

# Decoherence of coherent electronic excited states in the photosynthetic purple bacterium *Rhodobacter sphaeroides*

Xian-Ting Liang<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Wei-Min Zhang<sup>2,3†</sup>, and Yi-Zhong Zhuo<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics and Institute of Modern Physics, Ningbo University, Ningbo, 315211, China*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics and Center for Quantum Information Science, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan 70101, Taiwan*

<sup>3</sup>*National Center for Theoretical Science, Tainan 70101, Taiwan*

<sup>4</sup>*China Institute of Atomic Energy, P.O. Box 275, Beijing 102413, China*

In this paper, we propose a model to describe the quantum coherence and decoherence phenomena of energy transfer in photosynthesis observed in a recent experiment [see Science 316, 1462 (2007)]. As a successive two-color laser pulses with selected frequencies cast on a sample of the photosynthetic purple bacterium *Rb. sphaeroides* two resonant excitations of electrons in chromophores can be generated. However, this effective two-level subsystem will interact with its protein environment and decoherence is inevitable. We model this subsystem coupled with its environment as a spin-boson model. Its dynamics can be described using a quasi-adiabatic propagator path integral (QUAPI) approach. With the effective time-dependent level splitting energy and coupling coefficient between the two excited states, our theoretical result is in good agreement with the experimental data.

PACS numbers: 67.57.Lm, 03.65.Yz, 31.15.Kb.

*Introduction.* In order to lower the reliance on fossil fuels and nuclear power, one would expect to use solar energy as much as possible. However, the efficiency of artificially converting solar energy into electrical or other forms of energy is much lower than the natural photosynthesis. In the past decades, increasing attention has been paid to understand the intrinsic mechanisms of the light energy harvesting and transfer in plants and photosynthetic bacteria. In the previous investigations, the energy transfer was often described by a semiclassical model that invokes ‘hopping’ excited-state populations along discrete energy levels. Explicitly, the electrons in pigment molecules, chromophores, are excited by the incident light. Then the electronic excitation moves downhill from energy level to energy level through the chromophores before being trapped in the reaction center. However, it is hard to conceive of having a high efficient energy transfer between chromophores by electron hopping.

To understand the energy transfer among all excited states of each chromophore of the *Rhodobacter (Rb.) sphaeroides*, it is more effective to investigate the coherence of two excited superposition states of two chromophores created experimentally from two laser pulses. Many works have been done following this direction. Recently, Fleming’s group proposed that a ‘clever’ quantum algorithm may be used by the plants and the photosynthetic bacteria for the energy transfer [1, 2]. Unlike the semiclassical model, Fleming and co-workers suggested that a successive excitations make a coher-

ence superposition between electronic excited states of the chromophores. The energy transfer is considered to be carried by the coherence of the superposition state through an easiest route analogous to Grover’s algorithm for the fastest possible search of an unsorted information database [3]. However, Mohsehi et al. [4] argued that the standard Grover’s algorithm does not explain the energy transfer mechanism in photosynthesis. Nevertheless, even if the plants and bacteria work unlike the Grover’s algorithm, the coherent dynamics evolution of the electronic excited states in chromophores could still play an important role in the chromophoric energy transfer [5, 6]. In this Letter we propose a model to estimate how long the coherent superposition state can be persisted in the photosynthetic purple bacterium *Rb. sphaeroides*.

Recent experiments by Fleming group showed that the electronic coherence between two excited states may last for 400 fs or longer [1, 2]. Instead of investigating the coherence among all excited states of each chromophores of the *Rb. sphaeroides* [7, 8], they investigated the coherent superposition state of two electronic excited states  $|H\rangle$  and  $|B\rangle$  in chromophores created experimentally from two successive laser pulses. The laser pulses (with wavelength 750 nm and 800 nm) derives the system which is initially in the ground state  $|g\rangle$  into a coherent superposition state  $|\Psi\rangle = \alpha|H\rangle + \beta|B\rangle$ . However, the system of the two excited states inevitably interacts with its environment and leads the coherent state  $|\Psi\rangle$  to decohere. To obtain the persistent time of coherence, i.e., the decoherence time of  $|\Psi\rangle$ , Fleming et al. use a scheme of photon echo, namely, the third incident pulse (with wavelength 750 nm) on the sample is used to produce a photon echo. From the echo signals they can extract the decoherence time of the coherent superposition state [9].

