC and BHC is that there is an additional term for the BHC when the jth and kth system-bath interactions are non-commuting and each system-bath coupling is strong. Here in our model \[V_{sb}^2, V_{sb}^2\] = 0 and weak-couplings are assumed, in this case SHC is nearly equal to BHC. So we use the SHC as the definition of heat current \(J\) [27],
\[
J = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{dQ_j^s(t)}{dt} = \frac{d}{dt} \langle H_s(t) \rangle - \frac{dW}{dt} = \langle (\partial \rho_s(t)/\partial t) \rangle,
\]
where \(dQ_j^s(t)/dt = i \langle [V_{sb}^s, H_s] \rangle\) is the change in the system energy due to the coupling with the jth bath. \(dW/dt = \langle (\partial H_s(t)/\partial t) \rangle\) is the power, i.e., the time derivative of the work. \(d\langle H_s(t)\rangle / dt\) is the system energy current, i.e., the change of the system energy.

In what follows, we consider the process of cutting a spin chain, which has been used to study adiabatic speedup [39, 40] or non-adiabatic transformations [41, 42]. We focus on the heat current, energy current between the baths and system during the cutting process. The system’s Hamiltonian can be written as
\[
H_s = \sum_{i=1, i \neq j}^{N} \left[ J_{i,i+1} \langle \sigma_i^x \sigma_{i+1}^x + \sigma_i^y \sigma_{i+1}^y \rangle \right] + J_{j,j+1} \langle \sigma_j^x \sigma_{j+1}^x + \sigma_j^y \sigma_{j+1}^y \rangle.
\]
Suppose the chain is initially closed with the period boundary condition \(\sigma_N^{x,y}(y-z) = \sigma_1^{x,y}(y-z)\). For a uniform XY model, assume \(J_{i,i+1} = -1, J_{j,j+1} = J \cos \Omega t, \Omega = \pi/2S\). S is the total evolution time [39, 40]. When the chain is realized by optical lattice, the couplings \(J_{j,j+1}\) can be tuned individually by focusing additional laser beams perpendicular to the lattice direction [13]. Clearly, when \(t = S\), \(J_{j,j+1} = 0\). The closed chain has been cut into one open-ended chains (see Fig. 1).

As an example, here we let \(N = 5\) and suppose the initial state is the ground state [33, 40] of the Hamiltonian \(H_s\) in the single excitation subspace at time \(t=0\), \(|\psi_1(0)\rangle = \sqrt{1/5}(|1\rangle + |2\rangle + |3\rangle + |4\rangle + |5\rangle)\). \(|j\rangle (j=1,2,...,5)\) denotes that the state at the jth site is spin up state and

FIG. 2: (Color on line) Heat current \(J\) as a function of time \(t\) for different parameters (a) \(\Gamma, \gamma = 0.5, T = 50\); (b) \(\gamma, \Gamma = 0.01, T = 30\); (c) \(T, \Gamma = 0.01, \gamma = 10\). The total evolution time \(S = 10, L = \sigma_-, N = 5\).
all other states are in the spin down state. If the system evolves adiabatically, the final state at time $t = S$ will be $|\psi_t(S)\rangle = (1/2\sqrt{3})|1\rangle + (1/2)|2\rangle + (1/\sqrt{3})|3\rangle + (1/2)|4\rangle + (1/2\sqrt{3})|5\rangle$. This is also the instantaneous eigenstate of the time-dependent Hamiltonian $H_s(t)$. We use the fidelity $F(t) = \langle \psi_t(5)|\rho_s(t)|\psi_t(5)\rangle$ to measure the adiabaticity, where $\rho_s(t)$ is the system’s reduced density matrix in Eq. (7).

**Heat current without pulse control.**— Here, the thermodynamic quantities during the time evolution without pulse control are analyzed. First we calculate the heat current between the system and baths as well as the adiabatic fidelity. As an example, we take $L = \sigma_-$, $N = 5$ and the cutting time $S = 10$. For these $N$-independent baths the parameters are take as the same, i.e., $\Gamma_i = \Gamma$, $\gamma_i = \gamma$, $T_i = T$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., N$ [33, 38]. The heat current is plotted as a function of time $t$ for several different parameter values of $\Gamma$, $\gamma$ and $T$ in Fig. 2(a), 2(b) and 2(c), respectively. In the inset of Fig. 2 we also plot the evolution of the corresponding fidelity. In Fig. 2(a), the maximum of the heat current $J$ increases with increasing $\Gamma$ while the fidelity $F$ is the opposite. The environmental parameters are taken to be $\gamma = 0.5$ and $T = 50$. Stronger couplings destroy more of the adiabaticity and correspond to a higher heat current. Clearly, the oscillation becomes stronger with increasing $\Gamma$ and the heat current sometimes can even reverse (from system to bath) when $\Gamma = 0.01$. Fig. 2(b) plots the effects of the parameter $\gamma$ on the heat current and fidelity. $\Gamma = 0.01$, $T = 30$. It shows that the maximum heat current increases with increasing $\gamma$ and the fidelity is also the opposite. More non-Markovian baths can help to enhance the adiabaticity [40] but accompanied with a smaller heat current. The oscillation of the heat current increases with decreasing $\gamma$ and demonstrates the non-Markovian nature of the baths. The memory effects or the non-Markovian nature of the baths play an important role on the heat current or the adiabaticity. In Fig. 2(c) we consider the effects of the temperature on the heat current and fidelity. $\Gamma = 0.01$, $\gamma = 10$. As expected, higher temperature destroys the quantumness of the system, and correlates with worse fidelity and higher maximum heat current. In summary, the departure of the adiabaticity always corresponds to a higher heat current and more heat is transferred from baths to the system.

