

Quantum transport in quantum networks and photosynthetic complexes at the steady state

Daniel Manzano*

*Instituto Carlos I de Física Teórica y Computacional,
University of Granada, Av. Fuentenueva s/n, 18006, Granada, Spain*

*Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Innsbruck,
Technikerstr. 25, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria, Europe and
Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information,*

Austrian Academy of Sciences, Technikerstr. 21A, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria, Europe

(Dated: Last update: September 6, 2022)

Recently, several works have analyzed the efficiency of photosynthetic complexes in a transient scenario and how such an efficiency is affected by environmental noise. Here, following a quantum master equation approach, we study the energy and excitation transport in fully connected networks both in general and in the particular case of the FMO complex. The analysis is carried out for the steady state of the system where excitation energy is constantly “flowing” through the system. Steady state transport scenarios are particularly relevant if the evolution of the quantum system is not conditioned on the arrival of individual excitations. By adding dephasing to the system, we analyze the possibility of noise-enhancement of the quantum transport.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the last years, quantum transport in photosynthetic complexes has become an interesting field of study and debate. An important part of this research focus on the excitation transfer from the antennae that harvest the sunlight to the reaction center where the photosynthetic process takes place. More concretely, for the Fenna-Matthew-Olson (FMO) complex of the green sulfur bacteria empirical evidences suggest that such transport is coherent even at room temperature [1, 2]. These experiments show that the transient behavior takes place on time scales much shorter than the decoherence time due to the environment. Thus, most of the recent analysis have focussed on the single-excitation scenario in the transient regime obtained after pulsed photoexcitation [3–5]. As photosynthesis in nature is a continuous process of absorption of energy from the radiation field, without any specific measurement mechanism which determines when the quanta of energy are effectively absorbed, the photosynthetic complex and the radiation field evolve to a steady state where the energy is constantly flowing through the system [6]. This makes a steady state scenario more appropriate to analyze natural photosynthetic processes.

Moreover, quantum transport in non-equilibrium steady state is an active field in condensed matter physics. For ordered systems composed by qubits or harmonic oscillators, it has been shown the possibility of violating Fourier’s law and thus achieving an infinite thermal conductivity in the absence of noise [7, 8]. This ballistic transport turns into a diffusive one, with finite conductivity, if noise is added to the system as a dephasing channel, reducing therefore the energy transfer. This indicates the importance of the interaction with a dephasing environment for the energy transfer. The analysis of quantum transport in complex and photosynthetic systems can contribute to the design of artificial light-harvesting systems that are more efficient and robust [9].

As photosynthetic processes in algae and plants take place under continuous illumination, we analyze the energy transfer in quantum network and specifically in the FMO complex at the steady state. Also in this regime, we show that the excitations move coherently through the system. An additional decoherent environment reduces, but does not destroy, the coherent transport, and in some cases such environment can even enhance the transfer efficiency. The model we consider is based on a quantum network connected to a thermal bath, to model the absorption of energy from the radiation field, and to a sink, to deliver the energy quanta to the reaction center. As a particular case, we analyze the FMO complex and similar networks. In this scenario, the system evolves to a non-equilibrium steady state, where all the observables remain constant. A similar framework has already been used to analyze entanglement in light-harvesting complexes [10].

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we introduce the details of the model and of the master equation which describes its dynamics. In Section III, we introduce two figures of merit to evaluate the efficiency, and we perform an analytical comparison between the two of them. Uniform and general networks are analyzed in Section

*Electronic address: daniel.manzano@uibk.ac.at

IV, while in Section V we focus our attention on the FMO complex and related hamiltonians. Finally, in Section VI some conclusions are given.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE MODEL AND MASTER EQUATION

The energy transfer in photosynthetic complexes, like the FMO complex, can be described by exciton dynamics. Such systems are usually modeled as fully connected networks of two-level systems (qubits), and indeed several works have recently analyzed photosynthetic processes in this framework and considering a single excitation. Since the FMO complex is composed of seven chromophores, it is modeled by a network of seven qubits. To describe the absorption of energy from the antennae and the decay to the reaction center (RC), we use a Markovian quantum master equation in Lindblad form [11]. The validity of this master equation has been numerically verified in systems composed of harmonic oscillators [12], showing that it is accurate for small coupling even at low temperature. In the transient regime, this master equation has been previously used to describe the dynamics of the FMO complex and to analyze the effects of noise in the quantum dynamic [4, 5].