---

\*Email: xliang@ustc.edu

†Email: wzhang@mail.ncku.edu.tw

We shall attempt to understand theoretically in this Letter the dynamical process of excited electron states in chromophores. It is interesting to see, as we shall show later, that the problem can be described by a well-known spin-boson model [10, 11]. The model has been investigated by many methods though it has not been exactly solved and some approximation must be appealed to. Here, we shall use a quasiadiabatic propagator path integral (QUAPI) technique [12] to explore the decoherence dynamics of the above two excited state system, where non-Markovian processes are involved.

*Experimental description.* To be specific, in the two-color photo echo experiment on a bacterial reaction center (RC) [1], the RC from the photosynthetic purple bacterium *Rb. sphaeroides* includes a bacteriochlorophyll dimer, called the special pair (p), in the center, an accessory bacteriochlorophyll flanking p on each side (Bchl;  $B_L$  and  $B_M$ , for the L and M peptides, respectively), and a bacteriopheophytin (Bphy;  $H_L$  and  $H_M$  for the L and M peptides, respectively) next to each Bchl. The RC of *Rb. sphaeroides* has several absorption peaks which are made by the chromophores. In Ref. [1], the absorption spectrum of the p-oxidized RC at 77 K shows the H band at 750 nm and the B band at 800 nm (where H and B are used to denote excitonic states which are dominantly produced from monomeric Bphy and accessory Bchl in the RC, respectively). At the first step, they used a successive two laser pulses with different colors and tuned for resonant excitation of H transition at 750 nm (at time  $\tau'_1$ ) and the B transition at 800 nm (at time  $\tau'_2$ ) cast on the sample. The two pulses produce the coherence between the electronic excited states  $|H\rangle$  and  $|B\rangle$ . Then, in order to measure the decoherence time of the coherent superposition of the two excited states, the third laser pulse is cast on the sample after a time  $t_2$  from the second pulse, which generates a photon echo. When the times  $t_1 = \tau'_2 - \tau'_1$  and  $t_2 = \tau'_3 - \tau'_2$  are different one can detect the different integrated intensity of the echo signals in the phase matched direction. If the time  $t_1$  is fixed (the fixed time  $t_1 = 30$  fs in Ref. [1]), the integrated echo signals as a function of  $t_2$  represents the decoherence of the coherent superposition state between  $|H\rangle$  and  $|B\rangle$ .

The evolutions of the integrated echo signals is plotted in the Fig. 3 of Ref. [1]. From the figure one can see that: (1) The coherence is resonant with different frequencies in the first 400 fs. The first, the second and the third periods are about 100 fs, 120 fs, and 130 fs respectively; (2) The coherence between the excited states  $|H\rangle$  and  $|B\rangle$  persists for more than 400 fs; (3) The third peak in the evolution of the coherence decays more fast than the first and second peaks. In the following, we shall propose a dynamical spin-boson model to explain the above experimental result.

*Dynamical model:* Based on the above experimental analysis, we see that the photosynthetic bacteria is in a

coherent superposition of the two excited states  $|H\rangle$  and  $|B\rangle$  just after the two laser pulses. Then the problem is reduced to how to solve the decoherence dynamics of  $|\Psi\rangle$  after the second laser pulse. We can model the Bchl  $B_L$  and the Bphy  $H_L$  by the Hamiltonian in the Condon approximation as [13, 14, 15]