We only consider heat current in the above discussions, now we consider thermodynamic energy current, power as defined above in the cutting process of the chain. In Fig. 3 the heat current, energy current and power as a function of time $t$ for different parameter $\gamma$ are plotted. The parameters are taken to be $S = 20$, $\Gamma = 0.01$, $T = 50$, $L = \sigma_-$, $N = 5$. We find that the power is small compared with the energy current, which indicates that the work on the system can be neglected compared to the change of the system energy during the cutting process. According to Eq. (8), the heat current is nearly equal to energy current in this case. Also note that the power (absolute value) increases with increasing $\gamma$, indicating that the maximum work is required in Markovian baths when cutting off the chain.

**Heat current under pulse control.**— Completely adiabatic evolution requires an infinitely long time. However, the shortest time possible is desired for quantum information processing tasks so as to avoid as much dissipation and decoherence as possible [41]. Adiabatic speedup has been proposed to achieve an adiabatic evolution in a non-adiabatic regime using control pulses. The system evolution can be controlled by adding an additional Hamiltonian $H_a(t) = c(t)M$ to the system Hamiltonian [43], where $M$ is an operator and $c(t)$ is the control function. We let $M = H_s(t)$, so the total Hamiltonian can be written as [38, 41]

$$H_s(t) = [1 + c(t)]H_s(t).$$

Physically, the control function $c(t)$ can be implemented by a sequence of zero-area pulses [41]. The pulse intensity and period must satisfy certain conditions in order to guarantee an effective adiabatic speedup. Now we consider a general control and derive suitable pulse conditions. Suppose $c(t)$ is a sine function,

$$c(t) = I(b + a \sin \omega t),$$

where $a$ and $b$ are the undetermined constant parameters and $I$ is the amplitude of the intensity. By using the one-component Feshbach PQ partitioning technique, the pulse conditions require that [47]

$$\int_0^T ds \exp[i\int_0^s c(s')ds'] = 0.$$
Inserting Eq. (11) into Eq. (12), we obtain
\[
\int_0^\tau ds \exp \left[ i \int_0^s \dot{E}(t) ds' \right] = 0. \tag{13}
\]

Let \( \omega \tau = \pi, \beta \dot{b}/\omega = n \) (\( n \) is integer), and \( Ia/\omega = z \), then the pulse conditions become
\[
J_n(z) = 0, \tag{14}
\]
where \( J_n(z) \) is the \( n \)th-order Bessel function of the first kind. Clearly, when \( b = 0, a = 1 \), the results reduce to our previous zero-area-pulse results, the condition is the zero point of the zero order Bessel function of the first kind [47, 48]. \( \tau \) is half of the pulse period. In this case, the transition between different energy levels is constrained. A time-dependent amplitude \( I(t)/E_{mn}(t) \) can be used [38] due to the fact that the energy gap between the ground state and the first excited state is time-dependent.

Now consider the heat current, energy current and power during the process of adiabatic speedup under zero-area sine pulse control. We take the dephasing \( L = \sigma_z, N = 10, \Gamma = 0.01, T = 50 \) and for an example of time evolution we take \( S = \pi/3 \), which is in a non-adiabatic regime. The control pulses satisfy Eq. (14), with \( I = 2.405 \times 30 \) and \( \tau = \pi/30 \). The pulse function is taken to be \( c(t) = I \sin(\pi t/\tau)/E_{21}(t) \), with the time-dependent energy gap \( E_{21}(t) = E_2(t) - E_1(t) \). In Fig. 4(a), (b) we plot the energy current, power and heat current as a function of the rescaled time \( t/S \) during the adiabatic speedup for different parameter \( \gamma \). In the inset of Fig. 4(b) we plot the fidelity versus time \( t/S \). Fig. 4(a) shows that the energy current is nearly equal to the power for small \( \gamma \), and they begin to deviate with increasing \( \gamma \). Both the energy current and the power oscillate with time due to a sequence of periodic driving pulses. In the Markovian case, the current and power become nearly zero at the end of the evolution when \( \gamma \) is small. Conversely, in the non-Markovian case \( (\gamma = 0.5) \), the amplitude becomes larger and larger. In Fig. 4(b) we plot the corresponding heat current. Clearly the heat current becomes larger with increasing \( \gamma \). The same thing happens with the free evolution case, a smaller heat current corresponds to a higher fidelity. Thus the heat current may be a "signature" of the system adiabaticity. Non-Markovianity from baths can not only help to enhance the effects of the control but also constrain the heat current. In this case, the system's energy change is nearly equal to the work on the system. This is different from the case without control, where the system's energy change is nearly equal to the heat change.

Conclusions.— Dissipation phenomena in open systems is extremely important to understand. In this letter we have shown how to describe the quantum dissipative dynamics and heat transfer in non-Markovian finite temperature heat baths using QSD. By using spin chain cutting as an example, we have been able to describe adiabatic speedup under the control of external pulses. We have demonstrated that the heat current increases with increasing \( \Gamma \) and \( T \). We find that non-Markovian nature of baths can help to constrain the heat current. The results show that the energy current is nearly equal to heat current without control while it can be made nearly equal to the power with pulse control. However, for both cases a smaller heat current always corresponds to a higher adiabatic fidelity. Our investigation provides a description of the microscopic mechanism of heat transfer in non-Markovian baths, which is more realistic than the Markovian case and we believe it will have broad implications for control of energy and information transfer for quantum device engineering.
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