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PACS num bers: 73.23.70, $72.10 .-\mathrm{d}$
In a recent Letter, A vron et. al [1] in introduced a notion of optim al quantum pum ps. These are adiabatic quantum pum pswhich work without dissipation. In particular, they produce neither entropy nor noise. In the present $C$ om $m$ ent we show that in the absence of $m$ agnetic eld optim al quantum pum ps alw ays have a vanishing transm ission coe cient. Such quantum pum ps' do not $m$ ake use of $Q$ uantum $M$ echanics since alltunneling or interference e ects are banned by vanishing of the transm ission coe cient. W e leave it as an outstanding question whether genuine optim al quantum pum pswith nonvanishing transm ission coe cient can be constructed by $m$ aking use of the $m$ agnetic eld.

Recall that a quantum pum $p$ is a mesoscopic device attached to two (or $m$ ore) reservoirs by $m$ eans of ideal quantum wires. A $l l$ reservoirs have the sam e chem ical potential, and when the pum $p$ is not at w ork no charge transfer occurs betw een reservoirs. In the scattering approach pioneered by B uttiker et al. $\overline{\underline{R}} \overline{1}]$ and developed in
 scribed by the scattering $m$ atrix at the Ferm ienergy $S_{k l}$ $w$ here the indiges $k$ and $l$ label the outgoing and incom ing channels, respectively. T he $m$ atrix $S_{k l}$ is alw ays unitary, $S_{k l}{ }^{1}=S_{l k}$. A $s$ the pum $p$ operates, the scattering $m$ atrix changes $w$ th period,$S(t+)=S(t)$. In practioe, this is usually achieved by applying an altemating voltage to som e gates inside the $m$ esoscopic device [6్']. T he net current pum ped into the channelk at the $m$ om ent $t$ is given by form ula (eqn. (3) of [1] [1] ),

$$
\begin{equation*}
J_{k}=\frac{\text { ie }}{2}\left(@_{\mathrm{t}} S S^{\mathrm{y}}\right)_{\mathrm{kk}}=\frac{\text { ie }}{2}_{\mathrm{l}=1}^{\mathrm{X}^{\mathrm{n}}}\left(@_{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{k} 1}\right) \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{lk}}^{\mathrm{y}} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the noise production one gets (eqn. (10) of [1]

$$
\begin{equation*}
N_{k}={\frac{h e^{2}}{24^{2}}}_{1 \in \mathrm{k}}^{\mathrm{X}} j\left(@_{\mathrm{t}} S S^{\mathrm{y}}\right)_{\mathrm{k} 1} \mathrm{~J}^{2}: \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the absence ofm agentic eld, $B=r \quad A=0$, one can alv ays choose a gauge in which the vector potentialA vanishes. Then, the Schrodinger equation which govems the $m$ otion of electrons through the pum $p$ has real coe cients since all the term swhich contain i are proportional to A. This im plies that taking a com plex conjugate of a solution yields again a solution. C hoosing the incom ing and outgoing wave functions com plex conjugate to each other (this corresponds to tuming $e^{i k x}$ to $e^{\mathrm{ikx}}$ ) one obtains an extra sym $m$ etry of the scattering
m atrix $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{k} 1}{ }^{1}=\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{kl}}$. Together w ith unitarity this im plies that the scattering $m$ atrix is sym $m$ etric.

For sim plicity, we consider quantum pum ps with two extemal reservoirs. In this case, the general form of a unitary sym $m$ etric scattering $m$ atrix is given by form ula,

$$
\mathrm{S}=\mathrm{ab}, \quad \text { b }
$$

$w$ here $b$ is the transm ission am plitude, and $a$ and $c=$
$\mathrm{a} \mathrm{b}=\mathrm{b}$ are re ection am plitudes. The $m$ atrix $@_{t} S S^{y}$ is anti-H em ritian,

$$
@_{\mathrm{t}} S S^{\mathrm{y}}=\begin{array}{cc}
\mathrm{ix}_{1} & \mathrm{y} \\
\mathrm{y} & \mathrm{ix}_{2}
\end{array}:
$$

$T$ he requirem ent that $\varrho_{t} S$ is sym $m$ etric yields yc+ y $a=$ i $\left(\begin{array}{ll}x_{2} & x_{1}\end{array}\right)$ b. Form ula $\overline{\text { In }}$ ) now reads,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{N}_{1 ; 2}=\frac{\mathrm{he}^{2}}{24^{2}} \dot{\mathrm{y}}{ }^{\jmath} \quad \frac{\mathrm{h}}{6} \frac{\mathrm{~T}}{1 \mathrm{~T}} \mathrm{~J}^{2} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $T=\frac{b}{}{ }^{?}$ is the transm ission coe cient and $J=$ $\left(\begin{array}{ll}J_{1} & J_{2}\end{array}\right)=2=e\left(\begin{array}{ll}\mathrm{x}_{2} & \mathrm{x}_{1}\end{array}\right)=4$ is the net current betw een the reservoirs. $W$ e conclude that in the absence ofm agnetic eld an optim al quantum pump $\left(\mathbb{N}_{1 ; 2}=0\right)$ is only possible if $T=0$. A surprising denom inator ( $1 \quad T$ ) in form ula ( $\overline{\bar{\beta}} \overline{1}$ ) accounts for the fact that a transparent quantum pump w ith $T=1$ cannot transfer charge betw een reservoirs, and in this case $J=0$.
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