$$\begin{aligned} H_e = & \epsilon_0 |g\rangle \langle g| + \epsilon_H |H\rangle \langle H| + \epsilon_B |B\rangle \langle B| \\ & + \epsilon_{HB} |HB\rangle \langle HB| + J_0 (|H\rangle \langle B| + |B\rangle \langle H|) \\ & + \sum_{j=H,B} \vec{\mu}_j \cdot \vec{E}(t) (|g\rangle \langle j| + |j\rangle \langle g|). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Here,  $\epsilon_0$ ,  $\epsilon_H$ ,  $\epsilon_B$  and  $\epsilon_{HB}$  are the energies of the ground state  $|g\rangle$ , exciton states  $|H\rangle$ ,  $|B\rangle$  and two exciton state  $|HB\rangle$ .  $J_0$  is the dipole-dipole interaction between the chromophores  $B$  and  $H$ , and  $\vec{\mu}_j$  ( $j = H, B$ ) is the corresponding electronic dipole.  $\vec{E}(t)$  is the external electric field of the two successive laser pulses, namely,  $\vec{E}(t) = \vec{E}_{01} e^{-\Gamma_1(t+t_1)^2 + i\omega_H(t+t_1)} + \vec{E}_{02} e^{-\Gamma_2 t^2 + i\omega_B t}$ , and  $\Gamma_{1,2}$  are the decay constants of the laser pulses as they pass through the sample.

For simplicity, we assume that the dipole moments for H and B chromophores are almost the same:  $\vec{\mu}_H = \vec{\mu}_B \equiv \vec{\mu}$ . We can decouple the states  $|g\rangle$ ,  $|HB\rangle$  from  $|H\rangle$ ,  $|B\rangle$  by making the following canonical transformation to Eq. (1)  $\mathcal{H}_e = e^S H_e e^{-S}$  with  $S = \kappa(t)[\alpha(|H\rangle \langle g| - |g\rangle \langle H|) + \beta(|B\rangle \langle g| - |g\rangle \langle B|)]$ , where  $\kappa(t) = \vec{\mu} \cdot \vec{E}(t)$ ,  $\alpha = (\epsilon_B - \epsilon_0 - J_0)/\Omega$ ,  $\beta = (\epsilon_H - \epsilon_0 - J_0)/\Omega$ , and  $\Omega = (\epsilon_H - \epsilon_0)(\epsilon_B - \epsilon_0) - J_0^2$ . Under the condition  $\kappa(t)\alpha \approx \kappa(t)\beta \ll 1$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_e = & \{ \epsilon'_0 |g\rangle \langle g| + \epsilon_{HB} |HB\rangle \langle HB| \} + \{ \epsilon'_H |H\rangle \langle H| \\ & + \epsilon'_B |B\rangle \langle B| + J (|H\rangle \langle B| + |B\rangle \langle H|) \}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where,  $\epsilon'_0 = \epsilon_0 - \kappa^2(t)(\alpha + \beta)$ ,  $\epsilon'_H = \epsilon_H + \kappa^2(t)\alpha$ ,  $\epsilon'_B = \epsilon_B + \kappa^2(t)\beta$  and  $J = J_0 + \kappa^2(t)(\alpha + \beta)/2$ . As we see, the energy levels of the two excited states,  $|B\rangle$  and  $|B\rangle$ , and the coupling between them are shifted by the pulse-induced dipole-dipole interaction [ $\sim \kappa^2(t)$ ]. The decoherence dynamics of the coherent state  $|\Psi\rangle$  is dominated by the effective two-level Hamiltonian of the second curly bracket in Eq. (2) which can be rewritten as

$$H_0 = \frac{\epsilon(t)}{2} \sigma_z + \frac{\Delta(t)}{2} \sigma_x. \quad (3)$$

Here,  $\sigma_i$  ( $i = x, z$ ) are the Pauli matrix,  $\epsilon(t) = \epsilon_H - \epsilon_B + \kappa^2(t)(\alpha - \beta)$ ,  $\Delta(t) = 2J_0 + \kappa^2(t)(\alpha + \beta)$ . Note that both the level splitting  $\epsilon$  and the coupling  $\Delta$  are time-dependent now.