The quantum evolution of the network is determined by a hamiltonian of the form

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^7 \hbar\omega_i \sigma_i^+ \sigma_i^- + \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^7 \hbar g_{ij} (\sigma_i^+ \sigma_j^- + \sigma_i^- \sigma_j^+), \quad (1)$$

where σ_i^\pm are the raising and lowering operators that act on qubit i , $\hbar\omega_i$ are the one-site energies and g_{ij} represents the coupling between qubits i and j .

The absorption of energy from the antennae is modeled by a thermal bath acting on the first qubit. The delivery of the excitation to the RC is modeled by a sink that can absorb the excitations from site three, according to the labels given in [13]. The thermal environment corresponds to the following Lindblad superoperator:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{th}}\rho = \Gamma_{\text{th}}(n+1) \left(\sigma_1^- \rho \sigma_1^+ - \frac{1}{2} \{ \sigma_1^+ \sigma_1^-, \rho \} \right) + \Gamma_{\text{th}} n \left(\sigma_1^+ \rho \sigma_1^- - \frac{1}{2} \{ \sigma_1^- \sigma_1^+, \rho \} \right), \quad (2)$$

where the parameter Γ_{th} represents the strength of the coupling between the quantum system and the environment [11]. As there are no empirical estimations of this parameter we take $\Gamma_{\text{th}} = 1 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ through the paper. The parameter n is the mean number of excitation in the bath connected to the first site.

The absorption of the energy from the system by the sink is modeled by a second Lindblad superoperator corresponding to a zero temperature thermal bath,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{sink}}\rho = \Gamma_{\text{sink}} \left(\sigma_3^- \rho \sigma_3^+ - \frac{1}{2} \{ \sigma_3^+ \sigma_3^-, \rho \} \right). \quad (3)$$

This term describes the irreversible decay of the excitations to the reaction center. When the excitation is absorbed by the sink, it triggers a charge separation event. We assume that this process is faster than the system dynamics and, because of that, the sink does not saturate and can be described by a Markovian approach. Again, the coupling strength Γ_{sink} has not been estimated from experimental data, and so we choose $\Gamma_{\text{sink}} = 1 \text{ cm}^{-1}$.

Finally, the interaction with the surrounding environment introduces an additional dephasing term:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{deph}}\rho = \gamma \sum_{i=1}^7 \left(\sigma_i^+ \sigma_i^- \rho \sigma_i^+ \sigma_i^- - \frac{1}{2} \{ \sigma_i^+ \sigma_i^-, \rho \} \right). \quad (4)$$

The complete time evolution of the density matrix of the system is described by the master equation

$$\dot{\rho} = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [H, \rho] + \mathcal{L}_{\text{th}}\rho + \mathcal{L}_{\text{sink}}\rho + \mathcal{L}_{\text{deph}}\rho. \quad (5)$$

The steady state satisfies the condition $\dot{\rho} = 0$, meaning that the density matrix does not evolve anymore.

We analyze the energy transport in two different regimes: First, we study the low-temperature case, by choosing $n = 1$. This choice corresponds to a slow injection of excitations into the system, as should be the case for the FMO complex under weak illumination. In this case, the injection of energy in the system is so slow that the probability of finding more than one excitation at the same time in the network is almost negligible (but not excluded). Second, we simulate a high temperature environment, $n = 100$, where there is a higher probability of having more than one excitation inside the system at the same time. The different situations lead to different results.