Furthermore, this two-level system, as a part of chromophores, is inevitable to interact with its protein environment through the thermal vibrations. This thermal reservoir can always be modeled with a set of harmonic oscillators with spectral density

$$J(\omega) = \frac{\pi}{2} \sum_i \frac{c_i^2}{m_i \omega_i} \delta(\omega - \omega_i) = \frac{\pi}{2} \hbar \xi_s \omega^s \omega^{1-s} e^{-\omega/\omega_c}. \quad (4)$$

Here,  $\omega_c$  is the high-frequency cut-off of the bath modes. The different  $s$  correspond to the super-Ohmic ( $s > 1$ ), the Ohmic ( $s = 1$ ), and the sub-Ohmic ( $0 \leq s < 1$ ) bath cases, and the  $\xi_s$  is the dimensionless Kondo parameter for the three cases[16]. The decoherence and relaxation of the above two-level system are mainly resulted from the back-actions of the thermal bath. The total system of the two-level system coupled to its environment can be described by a spin-boson model[10, 11, 15]

$$H = H_0 + H_{e-b} + H_b. \quad (5)$$

The interaction between the two-level system and the bath, and the Hamiltonian of the bath are given, respectively, by

$$H_{e-b} = \sigma_z \sum_i c_i (b_i^\dagger + b_i), \quad H_b = \sum_i \hbar \omega_i b_i^\dagger b_i, \quad (6)$$

where  $c_i$  are the couplings of the system to the bath and  $b_i^\dagger$  ( $b_i$ ) are the creation (annihilation) operators of the  $i$ -th bath mode.

*Theoretical Method.* An exact solution to the coherence dynamics of the about two-level system from Eq. (5) has not been carried out. In many cases Markov approximation is usually used. However, as it has been pointed out [1] that the evolution of this system should be highly non-Markovian. To see how the non-Markovian dynamics may play an important role, it is useful to estimate the correlation time of the thermal bath, which can be obtained from the bath response function

$$C(t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\infty d\omega J(\omega) \left[ \coth\left(\frac{\beta \hbar \omega}{2}\right) \cos \omega t - i \sin \omega t \right], \quad (7)$$

where  $\beta = 1/k_B T$  with Boltzmann's constant  $k_B$  and the temperature  $T$ . When the real and imaginary parts of  $C(t)$  behave as a delta function  $\delta(t)$  and its derivative  $\delta'(t)$ , respectively, the dynamics of the reduced density matrix is Markovian. Otherwise, non-Markovian dynamics occurs. The broader the  $\text{Re}[C(t)]$  and  $\text{Im}[C(t)]$  are, the longer the correlation time will be, and the more serious the practical dynamics is distorted by the Markov approximation. Similar to Ref. [17], we calculate the correlation times of the bath. The result is shown in Fig. 1. As we can see the correlation time of the bath is about  $\tau_c \approx 15$  fs which actually depends on the frequency cutoff  $\omega_c$  in the bath.

The decoherence dynamics of the coherent states  $|\Psi\rangle$  is characterized by the time evolution of the reduced density matrix obtained after tracing out the bath degrees of freedom, i.e.,

$$\rho(s'', s'; t) = \text{Tr}_{\text{bath}} \langle s'' | e^{-iHt/\hbar} \rho_{\text{tot}}(0) e^{iHt/\hbar} | s' \rangle. \quad (8)$$

Following the experiment, the interaction between system and bath is turned on at  $t = 0$  when the second laser pulse is applied. Thus, the initial density matrix of the




FIG. 1: (Color online) Real and imaginary parts of the response functions  $C(t)$  for Ohmic bath. Here, we take  $\xi_1 = 3.5 \times 10^9$ ,  $T = 77$  K.

total system is a direct product of the system and bath components, namely,  $\rho_{\text{tot}}(0) = \rho(0) \otimes \rho_{\text{bath}}(0)$ , where  $\rho(0)$  and  $\rho_{\text{bath}}(0)$  are the initial states of the system and the bath. If we set  $\vec{E}_{01} = \vec{E}_{02} \equiv \vec{E}_0$ , the initial resonant two excited state can be written as  $|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|H\rangle + |B\rangle)$ . After the canonical transformation, the initial state remains almost the same  $|\Psi'\rangle = e^S |\Psi\rangle \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|H\rangle + |B\rangle)$  under the condition  $\kappa \sqrt{\alpha^2 + \beta^2} \ll 1$ , which is satisfied for the parameters we taken in the following numerical calculations. We also set the bath initially at the thermal equilibrium, namely,  $\rho_{\text{bath}}(0) = e^{-\beta H_b} / \text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H_b})$ .