III. ENERGY AND EXCITATION FLUXES

In the last years, the quantum transport in photosynthetic complexes has been analyzed through different models and with different measures of the efficiency, principally in the single-excitation regime. In [5] the dynamics of the FMO complex was analyzed by the use of a Markovian Redfield equation and by a generalized Bloch-Redfield equation [14]. The measure of efficiency that they used, was the average time that a single excitation spends in the network before being absorbed by the sink. The results showed that the Redfield approach correctly describes the dynamics of the system, but also that it fails in determining the optimal dephasing ratio that minimizes the trapping time. Moreover, this approach gives the unphysical results of a zero trapping time in the limit of strong dephasing $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$. An analogous model was considered in reference [4], with the difference that the efficiency was quantified by the population of the sink in the long time limit. Finally, reference [15] studied this problem in the absence of a sink, in such a way that the only incoherent dynamics was due to the presence of a dephasing environment. Here, the figure of merit was the highest probability of finding the excitation in the outgoing qubit in a time interval $[0, \tau]$, with τ being quite arbitrarily related to the estimation of the duration of the excitation transfer in real systems. The authors concluded that the addition of noise can increase the efficiency, but mainly in the configurations that initially performed poorly. Despite their differences, all these works analyze the transient behavior, and not the steady state.

For completeness, in order to evaluate the efficiency of these systems, we consider two different figures of merit. First, we observe that the net energy transfer across the system is quantified by the time derivative of the expectation value of the hamiltonian

$$\dot{E} = \frac{d}{dt} \langle H \rangle = \text{Tr} (H \dot{\rho}). \quad (6)$$

By using the master equation (5) and the fact that, in the steady state, the mean energy of the system is conserved, we obtain the expression of the energy exchanged with the different environmental channels.

$$0 = \text{Tr} (H \mathcal{L}_{\text{th}} \rho) + \text{Tr} (H \mathcal{L}_{\text{sink}} \rho) + \text{Tr} (H \mathcal{L}_{\text{deph}} \rho) =: J_{\text{th}} + J_{\text{sink}} + J_{\text{deph}}, \quad (7)$$

where J_{th} represents the energy flux from the thermal environment to the system, J_{sink} from the system to the sink, and J_{deph} between the system and the dephasing environment. As our main interest is to quantify the energy that flows from the system to the sink, in the following we use $J \equiv J_{\text{sink}}$ as our first measure of efficiency. This expression has been applied in previous works on quantum refrigerators [16] and to study the Fourier's law in quantum systems [7, 8].

The second measure of the efficiency that we use is the excitation flux, defined as the number of excitations incoherently absorbed by the sink per unit time. For a time interval $[0, \tau]$ it is given by

$$p_{\text{sink}} = \Gamma_{\text{sink}} \int_0^\tau P dt, \quad (8)$$

where $P \equiv \langle \sigma_3^+ \sigma_3^- \rangle$ is the population of the third site, obviously time-independent in the steady state. This fact allows us to consider the population of the third site as a measure of the speed of the excitation transfer to the RC. These two measures, the energy transfer and the population of the third site, are not equivalent since they measure slightly different quantities. Indeed, the results about the efficiency of the systems are different depending on the measure that is used.

In order to relate this two quantities it is useful to separate the hamiltonian in the following way:

$$H = H_3 + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq 3}}^7 H_{3j} + \tilde{H}, \quad (9)$$

where \tilde{H} represents the part of the hamiltonian that does not involve qubit three. Hence, J can be expressed as

$$J = \text{Tr}(H_3 \mathcal{L}_{\text{sink}}) + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq 3}}^7 \text{Tr}(H_{3j} \mathcal{L}_{\text{sink}}) + \text{Tr}(\tilde{H} \mathcal{L}_{\text{sink}}), \quad (10)$$

and the last term is null due to the fact that $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{sink}}) = 0$. A straightforward evaluation of this expression allows to express the energy transfer to the sink as a function of the population of the third site and the coherences between this qubit and all the others.

$$J = -\Gamma_{\text{sink}} \hbar \left(-\omega_3 P - \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq 3}}^7 \frac{g_{i3}}{2} (\langle \sigma_3^+ \sigma_i^- \rangle + \langle \sigma_i^- \sigma_3^+ \rangle) \right). \quad (11)$$

As $\langle \sigma_3^+ \sigma_i^- \rangle = \langle \sigma_3^- \sigma_i^+ \rangle^*$, the heat transfer will depend only in the real part of the next-neighbors coherences. It is probed that in a linear chain with equal one-sites energies and couplings these coherences are purely imaginary and the heat flux depends only in the population [7]. In the general case these coherences will be nonzero and they can contribute in a positive or negative way to the energy flux. It is clear from Eq. (11) that there is a strong connection between the energy and the population fluxes. It is also clear that these measures are related but not equivalent.

In a similar way the expression of the energy flux due to the dephasing environment can be calculated

$$J_{\text{deph}} = \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ j > i}}^7 -\frac{\gamma \hbar g_{ij}}{2} (\langle \sigma_i^- \sigma_j^+ \rangle + \langle \sigma_i^+ \sigma_j^- \rangle). \quad (12)$$

Again, in the concrete case of an uniform chain these next-neighbors coherences are purely imaginary and because of that this term vanishes. In a general fully connected network these elements are in general complex and there is an interchange of energy between the network and the environment due to the dephasing channel. That effect happens because the environment “measure” the system in a basis different to the hamiltonian eigenbasis. That measures can change the energy of the network and, in the steady state, that will lead to an energy flux.

IV. GENERAL NETWORKS

First we analyze the case of general fully connected networks where the excitations are absorbed from a thermal reservoir and deliver to a sink. First, we calculate the energy and excitation rates as a function of the dephasing ratio for an homogeneous network in both low and high temperature regime. Both the one-site energies and the couplings have values $\hbar\omega_i = g_{ij} = 1 \text{ cm}^{-1} \forall i, j$. The couplings with the thermal environment are $\Gamma_{\text{th}} = \Gamma_{\text{sink}} = 1 \text{ cm}^{-1}$.

The results for a low temperature thermal bath ($n = 1$) are shown in figure 1. Both measures of efficiency, the energy and excitation transfer, exhibit very different behaviors. The excitation transfer increases for small values of the dephasing ratio and decreases for higher ones. That probes that the excitation transfer at the steady state can be improved by the addition of an external noise to the system. This effect is due to the destruction of destructive interferences that inhibit the transport of the excitation to the qubit coupled to the sink. Similar results have been obtained in the one-excitation scenario [4]. For high values of the dephasing ratio γ the transport is reduced, due to a quantum Zeno effect, that avoid the coherent transport. The optimal dephasing ratio that maximizes the excitation transfer is $\gamma_{\text{uniform}}^* = 1.25 \pm 0.1 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, it is clear than this ratio is non-optimal for the heat transfer, that is higher in the absent of dephasing. For a lower temperature ($n = 1$) we have a similar result, but with smaller fluxes. The optimal dephasing ratio is independent of the temperature of the bath, indicating that it can be a general property of the hamiltonian.

For analyzing a more general case we also generated 7000 random hamiltonians, by Montecarlo simulation, where the one-site energies and the couplings between qubits are randomly selected from an uniform distribution, with $\hbar\omega_i \in [0, 10]$ and $g_{ij} \in [-10, 10]$ Again, the heat and the excitation transfer have very different behaviors. In figure 3 the heat and population fluxes are plotted for an small dephasing ratio, $\gamma = 1$, as a function of the fluxes for the same systems without dephasing, in the low temperature regime. For the heat transfer the addition of noise to the system can both increase or decrease the efficiency of the system. This improvement is smaller when the system is highly




FIG. 1: Excitation (left) and energy (right) fluxes for an homogeneous fully connected network as a function of the dephasing ratio γ for a low-temperature thermal bath, $n = 1$. Units of cm^{-1} .