The reduced density matrix  $\rho(t)$  can be evaluated by using the well established iterative tensor multiplication (ITM) algorithm derived from the QUAPI. This algorithm is a numerically exact one and is successfully tested and adopted in various problems of open quantum systems [16, 18]. For details of the scheme, we refer to previous works [12]. The QUAPI asks for the system Hamiltonian splitting into two parts  $H_0$  and  $H_{\text{env}}$ , where  $H_{\text{env}} = H_{e-b} + H_b$ . In order to make the calculations converge we use the time step  $\Delta t = 5$  fs which is shorter than the correlation time of the bath and the characteristic time of the two-level subsystem. In order to include all memory effect of the bath in the ITM scheme, one should choose  $\Delta k_{\text{max}}$  so that  $\Delta k_{\text{max}} \Delta t$  is not much shorter than the correlation time  $\tau_c$  of the bath. Here,  $\Delta k_{\text{max}}$  is roughly equal to the number of time steps needed to span the halfwidth of the response function  $C(t - t')$  [12]. It is shown that  $\Delta k_{\text{max}} = 3$  is large enough in our calculations.

*Results and discussions.* The decoherence of the two-level system is reflected through the decays of the off-diagonal coherent terms of the reduced density matrix. In Fig. 2a and b we plot the evolutions of the off-diagonal coherent terms of the reduced density matrix elements for the two-level system at 77 K and 180 K when the environment is modeled with the Ohmic bath ( $s = 1$ ), where we use the parameters  $\epsilon_H = 2108 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ,  $\epsilon_B = 2000$




FIG. 2: (Color online) The evolutions of the off-diagonal coherent terms of the reduced density matrix for the two-level subsystem at (a) 77 K and (b) 180 K.

$\text{cm}^{-1}$ ,  $\epsilon_0 = 570 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ,  $J_0 = 25 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ,  $\kappa_0 = \vec{\mu} \cdot \vec{E}_0 = 190 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  and  $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma_2 \equiv \Gamma = 3 \times 10^{24} \text{ s}^{-2}$ . We let the dimensionless Kondo parameter  $\xi_1 = 3.5 \times 10^9$  and the frequency cutoff  $\hbar\omega_c = 2000 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  [19] for the protein bath. According to Ref. [1], we take  $t_1 = 30 \text{ fs}$ , and  $t_2 = 50 \text{ fs}$ . Further calculations show that using the sub-Ohmic bath with  $\xi_{1/2} = 3.5 \times 10^3$  and super-Ohmic bath with  $\xi_2 = 3.5 \times 10^{21}$ , we can obtain the similar results.

The black square boxes in Fig. 2a and b are the experimental data from [1] and the red dots connected with red lines are our numerical results. The plots show that our theoretical description is in good agreement with the experimental results. As we see the coherence decay is much faster after the second peak and the oscillation periods of the evolutions increase with the time. These decoherence behaviors indeed come from the time-dependent level splitting  $\epsilon(t)$  and coupling  $\Delta(t)$  in our model, as a strong non-Markovian dynamics.

It should be pointed out that the bare level splitting  $\epsilon_H - \epsilon_B$  and the bare coupling  $J_0$  are not the experimental observed values. The experimental values are  $\epsilon$  and  $J$  which also contained the pulse-induced effect plus the back-action effect from the environment in the non-Markovian regime. Therefore, the input data  $\epsilon_H - \epsilon_B$  and  $J_0$  are different from that used in Ref. [1]. Our numerical calculations show that the profiles of the evolution curves of the off-diagonal reduced density matrix elements are sensitive to the changes of the bare level splitting  $\epsilon_H - \epsilon_B$ ,

the bare coupling  $J_0$  and the parameter  $\kappa_0$  but insensitive to the changes of  $\epsilon_H$  and  $\epsilon_B$  when they are in the ranges  $\epsilon_B = 2000 \sim 4000 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  and  $\epsilon_H = 2108 \sim 4108 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  and  $\epsilon_H - \epsilon_B \approx 110 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . Also our results suggest that the original dipole-dipole interaction between the chromophores B, and H is smaller than the pulse-induced dipole-dipole interaction. Combining them together, the effective dipole-dipole interaction strength  $J$  oscillates in time with the maximum amplitude being less than  $400 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . Meanwhile, the level splitting and coupling in the model also depend on the parameter  $\kappa_0 = \vec{\mu} \cdot \vec{E}_0$ . We find that the electric field strength  $E_0$  of the laser pulses controls the decay curves. If  $E_0$  increases the oscillation periods of the evolution will be decreased with time, and vice versa. These analysis provide, on the one hand, the information for further experimental test of our model, and on the other hand, the insight to understand the mechanism of the photosynthesis efficiency.

We would like to thank Prof. Fleming for sending us their experimental data for comparisons. This project was sponsored by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 10675066), the National Science Council of ROC under Contract No. NSC-96-2112-M-006-011-MY3, and K.C.Wong Magna Foundation in Ningbo University.

- 
- [1] H. Lee, Y.-C. Cheng, and G. R. Fleming, *Science* 316, 1462 (2007).
  - [2] G. S. Engel, T. R. Calhoun, E. L. Read, T. -K. Ahn, T. Mančal, Y. -C. Cheng, R. E. Blankenship, and G. R. Fleming, *Nature* 446, 782 (2007).
  - [3] L. K. Grover, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 79, 325 (1997).
  - [4] M. Mohseni, P. Rebentrost, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, *J. Chem. Phys.* 129, 174106 (2008); P. Rebentrost, M. Mohseni, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, arXiv: 0806.4725v1;
  - [5] M. B. Plenio, S. F. Huelga, *New J. Phys.* 10, 113019 (2008).
  - [6] Y. C. Cheng and R. J. Silbey, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 96, 028103 (2006).
  - [7] S. Jang, M. D. Newton, and R. J. Silbey, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 92, 218301 (2004).
  - [8] D. Leupold, H. Stiel, K. Teuchner, F. Nowak, W. Sandner, B. Ücker, and H. Scheer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 77, 4675 (1996).
  - [9] V. O. Lorenz, S. Mukamel, W. Zhuang, and S. T. Cundiff, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 100, 013603 (2008).
  - [10] U. Weiss, *Quantum Dissipative Systems*, 2nd ed., (World Scientific Publishing, Singapore, 1999).
  - [11] A. J. Leggett, S. Chakravarty, A. T. Dorsey, M. P. A. Fisher, A. Garg, and W. Zwerger, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 59, 1 (1987).
  - [12] D. E. Makarov and N. Makri, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* 221 (1994) 482.
  - [13] S. Mukamel, *Principles of Nonlinear Optics and Spectroscopy*, New York: Oxford University Press (1995).
  - [14] T. Meier, Y. Zhao, V. Chernyak, and S. Mukamel, *J. Chem. Phys.* 107, 3876 (1997).

- [15] T. Mančal, A. V. Pisliakov, and G. R. Fleming, *J. Chem. Phys.* 124, 234504 (2006); A. V. Pisliakov, T. Mančal, and G. R. Fleming, *ibid.* 124, 234505 (2006).
- [16] N. Makri, and D. E. Makarov, *J. Chem. Phys.* 102, 4600; 102, 4611 (1995).
- [17] X. -T. Liang, *Phys. Rev. B* 72 (2005) 245328.
- [18] M. Thorwart, P. Reimann, and P. Hänggi, *Phys. Rev. E* 62, 5808 (2000).
- [19] N. Makri, E. Sim, D. E. Makarov, and M. Topaler, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 93, 3926 (1996).