FIG. 2: Excitation (left) and energy (right) fluxes for an homogeneous fully connected network with a thermal mean excitation number $n = 100$. Units of cm^{-1} .

efficient. That shows that the most efficient configurations are also the most robust against the addition of noise, and they are very difficult to improve. The excitation transfer to the sink is improved for all the analyzed hamiltonians, again this improvement reduces when the efficiency of the system increases. These results are compatible with the conclusions of Ref [15] where it is shown that, in a single excitation picture, systems with small efficiency are more suitable to be improved by a dephasing channel than the high efficient ones.

The results in the case of a high energy thermal bath are very similar, as is displayed in figure 4. Then, the enhancement is smaller than for $n = 1$ and the population transfer can also be reduced, but only in a small rate. That implies that the energy transfer is more stable under the effects of noise for systems with a high number of excitations than for the ones in which this number is smaller. Again, the most efficient configurations are more robust against the effect of noise.

The differences between the energy and heat transfer come from the fact that the energy transfer depends both on the population of the outgoing site and the coherences between it and the other qubits. Even if the dephasing channel increases the population of this qubit, increasing consequently the transfer of excitations to the sink, it also reduces the amount of coherence between qubits. These two effects compete to determine if the energy transfer will be improved or reduced. The relation between the one-site energies and the couplings plays an essential and non-trivial role in this effect.

V. PHOTOSYNTHETIC COMPLEXES

For analyzing light-harvesting biological systems we consider the FMO protein complex in green sulfur bacteria. This complex is assumed to have seven chromophores and, because of that fact, it can be modeled as a network




FIG. 3: Energy (left) and excitation (right) fluxes for random hamiltonians in the low-temperature regime ($n = 1$), for a dephasing ratio $\gamma = 1$ as a function of the fluxes without dephasing. The green line separates the configurations with enhancement and depression of the transfer. Units of cm^{-1} .




FIG. 4: Energy (left) and excitation (right) fluxes for random hamiltonians distributed by a uniform distribution in the low-temperature regime ($n = 100$), for a dephasing ratio $\gamma = 1$ as a function of the fluxes without dephasing. The green line separates the configurations with enhancement and depression of the transfer. Units of cm^{-1} .

of seven sites. We use the experimental hamiltonian given in [13], tables 2 MEAD and 4 (trimer). In cm^{-1} this hamiltonian reads:

$$H_{\text{FMO}} = \begin{pmatrix} 12445 & -104.0 & 5.1 & -4.3 & 4.7 & -15.1 & -7.8 \\ -104.0 & 12450 & 32.6 & 7.1 & 5.4 & 8.3 & 0.8 \\ 5.1 & 32.6 & 12230 & -46.8 & 1.0 & -8.1 & 5.1 \\ -4.3 & 7.1 & -46.8 & 12355 & -70.7 & -14.7 & -61.5 \\ 4.7 & 5.4 & 1.0 & -70.7 & 12680 & 89.7 & -2.5 \\ -15.1 & 8.3 & -8.1 & -14.7 & 89.7 & 12560 & 32.7 \\ -7.8 & 0.8 & 5.1 & -61.5 & -2.5 & 32.7 & 12510 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

As for this hamiltonian the one-site energies are two orders of magnitude higher than the couplings, we can expect that they play a more relevant role for the energy flux. In this concrete case the energy and excitation transfer are very similar in contraposition to the general networks analyzed before.

In figure 5 the energy and excitation fluxes are plotted as a function of the dephasing ratio γ , for the FMO hamiltonian and $n = 1$. The addition of noise improves the energy transfer in this system and both measures of efficiency have a very similar behavior. Similar results arises for $n = 100$. The optimal value of the dephasing ratio is equal for both low and high excited scenarios, and for the energy and excitation transfers, with an optimal value $\gamma_{\text{FMO}}^* = 60 \pm 1 \text{ cm}^{-1}$. This result is on the same order, but quantitatively different as the one obtained in [5] by using the mean trapping time as measure of efficiency and a global-Redfiel equation to describe the dynamics of the network.

This optimal ratio is higher than in the case of the homogeneous network analyzed before, due to the different order of magnitude between the energies and the couplings.




FIG. 5: Energy (left) and excitation (right) fluxes from the network to the sink for the FMO hamiltonian as a function of the dephasing ratio, $n = 1$. Units of cm^{-1} .

As the FMO hamiltonian is inferred from experimental spectroscopy data, it is subject to experimental uncertainty. To check a more complete scenario, we performed a Montecarlo simulation. For this simulation 7000 random hamiltonians are generated, where each parameter x corresponds to a gaussian distribution with mean in the corresponding FMO parameter x_{FMO} and a variance $\text{var} = 0.1 x_{\text{FMO}}$. By this simulation we analyze random hamiltonians with the same order of magnitude than the FMO one.




FIG. 6: Energy flux for random hamiltonians distributed by a gaussian distribution around the FMO hamiltonian, for $n = 1$ (left) and $n = 100$ (right). The y axis represents the energy flux under a dephasing channel with $\gamma = 50$ the x axis represents the energy flux without dephasing. The green line represents the space where both fluxes are equal. Units of cm^{-1} .

For a low temperature bath the results about the energy transfer are shown in Fig. 6. For small dephasing most of the configurations are improved. This improvement is more important for configurations with small efficiency and it reduces for the most efficient ones. For a higher values of γ most of the configurations are degraded, principally only the ones with lower efficiency are enhanced. Again, this result is similar if we use the population of the sink as our figure of merit. This behavior can be understood by analyzing Eq. (11). The energy flux depends on the population of the third site and on the coherences, modulated by the couplings g_{3i} .

Bad configurations will be the ones where the coherences contributes negatively to the energy flux, and for this non-efficient configurations dephasing can help, by reducing the coherences. In the cases where coherence contribute constructively to the energy flux the effect of dephasing in the system could be negative, because it reduce the amount of coherence. If the mean excitation number in the thermal bath is higher ($n = 100$) the effect is similar, but the improvement or degradation of the systems is less important so, as happens in the general networks, the transport is more robust against noise in the presence of a high temperature bath. Very similar results arise if we use the excitation instead of the energy transfer as our figure of merit.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we analyze the efficiency of excitonic transport in general quantum networks and its relation with the addition of external noise to the system. Special emphasis has been made in networks that model a real photosynthetic light-harvesting system, the FMO complex from green sulfur bacteria. This regime, the steady state scenario, is more appropriate to model the real photosynthetic process in Nature, where the evolution of the system is not conditioned on the arrival of individual excitations and the energy flows across the system continuously. For this analysis we used two different measures of the efficiency of the system. First, the energy that is transferred from the system to the sink per unit of time and, second, the population of the site connected to the sink. This population is a measure of the number of excitations that arrive to the Reaction Center of the complex per unit of time.

The differences between these two measures principally depend on the relative orders of magnitude between the one-site energies of the qubits and the couplings terms. More concrete they depend in the difference between the energy of the qubit that is coupled to the sink and the coherences between this site and the rest of the network. If this one-site energy is much higher than the couplings they play the essential role in the energy transfer and both measures exhibit a very similar behavior. Otherwise, for general networks where these parameters are similar these two measures can be very different and they can behave differently under the effects of noise.

The results also show that the excitation transfer is more suitable to be improved than the energy one. Even for the same configuration, the addition of noise can increase the number of excitations transferred to the sink per unit of time but depress the energy at the same time. In both cases, if the dephasing ratio is too high there is a Zeno effect that suppresses the transfer. Highly efficient configurations are more stable under the effect of this external noise. Also, if the injection of excitation into the network is fast, and the probability of having more than one excitation in the system at the same time is high, the system will be more robust under the effects of dephasing and it is more difficult to improve it. The optimal amount of dephasing that leads to the maximum efficiency is a general property of the hamiltonian. This optimal dephasing ratio is also different for both measures.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wants to acknowledge M. Tiersch, G.G. Guerreschi and H.J. Briegel for useful conversations. The research was funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): F04011 and F04012 and by Spanish MEC-FEDER, project FIS2009-08451, together with the Campus de Excelencia Internacional and the Junta de Andalucía, project FQM-165.

-
- [1] G.S. Engel, T.R. Calhoun, E.L. Read, T.K. Ahn, T. Manvcal, Y.C. Cheng, R.E. Blankenship, and G.R. Fleming. Evidence for wavelike energy transfer through quantum coherence in photosynthetic systems. *Nature*, 446:782, 2007.
 - [2] E. Collini, C.Y. Wong, K.E. Wilk, P.M.G. Curmi, P. Brumer, and G.D. Scholes. Coherently wired light-harvesting in photosynthetic marine algae at ambient temperature. *Nature*, 463:644–646, 2010.
 - [3] M. Plenio and S. Huelga. Dephasing-assisted transport: quantum networks and biomolecules. *New J. Phys.*, 10:113019, 2008.
 - [4] A.W. Chin, A. Datta, F. Caruso, S.F. Huelga, and M.B. Plenio. Noise-assisted energy transfer in quantum networks and light harvesting complexes. *New J. Phys.*, 12:065002, 2010.
 - [5] J. Wu, F. Liu, Young Shen, J. Cao, and R.J. Silbey. Efficient energy transfer in light-harvesting systems, I: optimal temperature, reorganization energy and spatial-temporal correlations. *NJP*, 12(105012), 2010.
 - [6] P. Brumer and M. Shapiro. Molecular response in one photon absorption: Coherent pulsed laser vs. thermal incoherent source. *arXiv:1109.0026*.
 - [7] D. Manzano, M. Tiersch, A. Asadian, and H.J. Briegel. Quantum transport efficiency and Fourier’s law. *arXiv:1112.2839 [quant-ph]*, 2011.
 - [8] A. Asadian, D. Manzano, M. Tiersch, and H.J. Briegel. Heat transport through lattices of quantum harmonic oscillators in arbitrary dimensions. *arXiv:1204.0904 [quant-ph]*, 2012.
 - [9] R.E. Blankenship, D. M. Tiede, J. Barber, G.W. Brudvig, G. Fleming, M. Ghirardi, M.R. Gunner, W. Junge, D.M. Kramer, A. Melis, T.A. Moore C.C., Moser, D.G. Nocera, A.J. Nozik, D.R. Ort, W.W. Parson, R.C. Prince, and R.T. Sayre. Comparing photosynthetic and photovoltaic efficiencies and recognizing the potential for improvement. *Science*, 332(6031):805–809, 2011.
 - [10] F. Caruso, A.W. Chin, A. Datta, S.F. Huelga, and M.B. Plenio. Entanglement and entangling power of the dynamics in light-harvesting complexes. *Phys. Rev. A*, 81(6):062346, 2010.
 - [11] H.P. Breuer and F. Petruccione. *The theory of open quantum systems*. Oxford University Press, 2002.

- [12] A. Rivas, A.D. Plato, S. Huelga, and M.B. Plenio. Markovian master equations: a critical study. *New J. Phys.*, 12:113032, 2010.
- [13] J. Adolphs and T. Renger. How proteins trigger excitation energy transfer in the FMO complex of green sulfur bacteria. *Biophys. Journal*, 91(2778), 2006.
- [14] J.S. Cao. A phase-space study of Bloch–Redfield theory. *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 107:3204, 1997.
- [15] T. Scholak, F. de Melo, T. Wellens, F. Mintert, and A. Buchleitner. Efficient and coherent excitation transfer across disordered molecular networks. *Phys. Rev. E*, 83(2):021912, 2011.
- [16] N. Linden, S. Popescu, and P. Skrzypczyk. How small can thermal machines be? The smallest possible refrigerator. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 105(13):130401, 2010.